

## THE SENATE

Wednesday, March 6, 1974

The Senate met at 2 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.  
Prayers.

### DOCUMENTS TABLED

**Hon. Leopold Langlois** tabled:

Copies of a contract between the Government of Canada and the municipality of Leaf Rapids, Manitoba, for the use or employment of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, pursuant to section 20(3) of the *Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act*, Chapter R-9, R.S.C., 1970 (English text).

Report on operations under the *Regional Development Incentives Act* for the month of December 1973, pursuant to section 16 of the said Act, Chapter R-3, R.S.C., 1970.

Report of the Ministry of State for Science and Technology for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1973, pursuant to section 22 of the *Ministries and Ministers of State Act*, Part IV of Chapter 42, Statutes of Canada, 1970-71-72.

### BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

**Hon. Mr. Flynn:** Honourable senators, may I ask the Acting Leader of the Government if we really have to stay in the absence of the Leader of the Government?

**Hon. Mr. Langlois:** Honourable senators, this is the first time that my honourable friend has requested the presence of the Leader before participating in any debate in this chamber. I think this is a good move on his part.

### SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

#### MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY—DEBATE CONTINUED

The Senate resumed from yesterday consideration of His Excellency the Governor General's Speech at the opening of the session, and the motion of Senator Robichaud, seconded by Senator Perrault, for an Address in reply thereto.

[Translation]

**Hon. Leopold Langlois:** Honourable senators, in taking part in this debate, my first words will be words of warm congratulations to you, Madam Speaker, for your outstanding performance in the discharge of your duties and also for the honour that you bring to this chamber. Indeed, you are a model for all members of this august assembly.

I would also congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for his part in the debate; as my leader put it yesterday, I would add that he managed to convince us of one thing,

that he is against the party in office. He has been most successful in this.

I will also congratulate my leader, who would not want us to compliment him, because his performance keeps on being masterful, but still the speech that he delivered last night is one of the best in his career.

I also wish to extend my warmest congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, Senators Louis Robichaud and Raymond Perrault. Both delivered very eloquent speeches and they dealt with current problems with a broadness of mind that makes them greater in our esteem in this house.

Although I do not hope to reach the summit of eloquence of our colleague, Senator Robichaud, I welcome the view he expressed on the Senate role and the linguistic and cultural problems that the people of Canada are faced with; they are views that meet my own, and that I already expressed in this house and in the other place.

Indeed, when I took part in the debate on Senate reform during the last session, I emphasized the Senate role as that of a protector and a guardian of regional and provincial interests, even going as far as suggesting a greater representation of the various regions and ethnic groups which make up the Canadian mosaic.

I agree entirely with Senator Robichaud's views regarding bilingualism which is being implemented in Canada as a follow up to the legislation passed both at the federal and the provincial level, to promote its early and complete development. As he did, I strongly oppose and condemn any attempt to establish unilingualism, be it French or English, in any area of our country. Also, I abhor such expressions as "cultural sovereignty" and "mass Frenchification" which we find unfortunately too often in the statements made by a number of political figures in my province whenever they deal with the future legislation concerning linguistic problems in Quebec.

First of all, I do not believe in any project aimed at imposing this or that language on an ethnic group in Canada. I feel it would be absolutely inhuman to encroach in any way upon the parents' natural right to choose freely the language of instruction for their children.

Furthermore, I feel that such action would prove detrimental to the development of the French language in this country, both inside and outside Quebec. In short, I abhor global solutions to problems as complex as those related to instruction, language and culture. I believe very strongly that all Canadian provinces should promote the cause of bilingualism throughout Canada, a cause which is already fairly well advanced and has been approved by most Canadians.

Instead of discoursing on unilingualism on the pretence that one or the other language must be saved it would be infinitely preferable to lay down the basis for integral