

University of British Columbia. She was also nominated for the position of chancellor at University of British Columbia two years ago.

Mrs. Austin Brownell, member of the board of governors, Acadia University.

Mrs. Saul Hayes, past president of the National Council of Women and wife of the executive vice president of the Canadian Jewish Congress.

Mr. Norman A. Hesler, chairman of the regents of Mount Allison University.

Mr. W. A. Johnston, president of the Winnipeg art gallery.

Dr. J. F. Leddy, vice president of the University of Saskatchewan.

Mrs. Lloyd J. Lewis, widow of Judge Lloyd J. Lewis.

Father Malcolm Macdonnell, professor of history, St. Francis Xavier University.

Professor John Meisel, professor of political science, Queen's University.

Judge J. Michaud, eminent jurist and Acadian.

Hon. Roland Michener, former speaker of the House of Commons.

Mr. Pickersgill: A well known Liberal.

Mr. Lamontagne: Judge Alfred Monnin, president of the Winnipeg symphony orchestra, final festival chairman of the dominion drama festival.

Mr. Frank Pagotto, businessman from Montreal, of Italian origin.

Mrs. E. S. Russenholt, who among other things was chairman of the women's branch, Canadian institute of national affairs, chairman of the national radio awards committee for public affairs, free-lance broadcaster, and a member of the national advisory board of the Canadian association for adult education.

Again I ask the Leader of the Opposition, where is the 75 per cent patronage? I would like very much to get an answer from him, and I would also like to see some justification made of the accusations levelled against me, which were also a most unfair reflection on the eminent citizens who have so generously accepted to serve their country through the national conference on the centennial.

Such an unfair reflection will certainly not contribute to bringing together, as the Leader of the Opposition hopes, all parts of this country in a unity of dedication.

I should now like to deal with the other major point raised by the Leader of the Opposition. He claims that 1867 marked the birth of our nation and that in that year colonies by the sea such as—I quote more or less from *Hansard*—Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick joined together as a nation. Apparently the Leader of the Opposition has forgotten

National Centennial Act

the history of his country. If I am not mistaken Prince Edward Island joined confederation in 1873, not in 1867, and Newfoundland came to the same decision in 1949, not in 1867.

An hon. Member: Small potatoes.

Mr. Lamontagne: Look at *Hansard*. This is another example of the accuracy of statements made by the right hon. gentleman.

It seems to me that whether we would like to do it or not, we cannot change the facts of our history. It is quite clear to me, as it should be to the right hon. gentleman, that our nation and Canada existed before 1867. What did happen in 1867? United Canada and two other separate British colonies joined together in a confederation to form a single British colony, which became sovereign in fact much later in the present century. Thus, the only event we will celebrate, strictly speaking, in 1967 is the centennial of confederation.

We certainly do not want to downgrade Canada, as some hon. members claim, but I maintain that to state that Canada existed before 1867, that our nation was born before 1867, is not to downgrade Canada or our nation. It is merely a statement of fact to say that, in the strict meaning of our history, we will celebrate in 1967 the centennial of the Canadian federation, and we should all be proud to celebrate together this most important historic event.

[Translation]

I should like now to add a few words on the precise character of the resolution, as well as on the usefulness of the bill which will follow.

I should like in the first place to refer to the gist of the debate which went on between the former prime minister (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the premier of Quebec in October, 1961.

It must be pointed out that the English version of the present legislation, in the wording it uses, does not agree at all with the French version. When the Leader of the Opposition became aware of that mistake, in my opinion, he should have taken at once the necessary means to bring about the changes in the other official version of the legislation.

To show you very specifically the differences between the two versions, I would like to take, as an example, the official name of the administration. The English version reads: "National Centennial Administration"; this should have been translated: "Administration nationale du centenaire". In the official French version, it was translated by "Administration du centenaire de la nation", which is not at all the same thing.