

areas are predominantly citizens of Ukrainian origin. They are now getting into wrangles over whether they are going to have the street signs in two languages, and all that kind of thing. Disagreement has come into a community where never before had there been any such kind of disagreement. And that is not an isolated case.

All I am pointing out is that this series of steps that the Government of Canada has taken to try to accommodate the aspirations and concerns of the people of Quebec, has imposed a heavy strain on the people in many other regions of Canada.

We have been reading what I feel are very unfortunate statements by our press in the last few days about the possibility of severing the rest of our ties with the monarchy. I am not going to get into a debate on that subject tonight, but I draw to the attention of honourable senators that that is the kind of thing, in my view, that should never be raised under the circumstances that prevail in Canada today.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Manning: When you start raising highly emotional issues of that kind, you do a lot of unnecessary harm. The people who want to sever Canada's ties with the Crown are not going to gain anything by the severance. There is not a person in Canada today who is restricted in any way or whose way of life is altered in any way by virtue of the fact that historically this country has had a long traditional association with the Crown. These ties are in the realm of the abstract so far as their application to Canada is concerned in this day and generation; but these ties are related to the emotions and heartstrings of millions of Canadian people, and when you cut these strings or try to cut them you create a resentment, you create a reaction that is totally unnecessary because you have not gained a single thing in the process.

It reminds me of the principle the poet had in mind when he said:

Who steals my purse steals trash; 'tis something,
nothing;
'Twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands;
But he that filches from me my good name
Robs me of that which not enriches him,
And makes me poor indeed.

What I think he was trying to say was that when you take away from a man his reputation, you are no better for what you have taken away from him but you have robbed him of something that meant a great deal to him.

Analogously, if the minority groups of this country, or those who have no feeling for the Crown—and I have no quarrel with their attitude because that is their right—think that by taking away from the millions of Canadians to whom these things do mean a great deal, they are furthering their cause, they could not be more wrong. They are not going to be enriched by a severance of our ties with the monarchy, but others would be made poor

indeed by such severance. That is not the way to get unity in Canada.

I could go through the whole list of these things. For example, we have had disagreements at the federal-provincial conferences over the opting-out privilege. You cannot give such privileges to one part of Canada and not to another. You cannot argue that there is that much of a fundamental difference between provinces of Canada.

Economic aid is another example. I do not begrudge the money that Canadian taxpayers are spending to try to improve the economic conditions of Quebec, but I can understand the people in my province, and in Saskatchewan and elsewhere in the west, being more than a bit concerned—and I am sure the same is true in other regions that are much younger than Quebec—that a province which is rich in resources and which has had over a century to develop now has to have the aid of other, younger areas of Canada.

I am not quarreling with what we have done in this regard, but I am simply pointing out that all these things have exacted a price, emotionally, financially and otherwise from the people in other parts of Canada.

If having done all of these things we could meet here tonight and know that the aspirations of the French Canadian people of Quebec had been met and that everyone had now found his accommodation, then I am sure every honourable senator would say that it was not too big a price to pay for a result of that kind. But what is the irony of all of this? The irony is that we cannot say that. If we are realistic, we must acknowledge that notwithstanding all these and other actions which have been taken by this nation to meet the concerns and demands of Quebec, there is little if any indication that Quebec is any happier in Confederation today than she was five years ago. In fact, if we are to be completely honest, we may be compelled to admit that the reverse appears to be true.

The danger of all this is the backlash that may well develop in other areas of Canada if this situation continues much longer. In this set of circumstances, when the June conference is held, if Quebec is the province that rejects the revised formula or demands changes which other regions of Canada cannot accept, the consequences may well be serious not only for the hopes of constitutional reform but for the future of Confederation itself.

I confess to you, and I have some reticence in saying this, that if anyone had come to me five years ago when I was Premier of Alberta and had suggested that there was a danger of Confederation breaking up, I would have said, "Man! Your judgment could not be worse." I simply would not have believed that that was a real danger. I could not say that tonight, because I think that danger is there and we are only blinding ourselves to reality if, we refuse to recognize how real that danger is.

For these reasons it seems to me that there have been few constitutional conferences at which a heavier responsibility will rest upon the shoulders of the partici-