

The Address—Mr. Nielsen

victory. No price was too high, including the wooing of the Creditistes and the aid of Mr. Doyle, who at the time was being pursued by the former government for \$3 million in income taxes; and he still seems to be the recipient of preferential treatment.

There is one statement in the Murray Bay speech to which no one can take exception, and it is this:

I believe that there can be a Canadian nation within which the two basic cultures can develop in full and equal partnership.

No one has ever disagreed with that. It is exactly what the Leader of the Opposition said earlier and better in February of 1963. The quarrel lies in the means of carrying this principle into effect.

The other day the Prime Minister produced the incredible argument that we must not have a confederation conference because some provinces might demand the right to deal with foreign states. What does he take parliament for, a kindergarten class? Judging by some of the jeers which I have heard from those opposite, he may have a point. It was he and his government who created the treaty signing rights enjoyed by Mr. Lesage. Now the Prime Minister employs it as a cheap threat to discourage a confederation conference.

A confederation conference could agree on amendments to be made, and the constitution would then become a Canadian document. We would then have laid the foundation for a second 100 years of unity. There is no other way in which this can be accomplished. Premier Robarts knows this; Premier Johnson and others know it, and the Prime Minister also knows it. But to adopt it would be an admission that for four years his policies have been divisive and abortive. This government has placed the prestige of the government above that of Canada—and not for the first time.

This government has not only embraced but has propounded the theory that federal legislation would commence its application in the west, proceed to Ottawa, stop at the Ottawa River and resume in the Maritimes—having leap-frogged over the province of Quebec. This is a philosophy that is destructive of our national integrity, ruinous to our sovereignty, and that isolates the province of Quebec from the rest of Canada. It was cooked up between Liberals in Ottawa and Liberals at Quebec for the sole purpose of producing seats. It did that, sir, but in the process it did that at the expense of Canada.

We now have heard the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) in his speech to the Reform Club denounce those very terms which formed the basis of the Prime Minister's co-operative federalism. In so doing he showed a concept of Canada and a personal integrity that might stand as an example to a government not conspicuous for any determination but partisan determination in the past three years.

One cannot but wonder at the latest stand by the Prime Minister. It seems to be a product of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Trudeau) just as his earlier stand was a product of Mr. Lamontagne and Mr. Favreau. His attitude now is: The constitution, right or wrong. He seems to be saying: It has served us for 100 years, why change it? A few years ago the Prime Minister said in one of his celebrated sweeping-away efforts: We need a constitution for 1963. Do we not need a constitution for 1967? Perhaps 1963 was a vintage year for constitutions.

Let me quote now from an article which appeared in the *Montreal Star* in July of 1962 of a report of a speech made at Brockville by the Prime Minister. He is reported to have said:

Re-examination of the whole basis of confederation will be one of the first tasks of a new Liberal government.

Liberal leader Pearson told a rally here Saturday night that the confederation worked out in 1867 was no longer satisfactory for 1962.

'As Prime Minister, that's one of the things I'd like to deal with,' he said.

What a metamorphosis in the Prime Minister. As I have said on past occasions, he is one with an elastic mind, and this is but another example of that. What a change from the Prime Minister of the Charlottetown conference in 1963, when Mr. Lesage said "I don't like it—" and went on to deal with section 91 (1) of the B.N.A. Act. There were no scruples then, and no qualms.

Can this be the same Prime Minister who in 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965 and 1966, was ready to drive a truck through the constitution with the Fulton-Favreau formula—who said over and over that the constitution had to be brought up to date? It must be brought up to date, but not by a hand picked task force with no responsibility to the people. What hypocrisy this is.

The Prime Minister's speech yesterday was most revealing of these facets of his character; his readiness to throw overboard previously held convictions when he thinks the