

decide matters as important as the real issues between the federal Government and the provinces, the greater would be the difficulty and it would be of no use at all. It would be a tower of Babel and would be utterly useless. It would remind us of the *sans culottes* of the French revolution. There should be a meeting of an equal number of government and opposition members of the Quebec Legislature who would meet in camera to discuss the needs of the province, to hear witnesses, if necessary, and to make a draft of the Constitution to submit to the provincial house for debate, and afterwards to the legislative council, and then we would have something to discuss. We would know all the ambitions, all the needs and all the expectations of the Province of Quebec and what it considers essential to stay in Confederation. At the present time there is no definite basis for discussion. There are only threats and ultimatums to Ottawa, and I do not see why the Government of this country should capitulate to them. But, honourable colleagues, that being done, a draft of the Constitution made by a committee, a non-partisan committee, and, as I have said, a committee that would sit in camera so as to avoid being impressed by the newspapers, and then approved by the provincial house and by the legislative council, could be submitted to the federal Government in Ottawa and to the other provinces as a basis for discussion. Where do we go if we have no such basis for discussion?

Everybody speaks against the B.N.A. Act; nobody pays any attention to it. And this present bill apparently is doubtful legislation. How can we go on like that? There is a feeling of fear in this country. We wonder how long it will continue. But the time is coming when the system of progressive grants must stop. There must be some final agreement if there are enough men of good will in this country to meet together and to make up to date the work done a number of years ago by the Fathers of Confederation. But to consider the situation as it is now, one may ask: "Well, how can we live peaceably together, prosper, and be happy together?" It will be done inasmuch as the legislative power here in Ottawa, and in each of the provinces, minds its own business and remains within its own sphere of action.

I could say much more, but I appreciate the fact that everybody has discussed this matter with sincerity and in the hope that there will be a day that should not be too far in the future when the dealings between Ottawa and the provinces will be different from what they are now, I do not speak about the equalization payments. I am not against certain help to those parts of the country that are in need, but I must tell you

in concluding that Mr. St. Laurent, the former prime minister, was abused because he had said the Province of Quebec was no different from any other.

I sincerely believe that the farmers from the east are the same as the farmers from the west, that the professional men from the east are the same as the professional men from the west, and that the tradesmen of the east are the same as those from the west. The only difference is that some are more fortunate and better off than others, but their purpose is the same. Their purpose and ours shall be a united Canada, and there is no reason for any preferential treatment to any part of it.

**Hon. Salter A. Hayden:** Honourable senators—

**The Hon. the Acting Speaker:** I must inform honourable senators that if the honourable Senator Hayden speaks now it will have the effect of closing the debate.

**Hon. Mr. Hayden:** Honourable senators, my reply will be very brief. I want, first of all, to thank Senator Flynn for the remarks he made yesterday afternoon. I thought his presentation of what I would call the philosophy of taxation, federal and provincial, and of the inter-relationship in that respect, was a job very well done. A great deal of it, of course, lies in the long range, but it is very useful to have thinking of this kind published so that the public generally might get some real understanding of what should be the philosophy of taxation in these areas.

Then, I want to put at rest the worries and concern of Senator Hollett over the use of the word "may" in relation to the continuance of this Newfoundland grant, and his worry that the Minister of Finance may become temperamental and stop payment. His worry should be more extensive if "may" means what he thinks it means, because the word "may" is also used in connection with equalization payments, in connection with stabilization payments, and in connection with conditional and unconditional grants.

The best information and advice that the Minister of Finance could get as to the language that should be used in drafting—and I am sure the same advice was given in 1961 because the word "may" in this connotation occurs in the enactment of the previous Government at that time, and as I recall it no concern was ever expressed over it at that time—

**Hon. Mr. Brooks:** Except some political concern.

**Hon. Mr. Hayden:** Well, that is always with us, is it not?

The Department of Justice advised that the word "may" as used in this association,