

It is an honour for me to address this great congregation from the pulpit of the Sanctuary in Holy Blossom Temple. In its essence a place of worship, this Temple also serves the people of Toronto as an intellectual centre and a centre for social action. It exemplifies the way in which one of our great communities maintains its particular faith, traditions and culture while at the same time making its distinctive contribution to the life of the metropolis and the nation as a whole.

I would first like to congratulate those responsible, and particularly Mr. Milton Cadsby, for the initiative shown in arranging this seminar to discuss one of the most central and most demanding questions we face, the continued life, health and unity of our beloved country. I would also like, at the very beginning, to say to you frankly that the title given your seminar "Canada and Quebec a Year Later" presents certain difficulties for me. One cannot speak of Canada on the one hand and Quebec on the other. Without Quebec there is no Canada. Quebec is an essential element in the Canadian reality. It was the Indian word Canada that was adopted as the name for this part of North America by the original French colonisers. Our French-speaking fellow-citizens were Canadien for two centuries before the term Québécois took on its present meaning. Today, the overwhelming majority of the people of Quebec are still Canadien, then Québécois. On Sunday M. René Lévesque may see fit to challenge that simple, basic assumption. I suggest to you that you listen carefully and make up your own minds about the extent to which his argument is based upon observable fact, and the extent to which it flows from his own passionate involvement in his chosen cause.

The last of the first things that I have to say to you is that my personal faith in the continued life and health of a united Canada is unshaken, and my personal commitment to a united Canada will not be shaken. In saying this I speak not only for myself but for the Government of which I am part and for the Liberal Party that I support. Were this not the case, I could not be a member of the Government nor a supporter of my party.

In political discussions today the so-called "scenarios" are very much in vogue. I prefer to call them the "what ifs?" You know the sort of thing I mean - Can you devise a scenario by which John Lindsay would become the next President of the United States? - What if the British legislation for entry into the Common Market were defeated at Westminster? This kind of thing amounts to a highly-sophisticated and intellectually stimulating parlour game but, except when practiced by profes-