

Supply—Privy Council

permit, between all Canadians and the provinces and the particular points of view of Quebec, the establishment of federal-provincial relations which will make Canada and all the provinces work hand in hand in confidence, and not in defiance.

• (1:30 p.m)

Every two or three months we witness startled indignation on the part of the central government or one of the provinces, for such things as the Northern Territories, underground mining rights, the boundary between Labrador and Newfoundland, and others. Every other month we face constitutional conflicts, tension, misunderstanding and distrust.

But this is not good; surely, we are intelligent enough, in 1966, truly Canadian enough, to solve our problems once and for all. But we must not carry on as we have done in the last few years. We must not be afraid; other countries have done it. They revised their constitution. We must define the responsibilities of the provincial and central governments, define the Canadian characteristics of the two great cultures which is not only an endowment for Canada but makes Canada in the eyes of the world a very special and privileged country. Thanks to its dual aspect, its dual culture, Canada is looked upon with special favour internationally, as well by countries of French culture as of English culture.

That is a Canadian fact. We must be proud of it. On the other hand, if we want to put an end to stepping on each other's toes, to arguments and distrust, we must institute, as soon as possible, a parliamentary committee.

When the legislators in Ottawa have defined their way of thinking, then we can exchange views with the provinces and their specialists on the possibility of a national conference on the constitution. Why could a national conference on the constitution not be held in the fall of 1967? What better crowning-piece could there be to the Centennial of Canada?

I think that a national constitutional conference at that time would be a crowning achievement since it would bring Canadians together through their intelligence and their heart.

I beg the minister to use his influence in the Cabinet and with the Prime Minister. I am not making this request to embarrass the government. I am not afraid because should I

take office, which is impossible since I am the only member of my party, the request I make in the opposition, I would not dare grant.

I find myself in the situation of a free man, a Canadian who wants a final reconciliation between all Canadians, whether they live in Halifax or Vancouver. I am tired of the quibbling which is going on over fiscal, constitutional and cultural matters. I should like to see the energies of all of us, used to develop our beautiful Canada, in the economic, domestic and international fields. If all the Canadian people, from Halifax to Vancouver would go hand in hand, attune their intelligence, look toward the same goal and act according to well established plans, frictions would be eliminated and Canada would be able to make giant strides.

[*English*]

Mr. Saltsman: Mr. Chairman, I should like to add to some of the remarks made by my colleagues in regard to the Combines Investigation Act. I think anyone looking at the situation in Canada would almost have to agree that if the Combines Investigation Act, together with the ancillary legislation, was designed to control the growth of combines in this country per se, it has been a failure. It just has not worked. I think it is fairly obvious that it has not controlled combines in Canada and probably has not done so for a number of reasons.

In some instances there are probably excellent arguments why our industries should be bigger rather than smaller and why combinations of industries or groups may actually be beneficial to the economy. Apart from the fact that for one reason or another the legislation itself has not been administered as stringently as it might have been, I suggest that another reason for it not having been given the necessary impetus may spring from the fact that a recognition has arisen over the last few years that perhaps the question of combines is not so much a legal matter as it is an economic problem in this country and should be looked at in this manner.

I suspect that the difficulty with combines is no longer one of whether or not we are going to have combines and mergers in this country. I think the real question is, who shall have the say in the operation of the combines and for whose benefit shall they operate? In other words, are these mergers going to take place simply to enlarge the benefits to the people involved in these industries, or are they going to take place to