

The Address—Mr. Poulin

those who opposed the conclusions of the Massey report of having an eye to the electorate. If this interpretation is not in accordance with what he said, with great pleasure and great generosity towards the member who has interrupted, I withdraw what is false in my statement.

Mr. Arsenault: Hear, hear.

Mr. Poulin: Only yesterday, in this house, the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) gave us proof of his good will on a matter of this kind. Strangely enough, I do not hear any protest from the members opposite when I praise the government.

Mr. Arsenault: Which government?

Mr. Poulin: The present government.

Mr. Arsenault: Where?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Poulin: I wish to quote yesterday's *Hansard*. In reply to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who asked whether the government had given consideration to extending federal aid to education generally, the Prime Minister replied, and I quote from page 1355:

I do not know that any such representations have been received. While I have the responsibility as the head of the government I would have to ask my colleagues to join with me in refusing to consider such a request.

In spite of the question asked by the hon. member—and there was nothing shameful in asking it—I believe the Prime Minister and leader of the present government was fully justified in taking the position he has just taken. That is why I have no apprehension whatever as far as the present government is concerned. But the Prime Minister and the present government are not eternal.

A Conservative government which might one day replace it, and which I would also believe to be well-disposed, under its present leader would not be any more eternal.

And then? And later? In 25, 50 years, what ideas, what principles or sense of opportunity will guide those statesmen who will then be at the helm in our country? I am not in the least concerned whether they be red or blue or even colourless, but how can we be sure that these men will be as full of good intentions as the present leaders of our great parties?

An hon. Member: Never!

Mr. Poulin: And should they not be well-disposed would they not be then provided with the most dangerous weapon ever? That

is, to my mind, the very crux of the matter. We already know the past too well. Do we not have good reason to be worried about the future?

At the present time, even though the government is composed of well-disposed men, we see the officials of the C.B.C. allowing the airwaves to be used to warp altogether the education we wish to give to our children. What would it be if we had an ill-disposed government?

For instance, does Rev. Father Levesque, one of the commissioners, consider there is any appearance of common sense in letting a Chisholm, a Freud or a Cameron and others, with their materialistic and atheistic theories, use the facilities of the C.B.C. to indoctrinate the children of Canada and tell them the cause of our trouble lies in the fact that a distinction is made between the concept of good and the concept of evil? I speak subject to correction, but that is not what the good Father teaches. What means has he at his disposal to call a halt to such a scandal or to prevent its recurrence, if ever we succeed in bringing it to an end? What tactics does he suggest so that these nauseous outbursts will stop poisoning the air our children are breathing? Since he claims popular culture comes under the jurisdiction of the federal government, is he prepared, at least, to point out a few steps we could take to bring an end to such a state of affairs? Does he know where we should go in Ottawa, to meet a few bureaucrats or executives who might be in a position to understand the Quebec point of view?

Are we, in this respect, to be as successful as the member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Gagnon) and the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer) were, when they asked for a wider use of French in our armed forces?

Is it not realized that in all these matters that deal with the very soul of a people there are always persons or circumstances that might seriously embarrass a government, even the most favourably disposed?

I am thinking of British Columbia, where the provincial government refuses to grant a charter to a Catholic university. Such is their conception of human rights and respect for minorities—

Mr. Arsenault: It is the provincial government which refuses that.

Mr. Poulin:—which certain public men talk about *ad nauseam*!

The time has come to remedy a situation already jeopardized. And those who, speaking authoritatively, would have us believe that