

*The Address—Mr. Dorion*

of farmers of a given area. It even provides for the industrial, touristic and educational developments which stimulate agricultural production. All sectors of the economy depend on one another, and agriculture benefits from all other economical activities. This legislation calls for the co-operation of provincial and local authorities. On this basis, it can be the starting point of an era of prosperity for the areas which have not yet benefited from industrial development.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier today, one of the aims of the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne is to allow the opposition not only to criticize—indeed I heard as recently as yesterday the hon. member for Laurier say on the air that the responsibility of the opposition did not only consist in negative criticism, but in the working out of its own policy, so that the public might have an idea of the risk it is running if it ever was inclined to change its government. Now, on this point, I heard some opposition speeches. More particularly, I listened to the Leader of the Opposition, and read his speeches which I had not heard. I admit that I faced there a most troubling lack of material, which proves a real lack of political thinking in the ranks of the opposition.

If that gap is to be filled, we should, so to speak, go back to the various conventions held by our Liberal friends where they were so lavish in their promises and in all sorts of very contradictory talk.

For instance, in a matter in which I am deeply interested, as, indeed is the government, free education was promised at all levels. Ten thousand university scholarships of a \$1,000 each a year were offered for a four year period, according to need and merit.

In a party resolution, I read this:

The provinces have the responsibility to see to it that teaching in their primary schools is improved so as to fill the children's needs.

Therefore, from now on, under the rule of the gentlemen opposite, primary teaching would be taken out of their jurisdiction. Is it possible to carry further the non-observance of and disrespect for, the constitution of 1867, which, on that vital point, was precisely enacted to safeguard the co-existence of both the cultures of the two basic groups in our national community?

And I also read this:

Vocational courses and higher education in universities—

—and it is well known, in this respect, that the concept of a university varies according to the province, whether we think of Quebec or of any other province, because cultural methods differ.

Vocational courses and higher education in our universities cannot be the sole responsibility of the provinces... The federal government must share with the provinces the cost of higher education.

In other words, a partial but very significant sharing of the central authority with the provinces in educational matters, and, as I said before, in spite of the very clear and precise words of the 1867 act.

Indeed, to make us fully realize the effects of such a policy, may I quote what the hon. Mr. Garson said in this House of Commons on January 28, 1957. As a matter of fact, after having read an excerpt of the Rowell-Sirois report, saying that the provinces must control the education of our young people while they are at school, he made the following comment:

I would point out that if federal subsidies were large enough to be of any value to the provincial governments who would receive them, the federal treasury could not justify the distribution of such large sums of money to the provincial governments without assuming some responsibility as to the way they would be spent.

Could it ever be stated more clearly that this would mean the intrusion of the central government in the exercise of powers which are the exclusive and express responsibility of the provinces?

**Mr. Chevrier:** Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member allow a question?

**Mr. Pigeon:** No, no, sit down.

**Mr. Dorion:** I regret, but as my time is very short, I cannot do it now. When I finish my remarks, I will gladly answer your questions.

**Mr. Chevrier:** My question only concerns—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Dorion:** Have no fear, it is not unwillingness on my part, but I am afraid that what I have to say might exceed my time limit.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I say that Quebec, in particular, cannot accept this suggestion. On this point, I am content to use as my sole argument the conversation of the Hon. Mr. Lesage himself who, in this regard, follows the well-established tradition in the province of Quebec.

Does this mean that one of the principles behind confederation is transgressed when these provincial powers are touched? In this respect, may I quote the view expressed by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fleming) in this house on July 18, 1959:

The province of Quebec has a point of view in regard to education which I think all hon. members of this committee have a duty to recognize.