

Interim Supply

are Canadians before they are provincials of any province, and I think look for national leadership. If by some strange development this government began to give that leadership, they would be given the kind of support that has been denied them ever since the people gave them that uncertain mandate in April, 1963. I appeal to them to do so; to remember the importance of a strong dominion; to fight for it and to preserve it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman, after listening to the remarks of the hon. member who just resumed his seat, according to whom a certain province would ask Ottawa to collect funds to give them back to it later, I must say that I do not share his opinion at all, and I shall tell you why.

More and more at the present time we hear about amendments to the Canadian constitution. These suggestions do not come from one province only but from the whole of Canada. The Ontario premier seems to recognize—and he is a Conservative—that our constitution must get a second sober thought.

Not very long ago Her Majesty the Queen was in Canada and she said, in Quebec city, that a protocol which dates back a hundred years is not adequate and does not meet present needs. This is not surprising. It must be noted that it is the Queen herself who declares that the constitution must be changed, and adapted to the needs of the times.

I do not accept either the statements made by the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macquarrie) who makes a distinction between one province and the nine others.

We have no objection to other provinces claiming for themselves what the province of Quebec is claiming. We have no objection to the province of Ontario fighting for the recognition of its rights, provided that all the provinces continue to exist and constitute a nation with two cultures, the French and the English.

This reminds me of an example: let us take a Canadian family, no matter whether it is French or English speaking. If my friend from Queens (Mr. Macquarrie) brought up a family, he must have found out that when a family includes five, seven or ten children, no two of them are alike, and each of those children, upon growing and reaching maturity, endeavours to become independent. In other words, at 21 years of age, upon reaching majority, he wants to fly on his own, according to his aspirations, his possibilities, his capacities and his abilities. As soon as one lives on his own, he wants

to raise a family, establish a home, operate a business or a farm.

It is strange to note that among five brothers or sisters issued from the same family, none is willing to take orders from a sister or a brother; they all insist upon exercising their full independence. None the less, Mr. Chairman, come Easter, Christmas, another feast, or the mother's or father's birthday, for instance, the whole family will gather and get along very well. Every member of the family is happy to reunite, and then a brother tells how he is getting along in life, whether he is successful or not, and narrates his personal life.

We can see, Mr. Chairman, that there is unity among that family, but every member wishes to retain his independence.

In my opinion the same situation exists on the federal level; we have a country called Canada; it is composed of ten provinces which wish that their own particular ways, customs and traditions be respected.

No province is entitled to infringe upon the liberty of another province. The province of Quebec has no right to infringe upon the liberty of Ontario or of Prince Edward Island, just as Prince Edward Island or Ontario is not entitled to infringe upon the rights of the province of Quebec.

Mr. Chairman, we are no longer in 1867, but in 1964 and the Canadian constitution must be suited to 1964 requirements, granting as much independence as possible to every province. On many occasions we suggested in the house some amendments to the constitution: give the provinces more latitude, give them the required financial means not through taxation, but by using new sources of credit to provide for a normal development of the provinces.

A few days ago my colleague from Lapointe indicated with good reason that the Bank of Canada is now being used to help to stabilize the English pound. Why not use the Bank of Canada to stabilize the economy in this country, to abolish unemployment and get the economy really moving in Canada?

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing to prevent the government from using the Bank of Canada for that purpose. But when the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macquarrie) suggests that the provinces are asking Ottawa to collect money in the provinces to give it back to the provinces, it is not the case, that is not what is happening.

The provinces are asking Ottawa to withdraw from their own fiscal and taxation fields. In particular, that is what the province of Quebec is asking for.