

*National Centennial Act*

**Mr. Berger:** Mr. Chairman, I would like the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm to tell me whether he agrees entirely with the statement made this afternoon by the leader of his party, whereas he himself is asking us tonight to try to grasp the meaning of his words. This is absolute inconsistency.

**The Chairman:** Order. I understand the hon. member has raised a point of order; but I feel there was no point of order.

**Mr. Pigeon:** You are perfectly right, Mr. Chairman, for the point of order was ill founded.

Moreover, before venturing into that field, the hon. member should learn the standing orders of the house. Instead of sending an open letter to newspapers to criticize his leader for having given Mr. Gordon another term of office, he should, according to the dictates of his conscience, look after the interests of his fellow citizens from Quebec at the caucus.

With this, I conclude my remarks. If the hon. member for Montmagny-L'Islet wishes to speak, he will have the opportunity to do so since we live in a democracy. If he does make a speech, he will show that he is not gagged by caucus dictatorship nor by members of his party.

[Text]

**Mr. Kindt:** Mr. Chairman, anyone who comes from a province other than Quebec, who either sits in the house or is seated in the galleries, will get the impression tonight that at least 75 per cent of the discussion which takes place in this chamber is about the province of Quebec and is participated in by only French Canadians. There is nothing wrong with their participation, and we do realize that they have a tremendous number of problems. But, I wish to deal with one point brought up by this resolution, we want one Canada and we want a united Canada. What is more, when 1967 rolls around we still want a united Canada. I come from the province of Alberta. I happen to be half French and I know that those who are speaking for the French Canadians are not telling the truth. I want to repeat what the President of the Privy Council—

**Mr. Langlois:** Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege.

**Mr. Kindt:** I shall answer the hon. member's questions later when I am finished if he cares to ask them at that time.

**The Chairman:** Order, please. I understand the hon. member is rising on a question of privilege.

**Mr. Kindt:** He is just interrupting. He has had the floor.

**The Chairman:** Order. The Chair should have the opportunity to hear the question of privilege.

**Mr. Langlois:** I think an insinuation was made about French Canadians that was not quite true. I should like the hon. member to tell us exactly what was wrong and what was right, or what was not true.

**An hon. Member:** Sit down and listen.

**The Chairman:** I suggest to the hon. member that this is not a true question of privilege and I would ask the hon. member for Macleod to continue.

**Mr. Kindt:** The President of the Privy Council stated that unless changes are made in the act the province of Quebec will not co-operate in the centennial celebration of confederation, or words to that effect. Those are not the exact words.

**Mr. Lamontagne:** They are not my words.

**Mr. Kindt:** If they are wrong, let the minister correct them, because my point is based on what he said. It is all well and good for one province to say: Do this or else. If we in other provinces are approached with the thought that there are features in the bill which are good for all of us, including Quebec, all right; but when we are approached with the ultimatum, do this or else, it is blackmail. It does not sit well with the other provinces in Canada.

I do not think this is the feeling that the good people of Quebec wish to disseminate among the people of the other provinces of Canada. I think the minister either made a mistake or the government of Quebec has made a mistake. If the government of Quebec has come to the President of the Privy Council and pointed a gun at his ear and said, "Do this or else", it is up to him to tell the house, if that is the reason he has taken the position he has, and why he made that statement. If there is some other reason then I as one who comes from another province, would like to know.

Mind you, I have no qualms about certain features of the bill, but I do detest this particular statement of the President of the Privy Council. We all know that on the government front benches there are 10 cabinet ministers from Ontario and eight from Quebec. The government is loaded with ministers from those two provinces. If the President of the Privy Council is going to stand in his place and say, "Do this or else", he is rubbing the rest of the provinces of Canada the wrong way.

**Mr. Lamontagne:** On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I believe I never said what the hon. member is saying I said.