I say to those who insist that the English-speaking provinces voted against Quebec in the last election that they are mindlessly repeating what was said by a few in 1957. On that occasion, and how well I remember it, these same people could not accept the verdict. They were convinced, as they still are, that only the Liberal Party is able to assure national unity in this country.

If we were to believe these narrow-minded Grits—and I hasten to say that they are not too numerous, although they are vociferous—we would have to believe that the survival of Canada depends on a permanent support of their party, not only in Quebec, but everywhere else in Canada.

Well, I don't believe in, and I don't think anybody else here believes in, a one-party system. That would smack of dictatorship.

It intrigued me to read in yesterday's newspapers that the Prime Minister had accused the Tories of trying to divide Canada during the election campaign. When pressed for evidence, the only statement the Prime Minister could come up with in support of his accusation was Mr. Stanfield's description of Jean Marchand as Santa Claus to Quebecers.

Well, the fact is that this statement of Mr. Stanfield's was made in Quebec City itself at the end of the campaign, a few days after Mr. Marchand had announced grants of several million dollars to renovate the Place Royale, the Old Arsenal and other historical places in Quebec. I say this statement by Mr. Stanfield was justified. It was not directed against Quebec nor was it disparaging of Quebecers themselves. The Prime Minister, who a few days before had said that if the electorate wanted candy he would give it to them, is hardly in any position to make a fuss about Mr. Stanfield's statement. A man who has demonstrated such supreme cynicism towards Canadians in general should be more guarded about accusing anyone—especially the Leader of the Conservative Party who has shown himself to be responsible under very difficult circumstances—of fanning the flames of racism.

What is really dangerous for the unity of this country is the very attitude that all those who support the Conservative Party are against Quebec or against French Canadians. That is a barefaced and dangerous lie.

• (1430)

I, for one, have supported the Conservative Party for 20 years, and I am satisfied that I am as good a Canadian as any Liberal. Some Liberals have always been too vain to accept defeat valiantly and manfully. Despite the fact that since 1896 their party has been in office for close to 60 years and the Conservatives only 17, they want to hang on to power as if it was theirs by divine right.

Of course, there are bigots in all parties, but if any party as a whole has been guilty of using racial arguments for electoral purposes, it has been the Liberal Party in Quebec. I make this accusation with no hesitation whatever.

When I was a tender youth, Liberal speakers fulminated through Quebec describing the conscription of 1917 as the Tory conscription, when in fact it was imposed by the Union government. I have heard Liberal speakers refer to my party as the English party, and the accusations made against its leaders during the campaigns of 1953, 1957 and 1958 were the lowest and vilest of their kind, unfit to repeat.

I won't pursue this matter any further. I only wanted to express my disagreement with the thesis of the backlash against Quebec on October 30. I wanted to give voice to my firm belief that the interests of Canada, and that includes the province of Quebec, would be better served if there was adequate representation of Quebec or French Canada in the two major parties, the only parties able to muster a sufficient number of members in the House of Commons to form a government.

I am not greedy. I am not asking for much. I would just like to see us with a safe nucleus of about 15 seats in Quebec. The Liberal Party, at the worst of times in Ontario could always count on returning at least that number.

Let me sum up the meaning of the last election for you. The people of Canada rejected as unacceptable an unfeeling, unimaginative and inefficient administration, mismanagement of the economy, inability to curb inflation, arrogance in imposing fiscal reform which has created only confusion, high unemployment, spiralling taxes, obvious lack of respect for and confidence in private enterprise and private decisions, the downgrading of Parliament, and the pursuit of goals very often contradictory.

These are the reasons why the electorate so soundly thrashed the Liberals in the last election. It was the government's miserable record that lost it so many seats.

The increased support for the Progressive Conservative Party is attributable to a well-designed program presented by a leader who inspires security and stability. This practical, if not mathematical, victory of Mr. Stanfield's is a victory for self-reliance, self-sufficiency and self-respect. It is a victory for the attitude that more government is not the answer to our problems. It is a victory for the principle that change should not be sought merely for change's sake. And it is a victory for Parliament. Parliament will now have restored to it the authority which is rightfully its own.

In any event, whatever interpretation one can place on the election results, it is quite obvious that the public was not satisfied with the government.

The P.M. accepted the blame. He pleaded "guilty as charged" and promised to change his ways, to do better. That was, and nobody will deny it, the essence of his speech when he informed Canadians that he had decided to remain in office.

It is interesting to remember the questions that arose in people's minds at that time. Would Mr. Trudeau remain the independent, somewhat arrogant individual he had always been, and resign, or would he compromise for the sake of keeping power, if not for himself, at least for his party?

I remember when Mr. Trudeau and his good friends, Messrs. Marchand and Pelletier, used to take great pleasure in castigating and ridiculing the Liberal Party. I remember when Mr. Trudeau even belittled Mr. Pearson. How strange it was to see this very same crew in 1965 join the ranks of that very same party they had so mercilessly