

The Address—Mr. Gregoire

not really entitled to it. If the subamendment is out of order, then naturally his right to speak falls.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: My understanding is that according to the clock the hon. member for Lapointe still has five minutes to go. I would think that a ruling should be made on the acceptability of this subamendment after the recess.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2.30 p.m.

[Translation]

Mr. Gregoire: Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes I have left I would like to continue the remarks I was making this morning.

We advocate in Canada a system of two independent nations within a single great country.

[Text]

Two independent nations in one and only great country.

Each having its own fields of jurisdiction which allow a nation to develop fully politically, socially and economically. And to that end, each must have its own legislative, executive, judicial and fiscal powers to ensure its full development.

Once that is achieved, the two nations will be able to co-operate in perfect harmony in several areas to make of Canada not only a great country but one that will be renowned throughout the world.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I shall refrain from going into further details so that this solution may be discussed and every possible avenue explored. Let us not refuse to discuss the proposed solution, because I am convinced it will remove many fears and prejudices.

Let us refrain from considering every word as an ultimatum or as a threat, because in order to agree, one must clearly state one's claims.

In addition, no discussion is possible if one does not act fairly and aboveboard. We have learned to deal realistically in politics and not to indulge in sentiment any more.

Mr. Speaker, I also submit that we should not be die-hard extremists. Let us rather be daring in seeking a solution. Let us not wait until an unacceptable solution is forced upon us. Let us find one ourselves. Let us discuss and find a solution as soon as possible before we are forced to accept one that we dislike.

[Mr. Lambert.]

Before I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that French Canadians believe in their destiny but they wish to control it themselves so as to be in a better position to give it the direction they wish. The French Canadian people have a destiny of their own, and history has proved that no one can stop a people from achieving its destiny.

We have faith in our destiny; we believe in it. We feel that we can develop tremendously by ourselves and for ourselves, and that we can at the same time co-operate with English speaking Canada to create in harmony a single and great country, from one ocean to the other, a country where everyone would mind his own business to develop not only himself but also this single and great country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Mr. Gregoire, seconded by Mr. Perron, moves:

That the following words be immediately added at the end of the amendment:

"That this house also regrets that His Excellency's advisers failed to state that the year 1964 was to be the year of and for the Canadian families, through the increase of family allowances according to the factual cost of living."

[Text]

In the course of this morning's meeting there were some questions raised as to the acceptability of this proposed subamendment, and if any hon. members have comments to offer for the guidance of the Chair I would of course be very pleased to hear them at this time before a ruling is made.

Mr. Churchill: Nobody on the government side?

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I thought perhaps somebody on the government side would seek to advise Your Honour; bearing in mind, and I have very much in mind the statement of His Honour Mr. Speaker the other night in regard to a subamendment that has been dealt with by this house already. In any event, if Your Honour would refer to the words of Mr. Speaker, you will see he indicates that in future he feels subamendments must be relevant to amendments. Further I direct Your Honour's attention to the *Journals* of this house for March 5, 1948, when under similar circumstances in a debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne an amendment had been moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I need not go into the precise words of his motion, but there was a rather long subamendment moved, dealing with an entirely different subject. I need not again go into the precise wording. If hon. members will consult the *Journals* for 1948, pages 220 and 221, they will see