

*The Address—Mr. Lachance*

In my opinion, it would be advisable to explore seriously the possibility of establishing a Canadian common market for the purpose of trade planning. Since the provinces are competing for business at the present time, this does not help our trade and our exports. Therefore, we should promote the idea of a Canadian common market in order to plan our production and, consequently, help our export trade. This is a prerequisite if we want to maintain and improve our standard of living.

Mr. Speaker, there are essential parliamentary reforms and also administrative reforms which are imperative for the proper operation of our administrative system. It may be advisable to set up a board of directors for federal-provincial affairs. If we want the Canadian administration to improve and answer the present requirements of our modern world, we must plan our governmental administration and organization.

It may be advisable to set up a board of directors for federal-provincial affairs, with a permanent seat in Ottawa, where each province would be represented, to review regularly all the problems which are or could be debatable, with respect to joint jurisdiction. I think that it would then be advisable to create a department of federal-provincial affairs.

Mr. Speaker, as for the field of constitutional reforms, I think that it would be more than ever expedient to appoint a court to settle those constitutional problems which can crop up between the central government and the provinces or among the provinces themselves. This court could sit *ad hoc*, if necessary, to hear the constitutional issues and could be made up of, let us say, 13 judges, or rather 11 judges for the 11 provinces, plus four judges of the Supreme Court and that would make a total number of 15 judges. Then, it would not be necessary to appoint new judges, there would simply be a court made up of four judges of the Supreme Court. Why four? There could be five. Anyhow, we must come to a certain number, a certain balance, and the chief justice or his deputy in each province.

● (4:30 p.m.)

This court, which would automatically include the chief justice of the Supreme Court, or his deputy as chairman, as well as three other judges, and the chief justice or his deputy in each province, could then be called upon to settle constitutional problems or disputes between the central government and

the provinces, or between the provinces themselves. Any matter referred to it would be heard forthwith, and this is as it should be, and a report would be submitted to the various parties within a maximum period of three months or rather six months.

I do not think we should wait till a magic solution has been found before we amend the constitution, or till an agreement has been reached before we draw up a new constitution. It matters little what doctrine certain people preach. I do not believe we should wait till then to set up a court to solve the problems or disputes between the central and the provincial governments, or between the provinces.

With regard to parliamentary reforms, Mr. Speaker, discussions could be very lengthy. The matter interests me highly. If we do not reform our parliamentary institution, I fail to see how we can find solutions in the administration of our country. To my mind, the matter at hand is one of self-determination, of self-discipline. I cannot see why the house should not be able to find the means, although perhaps not all of a sudden, to improve our parliamentary system, and more particularly the standing orders.

I should like to raise a very specific problem here, namely that of French debates reporting. I think, sir, that the existing system is not adequate.

French language reporters—I would like to be corrected if I am mistaken—take shorthand notes of the debates at the same time as proceedings are recorded on a sound-tape system. After that, typists copy directly from those tapes and, unlike what some people think, including members of this house, it is the tape recordings that are used for transcribing speeches, not the shorthand notes.

Then, those copies go to the press gallery before the editors have had an opportunity to correct them, while it seems that a different system exists for English language reporters. The English reporters take the speeches down in shorthand, transcribe their notes and, of course, the work which is done by those reporters is more complete than the transcription from the tape because the reporter takes all the words down at the same time. When the newspapermen get the speeches made in English, these have been edited, and corrected by the reporters, whereas the speeches made by the French-speaking members are sent to them before they have been read and corrected by the French-speaking reporters or editors.