

and what should be the contents of a revised Constitution. I merely want to recommend its reading up to the page on constitutional revision to anyone doing research on the matter. This 1964 statement is most useful in establishing the position of each and every one involved and it could advantageously be revived in 1971 in a most constructive manner for all the participants.

[English]

The conference in its recent communique agreed that the federal Government and the provinces should proceed as quickly as possible to patriate the Constitution with an appropriate amending formula that would be applicable entirely within Canada. They also agreed to effect other remedial changes as soon as possible. This new approach, in my mind, provides a great breakthrough. Because of it there should now be less chance of a deadlock, and, if it is our wish, it will enable us to have a sovereign Constitution that will fulfil the ideals and the aims of all Canadians.

The formula whereby there can be amendments of concern to Canada as a whole plus one or more but not all provinces appears to me, in the present circumstances, justifiable. I am sure it will open up many interesting avenues where general solutions previously appeared unobtainable.

It is not easy to solve language rights problems where there is a disparate use of more than one language over an immense territory. Honourable Senator Connolly mentioned some important recommendations made in the Bilingual and Bicultural Commission Report on the question of languages. I, too, recently spoke on the language problems in Quebec. My own views are clear. They remain unchanged. They go unreservedly along with the B and B recommendations. Therefore I shall not repeat myself.

Travelling as I do, I am always fascinated by the culture and knowledge that multilingual nations provide to those around them. Such nations have more often than not shown evident general superiority which, I am sure, is a direct result of their added culture and knowledge. Canadians should strive to achieve these very important advantages and these internal peace-builders. To promote the learning of two languages in Canada could never be considered a mistake, either from a social, political or economic point of view. Moreover, now that we have language laboratories that make the studying of any language much easier than in the past, it seems a shame that any Canadian would advocate unilingualism for his sons and daughters—our Canadians—who would then miss the great, universal advantages of bilingualism and the knowledge that two cultures can provide. It would give Canada as a nation a distinct and most usable superiority of culture and knowledge and a relationship to the greater part of the world, and these things would bear their fruit in the many economic advantages that would derive from the greater knowledge of the peoples of all countries.

The United Republic of Soviet Russia comprises 15 republics speaking more than 15 official languages and 92 different dialects. Each republic has at least two official languages of its own as well as Byelo Russian, or the White Russian language, as it is called. I am informed

[Hon. Mr. Desruisseaux.]

that when they meet together to discuss their problems they use Byelo Russian. Although not everyone is conversant with it, it enables the majority to communicate and understand one another.

An analogous situation exists even in Germany, where there are seven or eight current dialects.

The point is that such multilingualism has not created troubles for these countries, and, in fact, has passed quite unnoticed by foreigners. Furthermore, there are many countries of Europe, Latin America, Asia and Africa where two or more languages are learned and spoken because it is the practical thing to do and has the further advantage of providing additional culture.

We should recognize the true cultural values existing in the world today and realize that the price of learning another language is small indeed for our sons and daughters.

I would suggest to you that to anyone who has travelled the world over it is obvious how much advantage can be derived from a second language. I disagree entirely with the current trend in the Province of Quebec towards unilingualism. Such a trend is destructive and negative and is cultivated mostly by revenge-seekers.

As I have said here on other occasions, I remain deeply concerned about the help unilingualism is receiving even from such an unlikely source as the Quebec authorities. And I say that advisedly because the Government of Quebec has recently announced a policy for French as the working language in industry. That is a negative, retrograde step for Quebecers. Quebec will be hurt economically by its own political stand on that. There is no doubt that the province will be the loser industrially and, even more unfortunately, culturally.

Hon. Mr. Choquette: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Desruisseaux: I for one will combat with all my strength all such retrograde policies which would limit our culture and knowledge to one language. We should rightfully fear in a young country like Canada any disintegration of mutually advantageous communications between Canadians.

It was agreed at the third session of the conference that the existence and independence of the Supreme Court of Canada should be entrenched in the Constitution. The conference further recognized the importance of provincial participation in the processing of its equitable candidates for appointment to our courts.

I unreservedly approve these suggested amendments. I already have expressed my views on the optional use of languages in the courts and in court procedures. I hope the optional use will be assured in our new Constitution; otherwise, how could we claim that there is equality among us?

The appointment of our judges through such provincial participation in the choice of candidates will constitute, in my view, an important step forward.

So far as I am concerned I believe the formula of provincial participation in the choice of our senators can also be applied in the consideration of candidates for the Senate. In a true federation, in a real and recognized