

*The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker*

fection. We believe that the right of veto constitutes a negative device. The letter of March 27 from the Louis Riel committee stated that the right of veto was a negative device, a stick in the wheel of parliament which will hold back the evolution of Canada as well as that of the provinces. Another article describes it as a Trojan horse, while yet another describes the whole formula as a "camisole de force", a strait-jacket. It is stated as well that it constitutes the grave danger of the balkanization of Canada. It then states that the special status of Quebec becomes simply the isolation of Quebec and the setting of Quebec to one side. I suppose that is one of the reasons there has been some deceleration on the part of the premier of Quebec in bringing this matter before the legislature of Quebec.

They then suggest that my stand and the stand of this party is wrong, and that we always argue so in matters such as this. I will place before this house an outline of the views of various constitutional experts across Canada. Professor G. A. McAllister of the University of New Brunswick said:

The repatriation formula as presently conceived should be rejected categorically.

The present formula is an arrangement for walking backwards into the future;—

Professor R. D. Gibson of the University of Manitoba said:

I am violently opposed to the amendment proposal.

Professor B. L. Strayer of the University of Saskatchewan said:

I believe the new constitutional amendment formula is unsatisfactory because it is unnecessarily rigid.

It will make future constitutional amendments virtually impossible.

And so go these statements. Dr. Alex Smith of the University of Alberta said:

A constitution must be at once sufficiently rigid to ensure stability yet sufficiently flexible to accommodate change.

Then he states that if this plan is brought into effect it will render the Canadian constitution the most rigid in the world and important amendments will be at the mercy of a single province's veto. Dean W. R. Lederman of Queen's University said:

I strongly favour bringing the constitution home—

Then he goes on to say that the formula is very rigid and means that important amendments would be very difficult if not impossible to obtain. Professor E. R. Alexander of the University of Ottawa said:

I am unalterably opposed to the Favreau formula.

When I was taking this stand it was said that I did so because I was anti-Quebec. If this constitutional amendment formula is accepted, then in so far as any province of Canada is concerned there will be virtually no change—there could be no serious change—in the constitution for generations to come.

What does the premier of Quebec say? He persists in enunciating a view of the amending formula which seems to be at variance with the pious assurances of the Prime Minister. Last night the premier embarked on the television program "Aujourd'hui"—the same program which saw the Minister of Justice not long ago enunciate the theory of associated states—and said that the formula was a strait-jacket, not for Quebec but for Ottawa.

I do not care what this is a strait-jacket for—for one or for the other—but the premier of Quebec has said that if we get this through it will be a strait-jacket for Ottawa, and so it will be. When you remove section 91(1) and deny the parliament of Canada the right to amend its constitution in respect of those things which come within the jurisdiction of the federal government, then you are emasculating the strong central government, and that is what is going to happen.

● (4:00 p.m.)

I want very much to hear what the Prime Minister has to say relating to the words of Premier Lesage. He was asked a question today and Your Honour properly ruled it could not be asked on orders of the day. Therefore, sir, I have to ask it at this time. I will be very interested to know if he accepts that.

Then, what else did Mr. Lesage say on "Aujourd'hui" last night? He said:

A good bluffer always keeps a card up his sleeve.

I do not know about whom he was speaking. Earlier, he had been mentioning the Prime Minister's views and his views.

In the course of negotiations, I will have a card up my sleeve—

I can imagine how that card will be located by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Favreau), who has not been able to find Rivard. You can just imagine how that will be noted by the Minister of Justice. Who has the card? I do not care who has the card, but this matter must be examined carefully by parliament, out in the open and not in secret, or through under the table agreements or behind closed doors. We want to know what went on. It was a happy party. The Prime Minister said, I will give you this, far more than you ever