

*National Arts Centre*

not satisfied with the lot we have had for the last 100 years and who today are demanding not only statements of goodwill, but legislation to guarantee precisely those rights of the other partner of confederation, and also guarantee that confederation is going to stay alive. Unless this *mane, thecel, phares*, is seen written on the wall, Mr. Chairman, what will happen is that our angry young men in the province of Quebec will have their way. They took 10 per cent of the vote in the last provincial election and it is neither impossible, nor visionary, to think that in a future election, they might take even more, unless we give them what they are entitled to and what they are demanding with the eloquence we know. Since that time, I have seen that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has made statements which I found disturbing, and I want you to note that I do not blame him nor accuse him of ill-will. But nevertheless, according to what I read in *Le Devoir* for Tuesday, June 21, he is reported as saying in Toronto:

The Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons stated Sunday before an audience made up of Canadians of Ukrainian origin his opposition to the creation of any political "third force" to represent Canadians who are not of Anglo-Saxon or French origin.

I recognize that the hon. Leader of the Opposition showed courage by saying that in Toronto, and I give him credit for making a courageous statement. But a little further on, the report says:

The Conservative leader also rejected the suggestion of two nations within Canada.

This is not so good.

● (7:10 p.m.)

I do not blame the hon. Leader of the Opposition for not understanding the point fully, since he comes from a place which is quite a distance from Quebec, and perhaps nobody has bothered to give him adequate explanations, but the fact remains that there are two nations here, which are partners in a covenant, and the one I represent intends to demand respect of this covenant, or else, and the hon. premier of the province of Quebec has very frankly said so recently, it would be equality or separatism. Therefore, this is the point that should be considered at this time, and that is the aspiration that should be met if anyone thinks it is the right of French Canadians. Otherwise, they should be told, so that they will know what attitude to take. I am still quoting *Le Devoir*:

[Mr. Mongrain.]

Mr. Diefenbaker attacked particularly an amendment to the National Arts Centre Act now before the House of Commons. It would provide for a recognition of the linguistic duality etc.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with those who spoke before me and who said that understanding is not established through legal texts. I hold the same opinion, Mr. Chairman, but it is obvious, after a century, that the expected results have not materialized, and thus we are forced to demand guarantees, written texts in black and white.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, I missed the statement made by the Prime Minister this afternoon. It has been summarized for me three or four times and I believe the hon. Prime Minister is full of good intentions. I would go further, Mr. Chairman. I believe the Prime Minister is the one who did the most for bilingualism and an understanding between the two nations which are members of this confederation. I could list a whole series of fine achievements and I am one of those who has the chance to say, in the statements I make all over the province, that, of all Canadian prime ministers, without meaning to belittle them, the present Prime Minister is probably the one who has shown the most clear-sighted understanding of the problem between the two races.

But that is not what we are discussing at the moment. I think that those who insist that this answers our wishes do not understand what we want very well. We do not doubt the good will of the present government; we are sure it will do everything in its power to be fair, but we say, for example, that when the present Prime Minister is no longer there, when the present government is no longer there, even if it is unpleasant for the party in power to hear these things—they know that one day they, too, may assume the shadowy role of the opposition—who is to say that the other government will understand the province of Quebec? Whether they like it or not, I appeal to the conscience of my colleagues. I am not appealing to their narrow-mindedness nor to their prejudices, but to their conscience as Canadians, and I know that all my colleagues here are Canadians who wish Canada well and want it to be united. I tell them once again: In Quebec, there is a large number of what we call angry young men who realize that good will and sound arguments were not enough to do