

Canada. Trade is the life blood of a country, so the work he does so well must be highly appreciated as it gives many good returns to the Canadian people.

In regard to making federalism work, I do not believe in co-operative federalism. What is it? It has been described or defined as follows by one of the provincial ministers. When the federal Government paid \$10 million for improving a highway he said, "This is co-operative federalism. Cheers! The Ottawa Government is paying \$10 million for the construction of a highway."

It seems that, according to the letter and the spirit of the Constitution, each legislative body should be completely independent of the other financially, in this sense, that the provinces should not expect subsidies, and progressively increased subsidies, from Ottawa and they should get enough from their taxes to pay for their expenditures.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier used to say that it is always a dangerous thing for one government to advance money to another one. I find that the formula of co-operative federalism is wrong, because the increase in gifts of subsidies from Ottawa to the provinces will never end. We will never know where we are.

Is it not a mistake to grant to the provinces everything that they ask for in matters of subsidy? There should be a definite and final understanding between Ottawa and the provinces with regard to the collection of taxes and the spending of money.

In regard to social progress, pensions, youth allowances, student loans, I will deal with those later.

Canada's influence in the world, apparently, is good. I have not the time to discuss that matter today, otherwise I would have spoken in reply to my good friend Senator O'Leary (Carleton).

With respect to the constitutional amendment formula, we hear people speak of the "repatriation" of the Constitution. That could be said if the Constitution had been made law in Canada and had been sent to London afterwards; it could be "brought back" to Canada. But it is an English statute, drafted by the Fathers of Confederation and passed by Westminster. Why is there not unanimous agreement between the provinces and the Government of Canada before having the Constitution brought to Canada?

There is something which is much simpler. As the provincial governments and the Government at Ottawa are composed of men

of good will, they should meet together and agree to a new Constitution which could be approved by the Parliament of Canada and by the provinces and assented to by Her Majesty the Queen of Canada. If a petition is made to the Queen with regard to that Constitution, it should be addressed to the Queen of Canada and not to Her Majesty the Queen in any other capacity.

What would be the use of bringing the Constitution to Canada while it is still unsettled? I do not believe in the F-F formula. It should be F-F-F—for factitious, fictitious and factious—factitious because it is artificial; fictitious because it is imaginary, and factious because it may lead to trouble.

In regard to redistribution by independent commissions, the view has been expressed that this should have been done by Parliament, but if it has been decided to have it done by independent commissions, I shall not insist on that point.

With regard to the flag, I have fought for a distinctive Canadian flag with the maple leaf as emblem. The flag which has been adopted by this Parliament and approved by Her Majesty the Queen is satisfactory to me. We can provide one for \$28.24—if you want to buy a large national flag, six feet by twelve feet, in nylon, that is what it costs.

In regard to defence integration and policy, I wish to felicitate the present Minister of National Defence, the Honourable Mr. Hellyer, for having succeeded in accomplishing a thing which has not been done since Confederation, bringing the "brass hats" to order. It had to be done, and he did it. There were some complaints, but he has done this very successfully.

Moreover, Mr. Hellyer is the only minister, to my knowledge, who has publicly praised his former associate Minister, Mr. Cardin, when the latter was appointed Minister of Public Works. This is a good note for both.

On the improvement of the provinces' tax position, equalization and increased federal abatement, I refer to what has been said. As to "opting out," the same thing.

In regard to constitutional amendment for those on widows', orphans' and disability pensions, here the Government shows respect for the Constitution. If they amend the Constitution for that purpose, so much the better.