

*Transportation*

But before sending that notice, he had already prepared his resolution and his bill without giving the provinces an opportunity to discuss the matter.

● (1:40 p.m.)

Thus, this is absolutely superficial and did nothing but emphasize the tensions between the Quebec government and the central government, when it would be so easy during this centennial year to show less arrogance, less inclination to act unilaterally to get the Canadians, the governments closer together and to give Canadian federalism a real sense of balance, understanding and respect for one another, in short to act with more tact and intelligence.

I am not sure of it, because the letters do not mention it, but I think that the members of the Quebec legislature, even some Canadians, are worried also about that administrative monster which is being created through this Canadian Transport Commission which will in fact regulate the whole field of transportation in Canada.

Whether in the fields of air, sea and road transportation, it is giving much power to a transportation commission set up by the federal government because it will regulate means of transport including the trucking industry in Canada and in Quebec whereas the C.N.R. which operates a trucking service comes under the same creating body, the central government. The members of that commission will also be appointed by the central government.

This, Mr. Speaker, leads us to wonder if that national commission, that administrative monster, will be able directly or indirectly to administer with true objectivity the field of transportation in Canada.

It would have been important among other things, for the federal government to discuss those matters before presenting a bill already drafted.

Those are the various points I wanted to submit once again to the minister. I do not know whether I have convinced him. He shakes his head negatively. Obviously, he does not understand easily.

Mr. Speaker, I felt I had to report on these provisions contained in the correspondence between the Quebec government and the federal government, and even if the hon. minister cannot understand, even if he refuses to change his attitude, I think the time will come very soon when circumstances will force him and some of his colleagues to treat

the provinces differently, and particularly the province of Quebec.

Of course, I do not know whether the minister often has the opportunity to go to the province of Quebec and to stay there longer than five or six hours, which is the length of time a banquet lasts. However, if we have a summer recess—although we are beginning to despair—I advise him to spend a week in several places in the province of Quebec and to talk with people of different ages belonging to different classes of society. He would then find it much easier—and this goes for several members here—to understand the Quebec point of view and the respect of the spirit and letter of the Canadian constitution, because in fact the constitution is the tie that binds us to the rest of Canada. Past infringements upon the constitution and the constant spoliations which took place during the present session were not calculated to bind Quebec to the rest of the country.

On the contrary, such spoliations can only widen the gap between the province of Quebec and the rest of Canada. That is why I would very much appreciate it if the minister would change his attitude toward my remarks. I understand that we could get together and discuss the main issues; however, there were no such discussions between the federal government and the province of Quebec on matters covered by this bill. I would want him to realize that, in this as in many other fields, the province of Quebec is not trying to put grit in the bearings, on the contrary, it wants to create a new climate and work in a spirit of good will, understanding, comprehension, on an equal footing, each in its own sphere of jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, that is why, in closing, I would ask the minister to voluntarily remove Part III of this bill, discard or postpone it until he has met with the Quebec representative.

After such a discussion or dialogue, the whole of Part III could probably be approved, with some minor changes being made through amendments which he would perhaps gladly introduce himself.

If the minister would agree to do so, that is accede to the request of the Quebec government to postpone Part III of the bill, it could perhaps afford the unique occasion, in this Canadian Centennial year, to see finally each side abandon its rigid attitude and, in good faith, in a friendly and brotherly way, enter into an open, honest and fraternal dialogue, precisely to create a climate of good will and