

The Address—Mr. Rouleau

The assistance program to municipalities, the establishment of a national grid are measures which, in my opinion, come under provincial jurisdiction.

The abolition of tolls on Victoria and Jacques Cartier bridges will require the consent of the authorities of the province of Quebec, since the province is a joint owner of those bridges.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the central government has no right to interfere in fields which do not come under its jurisdiction. We have the strict duty to legislate in a field which is ours, but we are forbidden to infringe upon those which come exclusively under provincial jurisdiction.

In a speech he delivered in Quebec on November 6 last, the leader of the Liberal party, the Hon. L. B. Pearson, stated the policy of our party in that field. I wish to quote an excerpt from that speech which he made in Quebec and which he had already made in Winnipeg:

Furthermore, the Liberal party believes in a strong and stable central government, within the limits of its jurisdiction. It is a necessity for the Canadian nation in our troubled world. Such strength however ought not to depend upon the weakness of provincial governments. On the contrary, the balance of our federalism is based also on strong provinces.

And he goes on to say:

Indeed we believe that the federal government should withdraw from the field of joint programs of a permanent nature once those programs are well established across the country. Upon putting an end to its financial participation to those programs, the federal government should compensate the provinces by granting them greater access to the field of direct taxation and adding equalization in order not to increase their financial burden.

Such is the doctrine of the Liberal party, as stated by the leader of the party, concerning the field of federal-provincial relations.

It is absolutely necessary that those who represent the Canadian people in this house be aware that provincial legislatures also have responsibilities to the people they administer.

If we, here, have no concern for the protection of provincial rights, certain movements will develop, not only in the province of Quebec but elsewhere throughout the country, as was the case in the west in the thirties, at the time of the depression. The central provinces were then noticing the birth of secessionist movements. This development could possibly recur in western Canada, as it is in the province of Quebec at present.

The province of Quebec has always been jealous of its rights. Under the leadership of Mr. Lesage, the present government wants the province to play its rightful role within the confederation. In order that the province of Quebec may assume its rightful responsibilities, in order that it may enjoy a con-

[Mr. Rouleau.]

structive autonomy, and not merely a negative one, it must be in a position to exercise its rights. And in order that it may do so, it must have the financial means to provide its population with what it is entitled to get.

Mr. Pigeon: What a contradiction.

Mr. Rouleau: If we do not care about provincial governments, as I have just said, movements will soon develop on an increasing scale, which will be disastrous not only for the country as a whole but for the provinces concerned in particular.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in our proceedings in the house we should always keep in mind the rights of the other provinces. We should deal with the problems coming under our jurisdiction and work in the interest of our fellow citizens, from coast to coast, in the interest of Canada and of the Canadian economy.

(Text):

Mr. Clancy: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just resumed his seat quoted out of context from the *Montreal Gazette*. Could I suggest that the whole article be put on the record.

Mr. Rouleau: I am sorry, I did not hear the question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has asked that the editorial of the *Gazette* from which the hon. member for Dollard (Mr. Rouleau) read be tabled. If public documents are read, hon. members are entitled to have them tabled. I suppose the hon. member has no objection to tabling the editorial.

Mr. Rouleau: I have no objection whatsoever. The rest of it is worse for the Conservative party.

Mr. Nicholas Mandziuk (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the hon. gentleman who spoke previously in congratulating the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Bourdages) and the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Browne) respectively. These hon. gentlemen spoke logically; they were impressive; they knew what they were talking about, and I am sure their respective constituents are proud of them.

For four and a half years we in this chamber have been treated to a chorus of moans and groans. We have been treated to insults by the hon. gentlemen opposite—

Mr. Habel: Oh, no.

Mr. Mandziuk: —and a similar chorus has gone out into the country.

Mr. Habel: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.