

interpretation of the BNA Act because today many young people believe that it was the federal government which created the provinces. That is not so. The provinces created the federal government and they unanimously decided to keep those sectors they claimed were under their jurisdiction. That is why today if we want national unity each and everyone of us should have the freedom to act freely within his own province. That, I suggest, is the first prerequisite to national unity. He must also be given the necessary means to administer his province. When you wonder whether the provincial governments have been able to fulfill their responsibilities, I think the main problem arose especially from the time when the federal government, sometime in the 40's began to take over direct taxation areas which they had left untouched since 1887.

● (1742)

That is when the provinces were faced with some hardship for the first time, were in need of money, and even today this lack of funds prevents them from providing the necessary services to their citizens in education as well as in all other areas under the provinces' jurisdiction. I feel that as long as we do not give the provinces the financial means to administer those areas which come under their jurisdiction like education, what they need is not the equalization formula but tax points. Let us give them tax points and you will see there will be no more regional disparities because I am sure provincial governments are as clever as the central government; they are just as clever and able to administer themselves but let us give them back the rights they enjoyed and the taxation fields they had before the 40's, and I think that as a result we shall no longer say that the provinces are unable to administer such or such an area. Let us give them back their taxation field and then we shall see that the provinces are as progressive as the central government and that they are able to live in Canada while keeping their own identity and being free to act within their own jurisdiction to build a united and free country, through the freedom of the provinces.

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I cannot help reacting to the comments made by the previous speakers about educational resources. I think that we cannot apply to Canada the thesis according to which when you are rich you can deal with your problems. Among the richest provinces, Ontario in particular has not been more generous with its minorities than New Brunswick, Nova Scotia or Quebec. So I think that we are off on the wrong track when we say: let us put tax points at the disposal of provinces to solve the education problem.

The motion of the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) reads as follows: "—consider the advisability of establishing an office of education, to conduct research in the provinces with the cooperation of the provincial governments and also in other countries, to consider the provisions of federal financial assistance for second language training in elementary and high schools and to disseminate information with a view to improving the education of Canadian youth." We cannot reject a motion asking the federal government to

Office of Education

coordinate action in the education field. As the hon. member for York East (Mr. Collette) said, that is done at the economic level as concerns manpower. It has been said this afternoon that \$3 billion had been spent for manpower, for reeducation and for readaptation of manpower to modern needs. The federal government did it to spur the economy and all the hon. member for Vaudreuil is asking for today is a better co-ordination. There is no province that can do it alone. There is no province which feels strong enough to say to the other: listen, we should work together to improve the lot of all Canadians. I think this motion from the hon. member for Vaudreuil must be considered seriously to meet the objective which was aimed at in St. Andrews last August.

I believe the education ministers met to discuss minorities' rights. And they tried bargaining. "If you can—Mr. Lévesque is speaking—give us Quebecers the guarantee that in your English-speaking provinces you will accept our French-speaking Canadians in duly constituted French schools, we from the province of Quebec will accept your Canadian immigrants." This is the worst kind of bargaining! And I cannot accept that premiers, whether they are independent or not, begin to bargain about my rights as a Canadian. As concerns language rights we are all equal, Francophones and Anglophones. I have the right to be at home in the west like in the east and I shall be at home in Ontario. I shall speak French in Ontario and I should like to see what government will prevent me from doing so!

[English]

I think the motion calls for further research, co-ordination of research and distribution of that research in the field of education. It is no secret that in this country we have ten different systems of education in the ten provinces. All boards do not accept that all Canadians equally have access to that system of education, because in eight provinces, if you are Francophone you cannot have access to post-secondary or secondary education. There is need for a co-ordinating body.

The hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) mentioned—and I think it is a strong point—that there should be better co-ordination to allow people in Alberta who speak French to go to school in Ontario for secondary or post-secondary education, so that they can continue in the language of their choice, just as is done in Quebec and in Ontario. It is only in the last ten years that Francophones in Ontario have been able to go to the secondary and post-secondary level. That is a great help. It was not done by money, however; it was done by political people who had the will to do it.

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval): Justice.

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): That is right, justice. The present system of education in Ontario, which has been in place for some years, provides that if you take 20 minutes of French for 8 years, say, or 13 years, you will become proficient in the language. That is nonsense, Mr. Speaker. They have been doing that for the last 15 or 20 years, but they cannot speak French at the end of 13 years. We may ask if we have wasted the money or have not motivated the children? I say,