

how much ground has been covered toward the outright acceptance of Canadian duality.

How else could the results of the last election be interpreted, Mr. Speaker? A government that had successfully rekindled our economy, balanced budgets, reduced unemployment and increased national production, rightly deserved the confidence of the greatest part of the Canadian electoral body.

The morning after the elections they were said to be useless, to be a throw-back. Some newspapermen commenting upon them, kept saying: Leaders must go. What a childish statement.

I sincerely believe that if, during the last two and a half years, certain newspapers had not looked for "sensationalism", in short, had there been fewer fault finders, and more conscientious citizens intent on explaining to the general public the real objectives of the various measures taken by the government to create, promote and further the dual character of Canada and had there been fewer personal attacks, the confusion existing in the minds of a large number of Canadians, as far as the future of our country is concerned would have been dispelled in no time.

Mr. Speaker, less than a year ago, that is in February 1965, the members of the commission on bilingualism and biculturalism presented a preliminary report.

This commission had been set up by the Canadian parliament, with the unanimous consent of the premiers of the ten Canadian provinces. In this preliminary report we find this:

They have been driven to the conclusion that Canada, without being fully conscious of the fact, is passing through the greatest crisis in its history.

The preamble goes on as follows:

The source of the crisis lies in the province of Quebec; that fact could be established without an extensive inquiry.

And further on:

If it should persist and gather momentum it could destroy Canada. On the other hand, if it is overcome, it will have contributed to the rebirth of a richer and more dynamic Canada. But this will be possible only if we face the reality of the crisis and grapple with it in time.

Mr. Speaker, how can this royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism be and remain the subject of sharp criticism by the Leader of the Opposition, he who should offer a possible alternative in the event of an election.

How can one imagine that for more than three months, the official opposition fought to prevent Canada from getting a distinctive flag at last—

*The Address—Mr. Laflamme*

**Mr. Vincent:** The old story all over again.

**Mr. Laflamme:** A tangible, essential, paramount symbol, I would add an elementary symbol for a people in search of unity.

How comforting it would have been yesterday—and I ask the hon. member who has just interrupted me to try and explain to his leader that this is essential for the survival of Canada as a nation—to hear the Leader of the Opposition say and affirm at least that the reference in the speech from the throne to a measure to be introduced to recognize "O Canada" as our national anthem was something, a step forward toward the development of a Canadian entity, toward the creation of another national symbol meaning that Canadian citizenship can be sought, with honour, by all Canadian ethnic groups.

Having heard yesterday the speech of the Prime Minister on the dual character of Canada, the sober and courageous statements about his concept of our Canada of today and of tomorrow, I can only state that this man, this leader came in his time to save this country from chaos. The scornful smiles which I detected on the faces of the members of the official opposition force me to say that unless their conception of Canada's ethnic duality is fundamentally modified, they will never come back to this side of the House.

Until 1960 and during 16 years in Quebec our politicians in power have continuously tried to represent the Canadian government as if it were that of a foreign country. It would be just as bad and deplorable to try to make the headlines today through wild statements against the Federal government, whether or not this would be worthwhile for election purposes. I wish and hope that the politicians of my provincial legislature will echo the words of the Canadian Prime Minister with as much broadmindedness, detachment, insight and maturity.

Those who continuously strive to make the headlines by smearing our government must desist; the voice of reason and logic must join in promoting, through cultural diversity, a Canadian identity which unbiased and right-minded individuals will find acceptable.

As a representative of Quebec in the Parliament of Canada, although I rejoice in the positive and dynamic policies of the provincial government and I recognize its role as the main control lever where the French Canadians, their cultural emancipation and control of their economy are concerned, I shall refuse to merely echo the voice of the