

*The Address—Mr. Racine*

sympathy shown by this government to our families who, by the thousands, are suffering from unemployment due to Conservative policies.

It is a Tory speech from the throne, since it is against the family like the party and government now guiding Canada's destiny.

There is nothing surprising about the fuss being raised in this administration, if we consider the contradictory statements made by cabinet members.

At the Accra conference, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Hees) stated that Great Britain's intention, with regard to the common market, is bound to dismember the commonwealth. In Halifax, the Prime Minister said he was confident, on the contrary, that the British would protect Canada, while in Windsor, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fleming) stated emphatically that Canadian trade would greatly suffer.

In the atomic field, the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Harkness) cannot get over the fact that Canada is without nuclear war-heads, while the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Green) is happy about the fact that we do not have any. No wonder things are not running smoothly.

When I listened to the speech of the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Nasserden) on January 29, I was not so much interested in the topic he discussed as in the designation he used for the previous Liberal administration. He mentioned at least four times the St. Laurent-Howe administration, but speaking of this government he said the "Diefenbaker government".

As a Conservative member, he was perfectly right in not associating with the name of the Prime Minister that of a French-speaking member of the cabinet.

The Liberal party has always respected the two main ethnic groups in Canada: we had the Mackenzie King-Lapointe team, then the Mackenzie King-St. Laurent team and finally the St. Laurent-Howe team.

I wonder how the present Prime Minister can claim to be the champion of national unity when he did not do anything along that line.

Let not the Prime Minister be mistaken about it, the public is aware of those facts. I wish to quote a few paragraphs from an article of Vincent Prince published in *La Presse* of December 29, 1961, under the title:

Water-carriers in the ministry.

Here is what the article says:

Most newspapers had foreseen that Prime Minister Diefenbaker would take advantage of his [Mr. Racine.]

trip to Quebec yesterday to announce a major cabinet shuffle and the strengthening of the position of French-speaking ministers within the ministry.

Once again, the Conservative leader belied the prophets. Nothing of the sort happened. The various heads of departments remained the same and the only change in the Quebec representation is that Mr. Jacques Flynn, the member for Quebec South, has replaced Mr. Paul Comtois, recently appointed lieutenant governor of the province.

The ministers from Quebec continue to head the least important, or at any rate the least glittering departments in the federal administration. True enough, Mr. Noel Dorion has been appointed chairman of the privy council, but that is purely an honorary title. He is still Secretary of State and his functions have not been extended, contrary to what others had expected.

The new minister, Mr. Flynn, has simply inherited the portfolio of his predecessor, mines and technical surveys, while Mr. Sevigny remains Associate Minister of National Defence, Mr. O'Hurley, Minister of Defence Production, and Mr. Balcer, Minister of Transport.

And I continue to quote from that same article in *La Presse*.

Except for this last department, it will be admitted that the posts entrusted to our representatives are rather unimportant. More generosity could surely have been shown. The Department of Justice, for instance, would have suited us very well. Mr. Dorion or Mr. Flynn would have been equal to the task. In any case, the more important portfolios—finance, trade and commerce, national defence, national health and welfare, agriculture, etc., continue to slip away from us.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Diefenbaker should have chosen the capital of French Canada to announce that he is perpetuating our inferiority in his cabinet. It was not worth the trip for his ministers. The announcement could just as well have been made in Ottawa.

Can the Prime Minister claim to be the champion of national unity when he flatly turns down, without an explanation or any consideration, the request for the setting up of a royal commission on bilingualism?

Can the Prime Minister claim to be the champion of national unity when he attempts to work up the rest of Canada on the question of the flag? What is he trying to do, in this regard—appeal to race prejudice?

This is what we are asking ourselves when we see how hard he has been trying to revive a badly reported statement of the leader of the Liberal party, made in Amherst, Nova Scotia, last November, and which our leader has described as inaccurate.

What is the Prime Minister trying to do when he asks his lieutenants to spread out this inaccuracy all over Canada before the election? Here are the views expressed in an article published in *La Presse* of January 23, 1962, I quote:

For one, I am afraid that the campaign Mr. Diefenbaker seems to be launching will put us back a hundred years. What are our English-speaking compatriots going to think? They will most