

Motion Respecting House Vote

Mr. Dionne: No, Mr. Speaker.

I noticed during this debate that several members took part in it in order to discuss various matters and I believe that it was quite in order—the debate was always in order anyway—to deal with constitutional questions, with rules, but you may recall that last night, I did mention that the main cause of the present debate was the fact that Bill No. C-193 dealt with a taxation matter.

I believe that it is not altogether practical in the present circumstances to labour questions dealing with rules, except to try to improve them. However, in regard to this question of constitutionality and of rules that arise therefrom, it always was and still is a matter of determining, as between those involved, who is going to have the greatest taxing powers. One does not have to be a wizard to realize that this problem is above all a financial one.

There is no question of being discouraged about it. As intelligent people, I believe it is possible for us to find some solution, to face the situation clearly and realistically.

I admit that all those writers and politicians, who are complicating the problem by talking about the repatriation of the constitution or the drafting of a new one, succeed sometimes in showing us their ability to deal with the subject, even to launch elections upon this matter. It is merely a play on words.

However, it would be far more important to try to reform the system which led to most of the difficulties we are facing. Nobody, even one with a string of academic degrees, would dare argue that the constitution is responsible for thousands of Canadian families living in misery in slums; it is not the fault of the constitution that schools are sometimes forced to turn away willing students for lack of space and money to build.

Who would argue logically that the poor conditions in which too many families are living, due to an inadequate income and which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp), because of the propensities of the system, continues to tax to the limit, who would argue logically, I repeat, that this is a constitutional problem? It is a problem involving goods and needs, a problem involving the means of distribution of goods and existing wealth.

Let us quit beating around the bush; Canadians of all origins will get along better together when they have equal opportunities.

[Mr. Speaker.]

I feel that we should aim for a type of levelling system, restore equal purchasing power, and strive to build a world with real aspirations for happiness by giving everyone the opportunity to meet his basic requirements.

Let us first of all give back to the government the control over money and credit and, then, we can talk of the sovereignty of parliament; the solution to constitutional problems will be easier to achieve.

Canadian citizens and visitors to our country will then be able to speak of liberty at home without unnerving the puppets controlled by the system which uses every means at its disposal to prevent real liberation.

Our early history abounds with accounts of our struggles and our resistance to the pressures exerted by friendly countries that did not always understand our aspirations but which realize today that our survival played an outstanding part in the evolution of Canada. Each one of us must assume fully his responsibilities to prevent such divisions as might keep us from becoming what we should really be: a united people in a free country.

Mr. Speaker, before bringing my remarks to a close, one word about the notorious taxation problem. Could it be that most of the representatives in this house have come to the conclusion that this notorious system cannot be changed?

Do we really believe that it is natural to think that the armies of brave men who brought the cross, the plough and the civilization to the forests of Canada, as well as their successors, who for three centuries, improved agriculture, built modern towns with the road system which we know, will have toiled and sweated on the Canadian soil to leave to their descendants an heritage of debts, of taxes and privations? Let us make an effort to get out of these ridiculous social conditions which allow misery to exist in the midst of plenty.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if hon. members may have comments to make on the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. member, from a procedural standpoint. Perhaps I should read the amendment first.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dionne, seconded by Mr. Simard, moved:

That the motion be amended by adding immediately after the word "government" the following words: And that the government will not present again the said bill in this current session, and that