

along cultural lines—and I use the word “cultural” purposely. There is hardly any difference between the members of this house over racial matters; our differences are mostly cultural.

Frankly, I do not believe this country is more divided along any line of thought than any other country in the world. At the same time, one must admit there are a number of matters of national interest about which there exists a wide divergence of views. We have an example of that right in the senate to-day. There is also a great divergence of opinion, for instance, on the amount of controls we should retain in this post-war period; on the attitude of the government towards labour and labour relations; on monetary policies; on the extent of government interference with private enterprise; on external affairs; on the extent to which we should assert our sovereignty.

On all but the last mentioned of these matters on which public opinion is divided, the cleavage is definitely not along cultural lines. On this latter issue, however, it would seem that my compatriots of French descent, together with members of the C.C.F. party, are prepared to go somewhat farther than most of the Progressive Conservatives and the Social Crediters. Every time the so-called ultra-nationalist group take a stand towards a more distinctive Canadian attitude on public matters, there are some members of the house who take the view that somebody is endeavouring to weaken our ties with Great Britain and the other countries of the commonwealth. This talk of weakening our ties with the countries of the commonwealth does not come from this side of the house, and for that reason one may be justified in wondering which group is more likely to contribute to the weakening of the ties. Frankly I feel that if those gentlemen were to remain silent on this matter they would help their own cause a good deal more. There is nothing more likely to create doubt in a person's mind than to be constantly talking about the problems which constitute the subject of such doubts.

During the short time in which I have been in this house it has struck me whenever a measure such as the one now before the committee happens to meet with the approval of the Quebec members, some hon. members opposite come to the conclusion that there must be some sinister design behind it and that it should be systematically opposed. I hope that my hon. friends opposite will recognize that there was no sinister anti-British design in the minds of my Quebec ancestors when they refused to listen to Lafayette, Franklin, and others at the time of the American revolution; that there was no

sinister design in their minds when they defended this country against the Americans during the war of 1812-14. Which group was trying to weaken the ties, and where were the sinister designs, when in 1849 a move was made for annexation of this country to the United States? I shall not take up time by giving the quotation I had intended to give at this point.

If I refer to those historical facts it is not with the view of recalling incidents which may be pleasant or unpleasant to one group or another. It is only to reassure some of our friends on the other side about the position of the so-called ultra-nationalists so kindly referred to in an article of the *Ottawa Journal* of April 16, which I quote:

Young Men in a Hurry

Why are our young ultra-nationalists, so influential with the present government, in such an infernal hurry with their ultra-nationalist schemes? In a single session of parliament we have measures to change “Dominion day” to “Canada day,” to make Canadian citizenship more narrowly Canadian, and to create a “distinctive Canadian flag.”

I shall dispense with reading another paragraph which I intended to read. The editorial establishes clearly that in some quarters there is a great deal of suspicion as to the loyalty of a group of Canadians in this country. May I quote from a letter published in the *Montreal Gazette* of yesterday over the signature of J. H. Bender, of Montreal:

Once more the Conservative party has resolved to try to regain the support it once commanded in this small conservative-thinking old province of Quebec.

The writer says in substance there is a suspicion about the loyalty of the French Canadians in some parts of Canada. I intended to quote a few paragraphs but that is the substance of it, and I do not want to take up too much time so I shall dispense with reading it. But I wish to bring this well-timed letter to the attention of the committee.

Let us be realistic for a moment, and ask ourselves what Quebec could possibly do to weaken its ties to the commonwealth. I see but two alternatives: annexation to the United States, and separatism. Hon. members who have studied the history of this country must have learned that the greatest opposition to annexation has come from Quebec. As to the suggestion sometimes lightly advanced of an independent Quebec state, it is simply preposterous. Some people, and Canadians of French culture are no exception to the rule, have a peculiar sense of humour. There are a few in Quebec who, in an academic frame of mind, choose once in awhile to talk separatism. In my opinion they do so pri-