

Mr. Diefenbaker: I heard a tiny squeak of "yes" from one corner. The resolution was designed to becloud national issues today, issues with which the government has been aimlessly dealing. The Minister of Finance said: "We moved with speed and determination"; they were his very words today. Even the finest of slow motion cameras would be unable to take a picture of this government moving with speed and determination.

What has the Prime Minister brought before this House? It is his contribution to Canadian unity. The Prime Minister has brought forward to the House a prettied up, curry-combed version of a policy in order to give himself a new image. This is to be a tranquilizer. I shall mention the election results in a moment because they were not tranquilizers to the government of the right hon. gentleman.

At every hand in this country there is division and disunity, the responsibility for which rests with the present government and nowhere else. The Prime Minister said he was bringing this resolution before the House so we could stand up and be counted. I shall stand, Mr. Speaker, and I shall be counted. For I will not become the hand-maiden of a government which in the last several years, as a result of the mental gymnastics of the Prime Minister, has divided this country to an extent that I only hope years to come will efface.

The minister who has just spoken referred to being able to communicate in both languages. In the city of Victoria I am told that the Department of National Health and Welfare is listed in the telephone book in French, and there are three numbers for those who want to communicate with the department in French.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: That is progress.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Hon. members applaud, but let me give them the rest of this. If you call the numbers they will answer you in English, and not one of them knows the French language.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: That little item came to me this morning. I miss some of these observations that are made, and I am sure I miss a great deal.

Imagine the speciousness of the arguments that are advanced by the minister. The reason that he will not accept the amendment is that he believes in "flexible rigidity". I have heard the minister make explanations before, but never on other occasions have I heard him approach the school men of the Middle Ages. Just imagine the argument, Mr. Speaker. The minister maintained that the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, even though not incorporated in an act, can be carried out by order of Council. What sham and hypocrisy is this?

The Leader of the Opposition was slapped in the face by the former secretary of state, who since the election has been demoted to Minister of Communications (Mr. Pelletier). The hon. gentleman brushed the amendment aside facetiously, but I never expected the Minister of Finance to give his support. The facetious and sneering answers to the proposition advanced by the Leader of the Opposition

Official Languages

which were given by the Minister of Communications reveals that this resolution is nothing but eyewash. It will not be legally binding whatsoever.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: If perchance the Liberal party should win the next election, what would happen to the promises made in an unenforceable declaration by parliament? The government do not have to follow such a declaration; they can do as they please. Preambles and that sort of thing have no efficacy in a court of law. Why does the government endeavour to deceive the Canadian people into believing that something is going to be done? Do you know, Mr. Speaker, why the government is doing this? It is doing it to ensure that there will be votes in the province of Quebec. And in other parts of Canada the government will be able to say: "We are just devoting ourselves to national unity".

I did not like the suggestion of the Minister of Finance that those who disagree with this resolution are in the category of separatists.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): That is not what I said.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It may not have been his words but that was his inference.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): That is your inference, sir.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am glad the minister does not hold that view. All I have to say is that this is a sham and a delusion. Hon. members opposite are going to ask the Tory party to line up and say "Me too". "Me too" was never the slogan on a standard that would make for a fighting opposition when the government is wrong in what it is doing.

What manner of thing is this? This resolution is designed to wash away the tears the government shed over the many defeats that they had in the last election. I look around me and ask hon. members, if they believe the Minister of . . . What is Marchand now?

Some hon. Members: No one knows.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, in this game of political musical chairs it is difficult to identify the Minister of Transport (Mr. Marchand). But what did he say a few days after the election? He said that the trouble was that those who voted for the Conservatives were fanatics. He also had in the chorus with him the former solicitor general, the present Postmaster General (Mr. Ouellet), and the former secretary of state, now demoted. That was the song that they sang. If what they said is correct, then all of the new members representing the Conservative party today owe thousands and thousands of votes to those who were designated by these ministers as "fanatics."

What happened in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker? I shall come to that in a moment, but I have never known anything to equal the transfiguration that has taken place in the Prime Minister since October 30. What a transformation it has been. In the twinkling of an eye he has pretended to be transformed and transfigured, and he now asks the