

Federal-Provincial Relations

footing, and it is in the province of Quebec that minorities are placed on an equal footing. Since 1867, our compatriots we like, the English Canadians, are treated on an equal footing; they are not made to pay double taxation for their own schools. But, in other provinces, French Canadians do not receive equal treatment. It started in 1871, when New Brunswick prohibited French tuition in the schools; then, Manitoba followed in 1892, and Ontario in 1917, through its Regulation No. 17. But, the province of Quebec never did anything like that.

Consideration should certainly be given to these problems right here in parliament, in order that Canadians sprung from the two main cultures, the two great founding nations, may feel at home everywhere in this vast country of ours and live with the feeling that we are all equal and brothers.

The economic aspect of our federal-provincial relations could also be discussed to advantage there. We received the first report—and there will be others—on economic matters, the report of the Economic Council of Canada. It seems that there will soon be published a report on the economic questions examined by the province of Quebec.

We know that in Canada, there are roughly five great economic areas. Canada is a vast territory. Due to its small population spread over such a vast territory, Canada has been a challenge to intelligent people who are faced with economic and industrial differences as well as varying amounts of natural resources.

That is why we should read those reports, call witnesses, discuss things together and assume our responsibilities in order precisely to find a *modus vivendi* to establish in our country, in every part of Canada, a stable and happy prosperity.

Finally, the federal-provincial relations could be analysed with regard to taxation. Once the legislators of our country have solved the problems of economic, political, constitutional and cultural relations, it will be necessary to set the basis of assessment with regard to priorities which will be established and understood between the various legislatures.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, such a committee is useful. I am quite aware that some hon. members might oppose it, but I believe that we have come to a crossroad of our life as a nation, and that nobody would have anything to lose by accepting the setting up of such a committee, so that we the representatives, may work together all across Canada toward

[Mr. Allard.]

a clearer definition of our political, cultural, economic and financial thinking, in order to get ready for a constitutional conference, because some provinces are ready for such a discussion while we are not.

Mr. Speaker: I must interrupt the hon. member as his time has expired.

[English]

Mr. Hugh Faulkner (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I find myself in the invidious position of agreeing with a lot of what has been said by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Allard) but disagreeing with the resolution. In his far ranging address which offered a number of potential solutions to the problem, but that dealt very briefly with his notice of motion which specifically recommends that a joint committee be established to deal with subject matters already discussed by royal commissions. I think his proposal would simply involve a rehashing of work already done by royal commissions, and in that sense is unnecessary and redundant, even though many of the things which he said in his speech on the more general subject did make a lot of sense. However, I intend to deal with his notice of motion.

The fact that the problem is a serious one is generally agreed by members on both sides of the house. We have had notices of motion presented by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), demanding a white paper on the subject, by my distinguished colleague from St. John's West, dealing with the field of education, which is indirectly involved in the same general question, and by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond (Mr. Prittie). Therefore on both sides there is a consensus that this is a serious problem.

One of the cornerstones of the problem is that within our federal system, jurisdiction is either overlapping or in some measure confused. We really do not know where jurisdiction should lie in such matters as water resources, conservation and education, but we do know that decisive government action is required in these areas. However, there is dispute as to which level of government should take that action. In my view we will never get decisive government action from a meeting of minds of 11 representatives from 11 different governments. However optimistic we might be, I do not see how we can possibly hope that a consensus will be arrived at by dominion-provincial conference on a long term basis with respect to a wide range of subjects.