

*The Address—Mr. Caouette*

extreme poverty: alarming international situation—it is written in the speech from the throne—crisis in Viet Nam, financial difficulties in the United Nations, poverty, illness, ignorance and lack of training of many Canadian citizens, poverty among the people, inadequate incomes—

What have we said over and over again in the House of Commons during the last three years? Inadequate incomes in Canada. The needy people are given a public assistance plan. Blighted and congested areas in our cities and what not.

Mr. Speaker, this is a gloomy speech, a speech in which the party in office recognizes the distress of Canadians, their poverty and the bad housing conditions.

Yet it is not the Creditistes who have been in office for the last 98 years, but the Liberals or the Conservatives. And when two political parties have made such a mess of things they are no longer worthy of the people's confidence and the latter should get rid of them as quickly as possible. I hope they do.

It is all very well for the Leader of the official Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), to introduce a non-confidence motion against the government, but he deserved the same thing himself when he was in office.

Mr. Speaker, we shall try for a few minutes to follow the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau), who, Monday, before the television cameras, divided into three categories the measures proposed by the government in the speech from the throne.

To begin with, the measures meant to boost our national pride.

Second, economic measures.

Third, social measures.

Among the measures intended to satisfy and stimulate our national pride, the speech from the throne mentioned a bill which would make "O Canada" the national anthem of Canada and an address to the Queen to authorize Canada to amend its own constitution.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Ralliement Creditiste will entirely agree that "O Canada" should be adopted as the national anthem of this country. In the programs we submitted to the electors of this country we asserted that the Creditistes intended to give Canada a distinctive flag and to officially recognize "O Canada" as our national anthem.

All we ask of the Liberal government is not to make the same error as last year when it asked us to vote in favour of a double mo-

[Mr. Caouette.]

tion proposing the adoption of a maple leaf flag and of the union jack.

● (3:20 p.m.)

If the government wishes to avoid another long and bitter debate, it should separate the two proposals concerning the national anthems so that supporters of a single national anthem may be able to vote in the affirmative, a thing they would not be able to do if they are asked to recognize, at the same time, another Canadian official anthem. As far as we, the members of the *Créditiste* party, are concerned, we will vote for a single Canadian official anthem just as we have voted for a single Canadian official flag.

The other measure meant to arouse our pride, according to the government, concerns the repatriation of our constitution, including what has been called the *Fulton-Favreau* formula.

Mr. Speaker, until the members of our group put forward the comprehensive views of the *Créditiste* party, may I give some indications as to what our stand will be on the repatriation of our constitution.

First of all, we feel it is utterly wrong to talk about repatriating the constitution. It would be possible to bring back to Canada something which had once belonged to Canada, something which had once resided in Canada.

Well, the *British North America Act* never belonging to the people of Canada, never belonged to Canada, and moreover never was approved by the people of Canada.

The *British North America Act* was born in Great Britain, passed by the government at Westminster, given to us by a foreign government over which we have no control. The *British North America Act* is a foreign statute created by foreigners and which belongs to foreigners. There is therefore no need to repatriate it.

I think that to accept freely a constitution which was never ours, which is not suitable for Canada and Canadians, which is not proper for the provincial states that we call the provinces of Canada would be to perpetrate a colonial mentality that is being forced upon us.

Let us leave that dusty document in the Westminster colonial office and if we are free people, if we are a free country, if we have an autonomous and free government, let us give Canada a truly Canadian constitution wrought by Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, what we need is not the repatriation of the present constitution. And