

specializes in furniture, employed 500 workers. Today the plant is almost closed.

In Cowansville we have two small shoe manufacturing industries which will soon close their doors or go bankrupt as a result of the federal government's policy. The same story goes for the rest of the province of Quebec. The only thing I ask from the members of the opposition is to forget all the stupidities concerning this bill and to support the legitimate requests of the national assembly of our province.

[*English*]

Here is a headline in today's newspaper which states "Yarn mills to close, 200 will lose jobs". Does a headline like this not indicate to the government that we have a particular problem involving textiles, shoes, clothing and footwear?

Mr. Stevens: They don't care.

Mr. Graftey: Hon. members don't care? Are hon. members not listening? For the next five years, three years or four years will you just have a Pavlovian dog responsible for everything coming from the province of Quebec and saying "Separatist, separatist, separatist"? Because if you do, my friends, nobody but you and your Prime Minister will aid the cause of separatism more.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Graftey: I will tell you what happened, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Because of the traditional situation, this government thinks it automatically has the Quebec electorate in its pocket.

[*English*]

For this reason, because the Liberals get their electoral support from the province of Quebec automatically, they think Quebec can put up with any insult and any mismanagement of their economy by this government. They think they will still vote Liberal. Wait until the next Gallup poll, Mr. Speaker. The Liberals will see what they have done to the electorate in the province of Quebec on this measure.

This particular budget regretfully was prepared not for the long-term good of Canada and Canadians, but for an election. It was the old Liberal strategy of divide and rule. It was not prepared for serious discussion in this House as we are doing tonight. But once and for all we have caught the Liberal government at their own game. Once and for all both French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians have seen the game of the right hon. Prime Minister—one policy for the rest of Canada and another policy for the province of Quebec.

An hon. Member: That is not true.

Mr. Graftey: Once and for all, what was the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien) up to? What was the hon. Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations (Mr. Lalonde) up to, and what was the Prime Minister up to? They were trying to escalate the confrontation between Quebec and the rest of

Income Tax Act

Canada for short-term votes for an election which the Prime Minister did not have the guts to call.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Graftey: The last thing that this Prime Minister and the King government expected to have to do was to come before the House of Commons and justify their chicanery to the people of Canada. Now the chickens have come home to roost and the government is caught, my friends.

Mr. Paproski: Right on.

Mr. Graftey: The government wanted a confrontation during an election. The Liberals wanted to go to English-speaking Canada and say: "Only the Liberal party can save you from this big, bad man Lévesque and all those terrible separatists". The Liberals were going to confront and confront. Forget Canada, and forget why this Prime Minister makes Mackenzie King look like a statesman.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Graftey: The government took Quebec for granted and thought it could insult Quebec with this proposition. Then it went to the rest of the country and said: "Look how tough we can be with Quebec". Well, my friends, wait until the next Gallup poll is out; it will be seen that it was the biggest backfire in Canadian history.

[*Translation*]

Ottawa does not have a monopoly on shrewdness when it comes to economic measures. From time to time, provincial governments also have good ideas. I may be repeating myself for the second, the third or even the fourth time, but I submit it is not too late for you to withdraw this bill and to accept as soon as possible, first of all, the amendment proposed by the NDP this afternoon and, second, the proposition made by the National Assembly of Quebec.

[*English*]

What we are being confronted with this evening and during this week proves more than ever—and I agree with the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) on this point—that we are in dire need of constitutional revision. When I think of the wasted ten years since this Prime Minister has taken over, my heart nearly breaks in two. I remember when I greeted my friend, the right hon. Prime Minister, when he came here as a backbencher over ten years ago. I think of the number of times when I sat in the parliamentary cafeteria with him and said to him: "Mr. Trudeau, with our social, cultural and political atmosphere, but moreover because of economic duplication and waste, if there is one thing you can do it is to help bring meaningful constitutional change to Canada as quickly as possible." He said to me: "I have not come up here to do that. The present BNA Act is flexible enough for my needs." Subsequently I found out what he really meant.

I say regretfully, Mr. Speaker, that the Fathers of Confederation drafted the British North America Act feeling that it would always be, in cases of prime ministers, in the hands of