

*National Centennial Act*

going to celebrate, since Canada existed long before 1867.

He went on to say—and this surprised me:

I also remember that at the last Conservative convention, for instance, a resolution was moved to change the constitution so that the word "dominion" be deleted. It was put to a vote and a majority of delegates voted to have the word "dominion" suppressed.

These words give a somewhat different impression to that given by the hon. member's leader. The hon. member for Marquette made what I consider to be a fine speech, a fine contribution. He, too, ranged far and wide. I find I must agree with many of the things he said. As reported on page 4942, he stated:

Other peoples came into this country after 1867.... They came here, not as hewers of wood or drawers of water. They felt they were coming in as equals, as partners in the building of this nation and they so feel today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I agree. Then the hon. member went on to say:

These people who came were prepared to make maximum contributions to the development of one over-all Canadian culture. They are making those contributions today to a national culture embracing the best of all cultures.

These are not words with which one can argue. I agree with them. He went on to say:

These people pray, and I believe I have a right to ask on their behalf, that they be not left behind in celebrating the 100th anniversary of this great nation of ours. They wish to celebrate. They wish to take stock of what they have achieved and what they have contributed to this nation. They hope that the two founding races appreciate their contributions and they are not asking for anything else.... They ask for the privilege of full participation.... I am proud of my racial origin and I am proud of being a Canadian.

Like many other members of this house, I, too, am a Canadian who descends from an ancestry which is other than French or English. I am proud of my Italian ancestry, just as the hon. member for Marquette is proud of his Ukrainian ancestry. But, Mr. Speaker, when he implies in his speech that people who have come to this country from the European nations may be looked upon as second class citizens because of an amendment to this act, then I say he is not speaking with sincerity but is speaking strictly for purposes of public propaganda. I take objection to his remarks when he says, as found on page 4943 of *Hansard*:

If we are a nation, this is a national celebration and the purposes of this act would remain the same if it were called the National Centennial Act.

The hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Pigeon) does not agree with that. We have not heard from the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer) or the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Valade). I am wondering what they are thinking. But this

[Mr. Macaluso.]

is not important. We all know that the right hon. gentlemen at one time in the history of the country tried—

**Mr. Valade:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am very delighted to hear the hon. member but I think he is completely out of order. He has been reading from speeches by different members of the house and saying, "I agree with this" or "I do not agree with that". We would like him to tell us his own opinion and come back to the main purport of the bill. I do not mind hearing his comments but I should like him not to read the speeches of others. I hope he can make a speech of his own.

**Mr. Macaluso:** On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, this just shows that the hon. member does not know whereof he speaks. I am quoting from certain speeches made by members of his party, and if they were in order when they made them I am in order when I quote from them to show how inconsistent they are.

**Mr. Pigeon:** We are on second reading.

**Mr. Macaluso:** I still intend to quote certain remarks made by members of the party to which the hon. gentleman belongs. With regard to the changing of the short title of National Centennial Act, at first I wondered why it should be changed. But I was not aware then that the premier of the province of Quebec had written to the Leader of the Opposition when he was prime minister setting out the reasons why he recommended this change. I was not aware until it was explained by the President of the Privy Council in the house why Canadians of French origin object strenuously to the wording of the short title. This only goes to bear out what I have always considered and still consider to be a lack of interest on the part of the right hon. gentleman in many things with regard to which he states that he was or is the great defender. We would not have wasted three days in the house—

**Mr. Churchill:** What are you doing?

**Mr. Macaluso:** —if the plea of the premier of the province of Quebec had been listened to at that time and if a proper translation had been made at that time. I am quite concerned about the people who have come to this country from the European nations. As the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Mandziuk) stated, they came to this country to be Canadians, they are Canadians and, as I said the other night during the speech of the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Gregoire), they are making a contribution.

But I would say that each and every one of us has a responsibility to see that the