National Centennial Act

this out, Mr. Chairman, and saying that if there is any amendment that needs to be made to our constitution, if it is necessary, if it hurts some part of this nation, let us correct it, but let us not ruin this nation. Let us keep this nation united. Let us keep this nation strong. Let us keep this nation so that everyone, regardless of racial origin, owes allegiance to no other country but Canada.

Mr. Macaluso: Mr. Chairman, I was most interested in the hon. member's speech. I found in it many points with which I agree, but there was one statement about which I should like to ask a question. The hon. member referred to his two fine daughters who are teaching. He mentioned, I think, that they are teaching in a solely English district and this district had no objection to name. Is the hon, member inferring that there are districts or areas in this country where anybody does object to a person's name, no matter what that name may be?

Mr. Mandziuk: I started by saying that we had to overcome prejudices; that there was discrimination; that there were such areas; that there were such districts. However, I have not seen any in the last 20 or 25 years, or at least since the last world war.

[Translation]

Mr. Gregoire: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the resolution is precisely to change the expression "national centennial" to "centennial of confederation".

The hon. member who has just spoken, the hon, member for Marquette (Mr. Mandziuk) said: "Whether it is the centennial of the nation or of confederation, what does that change, those are only words, let us get some action".

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall reply to the hon. member for Marquette that those may be words but to us, they have their meaning. If, in 1812, that is 55 years before confederation, when the nation already existed, when there were Lamontagnes, Tremblays, Merciers, Caouettes and Gregoires who fought in the Canadian army against the invader, if it had not been for them, he could not boast of being a Canadian citizen today. He could simply call himself an American citizen.

Before confederation, there was a Canadian nation, there was a Canadian country, there was a Canadian fatherland and Canadian citizens who worked, fought to develop that country. It is precisely because there was a Canadian history prior to 1867 that the hon. member for Marquette can be proud to live in a country which progressed, developed and expanded.

1867, the hon, member for Marquette might is said, is known to be outspoken. Well, I will

French in Ontario. Why not? I am pointing think to himself that he would not be welcome in Canada. It is because Canadians fought for Canada before 1867 that he is here today.

> That is why words mean something to us. "Centennial of confederation" and "national centennial" do not mean the same thing at all.

> Does the hon. member for Marquette realize that it is because of our forefathers who were here in Canada before 1700 and 1800 that he can share with us the benefits of this country? I cannot tell what his ethnic origin might be, but two centuries ago those people were not here.

> We welcome as friends all those who come to live in Canada. We want to recognize their rights and privileges, but we want them to recognize that, before they came to Canada, our two great nations worked towards the development of this country.

> We are happy to grant them all the rights which every Canadian citizen can enjoy, but we do not want them to forget that we fought, before they came, so that they might enjoy the rights and the freedom which are now ours in Canada.

> A while ago, I heard the hon. member for Marquette say: We want our rights without taking anything from anybody, but let no one take anything away from us either. If ever a Canadian citizen from another ethnic origin is deprived of any right as a Canadian citizen, I will be the first to stand in this house to see to it that he is granted his rights, and that, in any province, in Quebec or elsewhere.

> We favour the respect of the rights of each and every one and we are not asking Canadian citizens to give up their rights, because, on the contrary, we want to preserve them.

> Yesterday, the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher) said to me: "You are engaged in a fight; what have you got against English Canadians? Why are you fighting against us?" I answered him: "Since we sit side by side, then read Hansard or stay in the house and listen to us; then you will realize that we do not want to take anything away from the English Canadians, we want nothing from them, no concession, no privilege, we do not want them to give up anything, we are simply insisting on our right to grow, to expand and progress as French Canadians.

> I think it is possible to do so without taking anything away from the English Canadians; furthermore, we want to help them to grow.

I was just reading part of a speech made If it had not been for that period before by the hon. member for Port Arthur who, it

[Mr. Mandziuk.]