

day, or approximately 5,500 lines. Of this amount 4,463 lines, or over eighty per cent, were taken by the government speakers; 449 lines by the Progressive Conservatives and 354 lines by the C.C.F.

Then we had a motion from the Prime Minister to the effect that Wednesday sittings of the house were out from February 22 to June 14, 1944, in spite of most strenuous opposition from all opposition parties in the house.

We have also had the banking and commerce committee sitting for some twenty-seven days, and almost the entire time of that committee has been monopolized by two members of the government party.

There are many other figures I could give of the time that has been taken up this session, but I will content myself with saying that government party members are the ones who are responsible for our not making better headway at this time. In these critical days our first thoughts should be with the gallant young men and young women, and their dependents, who are doing so much for us to-day.

Mr. FREDERIC DORION (Charlevoix-Saguenay): Mr. Speaker, if I happen to speak at this stage of the debate, it is not, Mr. Speaker, because I want to be labelled as leader of any group, and on this point I should like to tranquillize the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck) who, on February 1, in the course of the debate on the speech from the throne, mentioned the fact that he was speaking after many leaders, some of them, he said, leaders of "one man" parties. As I had been speaking before him, there is no doubt that his remarks were directed to me as well as to others who had spoken before him.

I believe the hon. member for Trinity is an able lawyer, and he must be aware of the fact that there can exist some independent members who do not need blindly to follow a leader, being able to think for themselves.

I happen to be here as representative of constituents who sent me to this house to represent their personal views and not the ideas of a party.

Since the beginning of this session we have discussed many projects relating to social security. Every group, and I should say every hon. member of this chamber, has had an opportunity of expressing his personal views on the different post-war projects, many of which have been discussed at great length. This goes to prove that everybody is anxious to look forward, and endeavour to prepare to his utmost capacity the future of our country.

There is no doubt that this sentiment is shared by the whole population, and especially by those who, at the present time, are engaged in the gigantic struggle, of which, thank God, we hope to see the end before long.

I should like to draw attention to the fact that, for the last few years, and especially during this session, many declarations made by persons in authority have led us to believe that this country is moving more and more toward greater centralization. All the new projects brought before the house for the purpose of social security bear in themselves this very danger of a greater centralization.

We must not set aside and we must never forget the basic principle which is the foundation of our national life and by which this parliament is bound to give its fullest respect to the constitution under which we live. We must never forget that the provinces constituting the Canadian federation also have their rights under our constitution, and my contention is that none of these new projects can produce good results if the provinces do not share the burden. The provinces should be called upon to collaborate with the dominion government, but should never be called to give up their own rights. If we refer to some declarations, we come to the conclusion that this government wants more than a collaboration on the part of the provinces.

From the discussions that took place on bill No. 82, for the establishment of a new Department of Reconstruction, I should like to quote a few sentences, which will show that I am right in scenting the danger which I have just mentioned. On June 20, in the course of the debate just mentioned, I find at page 4009 of *Hansard* the following words:

Mr. Gillis: They are always prepared to do it, but they always throw up a straw man so that we cannot get through it, with the cooperation of the provinces. You hide behind the British North America Act.

The answer given by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) was as follows:

I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend, but he has referred to New Zealand. I wonder if he has brought out the point that they have only one government in New Zealand, a unitary government, which is able to do things. If there were only one government in Canada, the lower age of sixty-five would now be in force.

Later on, in the same debate, at page 4013 of *Hansard*, I quote from the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Martin):

But this government has not overlooked the desirability of taking unto itself powers that now reside elsewhere. It attempted that in 1941, the first real attempt ever made in this country, by having a conference with the prov-