

*Abandonment of Defence Projects*

I think that this subamendment is completely inconsistent. In brief, what our friends of the Ralliement Creditistes are saying is that they are a little against nuclear arms, and that, in a certain part of Canada only. That reminds me of someone who had travelled in Europe and had visited the place des Pyramides where the statue of Joan of Arc was erected. And when he came back, if someone asked him whether it was an equestrian statue, our traveller answered: "It is a little bit equestrian".

Such is the stand taken by the members of the Ralliement Creditistes. They are against nuclear arms, but only a little bit.

If you analyse the observations made by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Girouard) this afternoon, and if you consider the terms used in the subamendment itself, without any consideration for constitutional points of view or for national unity—matters which do not seem to concern our friends in the Ralliement Creditistes—you find out that if the subamendment were passed, that would mean that the house decided there would be no nuclear arms, only in the province of Quebec, but it would also mean that our friends sitting in the far corner of the house are in favour of nuclear arms for the rest of Canada.

**Mr. Gilles Gregoire (Lapointe):** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Balcer:** What an inconsistent attitude.

**Mr. Gregoire:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. In view of the fact that there are only a few minutes left, I think we could allow the hon. member for Three Rivers to proceed with his observations.

**Mr. Balcer:** Mr. Speaker, if the house adopted the subamendment, would that mean that the house is in favour of nuclear arms in North Bay, Edmundston, Ottawa, but not in Hull?

At once, you can see the inconsistency of the subamendment which I think is absolutely ludicrous. We, Conservatives, have objected to nuclear weapons throughout Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, on Vancouver island as well as in Newfoundland and this before, during and after the general election.

As for our Liberal friends, they are in favour of them today, but they were strongly against them before the last general election.

This afternoon, someone quoted the speech made by the member of Laurier (Mr. Chevrier) during the memorable election campaign in the Labelle constituency where he drew a frightening picture of the La Macaza base. He then stated that the Bomarc base in

[Mr. Balcer.]

La Macaza would result in the death of thousands of persons in Labelle and that for that reason, the constituents should vote against the Conservative candidate.

And it is that same member for Laurier who said before 4,500 people during the last election campaign, as evidenced in a newspaper article:

Chevrier. No atomic bomb in Canada ever.

Mr. Speaker, that is what happened during the last election campaign, and I understand the concern of many citizens about the shifting of attitude of this government.

As far as the amendment to the amendment is concerned, I repeat that it is irresponsible, contrary to common sense and that its only result would be to maintain the Liberal government in office. But, what is worse, this subamendment runs counter to Canadian tradition and national unity. In fact, it reveals an anticonstitutional attitude. It is a subamendment that I would describe as separatist, moved by people who claim not to be separatists.

They want legislation which would apply only in the territory of the province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the way to build a country. Are we going to have ten family allowance acts? Are we to have different rates in the different provinces of Canada? Are we going to set up different federal tax structures in Manitoba, in Vancouver and in Nova Scotia? That would create utter confusion, Mr. Speaker.

Worst of all, sir, is the irreparable wrong that subamendment, and everything it stands for, can do to national unity, to the ties of mutual friendship, respect and pride that every member should be duty-bound to promote in Canada.

We have not been elected to bisect the country, but rather to consolidate and favour mutual understanding not only between the two great races which form it, but also between the different provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I am a member—

**Mr. Gregoire:** I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Balcer:** I am a member for Canada, I have been elected in Three Rivers, a city 97 per cent of which—

**Mr. Real Caouette (Villeneuve):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege—

**Mr. Balcer:** —97 per cent of which is French speaking. The people I represent do not have any inferiority complex. I am proud of being a French Canadian and—