

courage, energy or respect for the French language to defend the language they learned on their mother's knees.

Mr. DUGUAY (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I would request the hon. member for Ottawa to withdraw the words he has just uttered. The rules of the house do not permit the hon. member to insinuate that; through lack of energy or pride or any of the reasons which he has just enumerated, we abstained from rising in the house to defend our rights. I ask the hon. member for Ottawa to withdraw such expressions.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Translation): I think the objection is well taken, inasmuch as the hon. member for Ottawa ascribes motives to the members on the right; he is bound to withdraw that part of his remark.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I bow, with the best grace, to your decision, because I am aware of your impartiality.

Did any one, sir, rise on the Government benches to speak on this resolution? They were quite satisfied with accepting the motion for the adjournment of the debate, this will always be an indelible brand on the foreheads of those who, at present, are privileged, for a rather ephemeral time, to sit on your right, sir.

It may seem rather paradoxical to you, Mr. Speaker, that I whose mother tongue is French should express in the English language, and in this honourable house of all places, my views on the question now under consideration, and if I do it in that tongue it is because both the French and the English languages are the official languages of this bilingual country. It is because, under the terms of the federal pact, I am at liberty to use which ever one of those two languages I might prefer as the conditions and circumstances may warrant or as conditions and circumstances may guide me. But how much more pleased I should be, and how much better I could do justice to the cause which has been placed before you, Mr. Speaker, if only I were able, to use the language that I learned at my mother's knee.

With the spirit and with the purport of the resolution now before the house I have no quarrel; with that resolution I am in hearty accord. But I differ with my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Boulanger) to this extent: The operative clause of the resolution reads:

Therefore be it resolved that, in the opinion of this house, in order to more clearly establish the distinctive character of the Canadian people and to better ensure its preservation, all state currency, notes or bonds should be in both official languages.

[Mr. Chevrier.]

I say that the character and the preservation of the Canadian people already have been clearly established and preserved by the terms of the federal pact, and that from that pact there flows the obligation upon the federal power to treat the French language in the same manner at all times as they treat the English language, more particularly in connection with any matter that may originate from federal control.

I shall base my argument for bilingual money on the terms of section 133 of the British North America Act. Construed in its most limited and restricted sense, and reduced to its simplest form, section 133 of the British North America Act means that all acts or actions emanating from the federal power when reduced to writing may be—note, “may” be—in either of the two official languages. I repeat, section 133 says that they “may” be in either of the two official languages. That means that when the federal authority in the exercise of its powers makes use of the English language, the French language may be similarly used for the same purpose.

It may be objected, although I trust it will not be, that that section is not imperative in its terms. With that contention I have no quarrel. But what difference is there between using the French language in any pleading or process—I am now quoting the words of section 133—which obviously are written documents, issuing from any court of Canada, and using the French language in conjunction with the English language on any paper money or coin printed, stamped, coined or issued out of the Royal Mint? Both the process and the coin or a dollar bill are issued under the federal jurisdiction by federal authority, and if there is any difference between issuing the process and issuing a dollar bill, then it ought all to be an argument in favour of issuing bilingual money, because the mint is now under federal jurisdiction and under the control of the parliament of Canada.

Why should it not be so? Do you answer, simply because it was not so explicitly stated in the bond, and that therefore the fathers of confederation did not think of it? No. I am quite satisfied that the fathers of confederation never had under contemplation the issuing of bilingual money. But there were many other matters the fathers of confederation had not in their minds when they drafted and approved of sections 91 and 92. The proof of that is that during all these years His Majesty's Privy Council has been functioning in an endeavour satisfactorily to interpret those sections. What the fathers of confederation contemplated was a united, pros-