Interim Supply

that in a day or two this matter would be constitution. It is through these powers that debated and quickly approved because the 10 provincial premiers had approved it and the government had approved it.

But this is too serious a matter for that kind of treatment. That is why a member of the New Democratic party quite properly rose and said they were going to fight it. I would ask the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate to take a look at what the Winnipeg Free Press has had to say in this regard. He will find there an entirely different slant placed on the interpretation of the Fulton formula and the present Liberal government formula. I believe that in the guise of bringing the constitution home and in the guise of toadying to the separatists in the province of Quebec, the Liberal government was slipping a fast one over on the people of Canada.

Why do I say that? I say that because we all know, every political science student knows, that certain powers were delegated to Ottawa and certain powers were delegated to the provinces. I think it is fair to say that this division of powers was preserved under the Fulton formula, but what happens to them under the formula laid down by the Liberal party?

Mr. Pickersgill: There is no difference in that.

Mr. Woolliams: The minister says there is no difference. I would be interested in hearing him explain this; I should like to get him on the record. I have always thought the Winnipeg Free Press was a fairly reliable newspaper, even though I have not agreed with it because it seems to be pro Liberal and I am pro Conservative. In the days of Mr. Dafoe all of us in Canada, wherever we lived, realized it was a newspaper of national importance because of the way the editorials were written on those issues affecting the nation as a whole. I wonder if the minister is also set out on the same page.

If I have time I will place some of this editorial on the record. The minister will find there exactly what I suggest our position gated to the provinces. This party has been is. I am going to repeat the charge I level at on record for years in favour of bringing the this government, and it is a serious charge. This is a very important issue. It is not something to be played with, because our whole favour of it, and this party has been in country is at stake when we change the favour of it. I believe everyone in Canada [Mr. Woolliams.]

parliament operates.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wonder if the hon. gentleman would allow me to ask him a question.

Mr. Woolliams: I wonder if I can finish my remarks, please.

Mr. Pickersgill: Yes, of course; I would not think of intruding.

Mr. Woolliams: I do not want to be rude, but I have hurt my friend's feelings. If he will bear with me, I should like to hear what he has to say when I have completed my remarks. As I say, I should like to get him on record about this matter.

I should like to make my personal recommendation to the government right now. I hope the government will allow the top constitutional lawyers, the top political scientists of this country, to examine this proposal thoroughly. Let us have it out in the open. I have a deep suspicion-and I think this is why the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate keeps asking me questions-that under the guise of bringing home the constitution we are in danger of weakening the powers of the central government and dividing up this country into ten balkan states. You, sir, give in to the separatists of the province of Quebec.

An hon. Member: Now you are starting to divide Canada.

Mr. Woolliams: I hear some of them shouting about the province of Quebec. I believe this, and I will say it not only in this house but elsewhere; I believe the people of Quebec want a strong country just as those in any other part of the nation do. It is time that we spoke up like leaders instead of trying to soft soap the whole problem we have in this country. You are never going to cure the patient by giving him these weak soda pills. If the patient has something wrong and he needs surgery, we have to use surhas had occasion to read the issue of October gery. All you are doing is saying yes. In fact 26, 1964, which carries the editorial headed I often think of that song from the famous "A Formula for Constitutional Chaos". The play "Oklahoma", "I'm just a girl who can't premier's draft of changes in the B.N.A. Act say no". Now, you never say no. You never measure up to your responsibilities.

> There were certain powers delegated to the central government, and certain powers deleconstitution home so that Canada can attain full nationhood in every respect. I am in