

lature, it is unnecessary to state, the constitutional stipulations are complied with in their widest interpretation. Our fellow-citizens whose language is English enjoy every right, and, better still, the most extensive privileges. Would to God it were so for the minorities in all provinces of Confederation!

Hon. Mr. LACASSE (Translation): Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. CHAPPAIS (Translation): In the Dominion sphere, the British North America Act is entirely adhered to. The speech from the Throne is delivered in both languages: the English and French versions. The Debates are published in both languages: the English and French versions. The Journals of both Houses are published in the two languages: the English and French versions. The Statutes are issued in both languages: the English and French versions. The sessional documents are printed in the two languages: the English and French versions. However, there was a sphere where this equality was not, in practice, recognized. It was in connection with the legal currency and Canadian bank notes. More than once an endeavour was made to introduce the rule of the dual languages. And here, honourable colleagues, I wish to assure you that I harbour no mental reservation from the political standpoint. Long ago, I dissociated myself from what is known as party spirit. I simply wish to remind honourable gentlemen that, in 1907, for instance, an endeavour was made, and again later, to stipulate that the rule of the dual languages would apply to currency. It failed.

To-day, at last, the bill under consideration sets forth the consecration of the principle of the dual languages applied to the legal currency. Section 24 of the bill under consideration stipulates as follows:

The form and material of the notes shall be subject to approval by the Minister: Provided that notes in either the English or French language shall be available as required.

Faced with this text, I ask this honourable Chamber: Is it a setback or a step forward? Is it a retrogression or an advance? The answer, with all the clearness of the evidence, is thrust upon us.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND (Translation): I never stated that it was a retrogression.

Hon. Mr. CHAPPAIS (Translation): Certainly not. My honourable friend is too intelligent to hold such views. However, it has been stated and written.

Hon. Mr. CHAPPAIS.

Referring to section 24 of the bill, I state that this measure, after sixty-seven years of federal rule, is a supplementary act, a new proclamation, in a new sphere, of equality in both languages.

I am pleased to be able to quote the words of a man whose evidence cannot be doubted. The following is what Mr. Henri Bourassa stated in a recent speech:

I think the amendment as framed by the Minister of Finance conforms strictly to the letter of article 133 of the British North America Act. . . .

It was stated that this amendment of the Minister of Finance is a step backward. Of course, I have a very simple mind and a limited experience both in reading law and in parliamentary government: but I cannot get it into my head that the fact that this legislation declaring for the first time that bills and money shall be printed in French, is a backward step in the acknowledgment of the French language.

Hon. Mr. LACASSE (Translation): How did Mr. Bourassa vote?

Hon. Mr. CHAPPAIS (Translation): I refer to Mr. Bourassa's views; they have a particular weight.

Hon. Mr. LACASSE (Translation): Which is expressed by a vote.

Hon. Mr. CHAPPAIS (Translation): Now, I hear tremulous voices—some are sincerely moved—exclaim: "We not only request that bank notes be printed in French; we want bank notes printed both in English and French." To this one might reply: "De gustibus non disputandum." You prefer bank notes bearing both French and English inscriptions, we prefer bank notes bearing entirely French inscriptions. With the utmost goodwill, I cannot see how the recognition of the rights of my language is more complete with a bank note printed half in French and half in English than with a bank note printed entirely in French.

Perhaps, in practice, the working out of the two-note system would create some inconvenience. That is possible. However, let us await events; there will always be time to remedy such a system. At present, for my part, I only look at the principle, at the official recognition of the rights of the French language. I look upon the rest as of secondary importance, a matter of modality, a question of shade. Shall we quarrel, shall we fight over a matter of shade, when the principle which is dear to us is wholly recognized?

We are told that the French note offered to us will have the effect of limiting its usage to Quebec. I cannot admit this.