

*Dominion-Provincial Conference*

Conservative party about the affairs of the country.

I was especially surprised when the Prime Minister suggested that the opposition should speak out, for example for or against monarchy. He undoubtedly forgot that not so very long ago, the young Liberals of a certain Ontario riding, the name of which I forget, had passed—some government members remember it—a resolution to abolish monarchy in Canada. It must be admitted that the resolution was defeated.

This was not an initiative of the Conservative party, but one that originated from young Liberals of an Ontario riding. When the Prime Minister asked his question this morning, I wonder if he was not putting it to the young Liberals rather than to the Conservative party. This was a roundabout way of imputing to the opposition attitudes which do not square with the facts. He also tried to place the opposition in an ambiguous position when he accused the Progressive Conservatives of promoting the two Nation theory. It was highly wise or clever of him to speak in English on that occasion.

• (4:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

I think I should repeat what the Prime Minister said this morning. He said the opposition should say whether two nations form one Canada, because we know that "nations" means one thing in French and something different in English. What the Prime Minister did not say this morning was that during the last election campaign he was trying to convince the people we were attempting to divide this country by preaching for two nations because what we were actually doing was preaching for two Canadas. I think the argument was dishonest at that time and is no more honest now when it is brought into the house in this way.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, on this side, we have always been true to our principles. On the occasion of the Montmorency conference, to which the Prime Minister has referred this morning, indeed, we spoke about two nations, but we did so exactly in the same sense as the Prime Minister, the Progressive Conservative party has never preached division by advocating two Canadas. And if I stress the point, it is due to the fact that, like many other people, I had to refute the fallacious argument, the false propaganda to that effect that was

spread across the country during the last election.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister also asked the opposition this morning to define its position on the linguistic question, and he then explained his own approach, as he had done at the constitutional conference, and I quote:

Those who believe that we want to impose the French language throughout the country are mistaken. What we want is to set up bilingual regional districts.

However, Speaker, if we refer to the brief entitled: "For a just society in Canada." We find this at paragraph 6, under the heading "bilingualism".

From now on, every citizen will be able to resort to one or the other languages to deal with the federal administration.

Mr. Speaker, no specific details are given in this brief regarding the bilingual districts the Prime Minister referred to this morning and those he referred to at the Conference.

So, we must ask ourselves whether the Prime Minister is really playing a political game or whether he is in earnest when he wants to settle the linguistic problems of Canada.

That problem has certainly not been solved. We have confidence in the goodwill and the good faith of our Canadian fellow-citizens; we are well aware that, when that question will be submitted to bodies whose task it will be to define a policy, that language provision will surely receive the support of the Canadian people, with a view to building a united Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the constitutional conference held this week has been, in my opinion, less productive than the two previous ones. In fact, I think that the conference which has most contributed to develop a sound basis for the drafting of a new constitution was, not the one which took place this week, nor the previous one held in February 1968, but that convened by the premier of Ontario (Mr. Robarts) in November 1967.

At this last conference, the premiers were not obliged to comply with instructions or imperatives, as required by the Prime Minister, but it was attended by representatives who were discussing together their needs and their problems and were endeavouring to put forward solutions.

Of course, if one refers to the constitutional conference in February 1968, when the present Prime Minister was Minister of Justice, it is obvious that that conference was