

*The Address—Mr. Gregoire*

**Mr. Gregoire:** That is exactly what I will tell you when I have given some examples.

**Mr. Winch:** The province of Quebec should be a self governing section of the confederation of Canada?

**Mr. Gregoire:** Would you say that again?

**Mr. Winch:** Mr. Speaker, I asked the question because of the quotation of the hon. member. After all this time—and we have listened to the hon. member now for 20 minutes—is the hon. member saying that Quebec, in his estimation, should be a self governing state inside the confederation of Canada?

**Mr. Gregoire:** Exactly; self governing.

**Mr. Fisher:** That is an admission of failure on your part.

**Mr. Gregoire:** I beg your pardon?

**Mr. Fisher:** I would just like to ask the speaker, Mr. Speaker, whether he does not concede that this is a tremendous admission of failure on his part, for all French speaking members of parliament both now and in our past, if we have come to this?

**Mr. Gregoire:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer that and then I will try to come back to the line of argument I was pursuing. If you will permit me, I will continue in French because I can express myself better.

[*Translation*]

Every country, Mr. Speaker, goes through periods of normal evolution. When a country is passing through its primary phase of development or growth, we often see other countries coming to the assistance of the younger one. But every country, at a certain stage in its history, reaches a period of maturity where it is capable of looking after its own development and administration.

We are grateful to our English speaking fellow citizens who have enabled us to develop ourselves and to grow to the point we have reached today, so that the alliance we had in the past allowed us to become today a nation capable of administering, managing and governing itself.

Gentlemen, our thanks for the past. We shall not prove ungrateful in future, now that we can watch over our own destiny, alone as do all other countries of the world.

This does not mean that we want to break all ties. It does not mean that we want to end an existing co-operation, not at all. But I believe—and it has been proved by numerous instances throughout history—that a nation existing in a specific area never achieved development and progress unless it did it by itself, by its own efforts, because that nation alone may choose then to live

[*Mr. Winch.*]

according to its own possibilities and characteristics. Never has a nation been able to achieve development while under the control or leadership of others.

If we really want to promote the development of the province of Quebec as a French Canadian group which would enrich this American continent, then the French Canadian nation must be allowed to grow by itself because it is the only way it will develop fully and properly.

I spoke a while ago about Puerto Rico as a government with its own executive, legislative and judicial powers. That did not upset the administration of the United States. Here is what the chief justice of the United States, Earl Warren, said about that:

[*Text*]

In the sense that our American system is not static, in the sense that it is not an end but a means to an end—in the sense that it is an organism intended to grow and expand to meet varying conditions and times in a large country—in the sense that every governmental effort of ours is an experiment—the new institution of the commonwealth of Puerto Rico represents an experiment—the newest experiment and perhaps the most notable of American governmental experiments in our lifetimes.

[*Translation*]

The Americans did not complain about that new system set up in Puerto Rico, which remains a free country associated with the United States, as they say in their own language: *estado libero asociado de Puerto Rico*: free state, associated with Puerto Rico. They have the same foreign affairs department, the same defence department, the same postal service, etc.

It is a new idea for a modern state. Therefore, why not look for a new idea when it is seen that a basis of compromise is not doing Canada any good, and it is interfering with its national development. If we were to put an end to such a compromise, if we could work in a climate of understanding, leaving to each group responsibility for its own development, then we could make sound progress.

Let us take for instance the field of education. The province of Quebec says: We do not want any encroachment in the field of education, and I am not the one who says that; all Liberal members know that and share the same idea. We do not want any infringement of the field of education. But the nine other provinces like nothing better than centralization, as it will help them. Who prevents that centralization in the field of education that would help the nine other provinces? Who prevents that? It is the French Canadian nation that is opposed to it. Not only do we prevent it, but we also restrain the activities of the federal government in