

The Budget—Mr. Caron

Mr. Caron: I do not accept this ruling. You are looking at it in a narrow way. It has always been the practice in this house for hon. members to speak on any subject they wanted during the Throne Speech debate and the Budget debate. This is what I am doing now. I do not think you have the right to do what you are doing at present. I cannot accept this ruling.

I think we have the right to refer to what has been said in this house, and I intend to go on with it.

[Translation]

If both languages are official in this country, we have a right to speak either one anywhere. This is the reason why I state, sir, that I am entitled to act in such a way.

May I say a few words on the National Capital Commission. This body considers kindly the Quebec side for access to the beautiful Gatineau park through the city of Hull. But otherwise, nothing doing.

I recently requested the National Capital Commission for a park development in the national capital region. The MacLaren Company donated a lot measuring 1,000 by 500 feet for a park. I was told experts would be sent to give advice, but no money.

On the Ontario side, however, thousands and millions of dollars are spent; but, for the Quebec side, they are cautious, they are afraid to spend.

I submit that the National Capital Commission should spend as much in Quebec as in Ontario. Those things, which we need, must be maintained. That is why I say that the National Capital Commission is remiss in its duty at present by supplying experts without the necessary funds to renovate and develop the parks we are interested in.

We are proud of our province of Quebec and our city of Hull, just like the town of Lucerne and the neighbouring towns, which are Quebec towns deserving the attention of the National Capital Commission.

We did not get what we wanted. But on the other hand, we saw trucks carrying earth and cement on the Ontario side, because in Ontario, millions mean little. But when it is for the Quebec side, everything is double-checked.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to accept this. I claim that the National Capital Commission has an obligation to spend on the Quebec side as much as it spends on the Ontario side. We, in the province of Quebec, must get what we are entitled to. That is why I am

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

asking today that the National Capital Commission should think of us and give us what we are entitled to.

Today, everything has developed, everything has changed. The National Capital Commission should also have changed in order to keep pace with progress. Only the mer change within the N.C.C., but the principles remain unchanged. The men have changed, but the principles remain the same. Expenditures are made in Ontario but not in Quebec.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the N.C.C. must assume its responsibilities in the province of Quebec as well as in Ontario. That is why I am asking those whose duty it is to speak to the members of the N.C.C. to go ahead and tell them: Look toward Quebec, you are needed there and you must carry out your obligations.

Mr. Speaker, if we are given advice, Ottawa gives money. That is the main difference. But I believe we are entitled to a small share of this difference. The population is not as large, I admit it, on the Quebec side; we may get a bit less than Ottawa, but we must get some. That is why I ask that this be attended to with special care. The cities of Hull, Gatineau Point, Lucerne and others could benefit from what the National Capital Commission is doing. I would suggest to these gentlemen that they find out the facts before asking for some change or other.

Recently, I heard the member for Outremont-Saint-Jean (Mr. Lamontagne) speak in Quebec of a national capital that would encompass the Ottawa-Hull area. It was reported yesterday in the press that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) had said the same thing yesterday, but I was told a while ago that he had not said it, that he had simply answered the press that it was a point of view. I accept his point of view.

But I submit that the former minister, the member for Outremont-Saint-Jean had no right to go to Quebec to speak of a national capital, because it is neither within his responsibilities nor his duties.

The national capital could be a fact, if we knew we would be accepted within the whole of such a national capital. But we do not know. We are not respected. That is why I say that we cannot accept it.

The national capital would be fine if the National Capital Commission were like the commission on bilingualism. But only a few of its people speak French, while the great