

*The Budget—Mr. Seigny*

be said that it is rather surprising and painful to see that the resolutions contained in the report have been adopted without a single voice being raised among the 2,000 delegates to point out the danger of the policy stated in that document. In fact, the vote on the report followed three long speeches, one of which was made by Mr. Lionel Chevrier; the other interventions were also favourable.

For a man concerned about provincial autonomy and the spirit or even the letter of the constitution, as interpreted by the most competent courts, it is extremely difficult to approve, even on grounds of national emergency, the principles of the Liberal convention resolution. To recognize the principles of this report is like putting dynamite in our constitutional structure and setting fire to the fuse at the same time to make it explode. The Liberal party declared itself in favour of a mass offensive against provincial exclusiveness in the field of education. No other conclusion can be drawn.

This article which I just read and which was written by Mr. Clement Brown, indicates clearly the state of mind of all those who followed the activities of the Liberal party during its recent convention and who, like us, are shocked at this centralizing attitude on the part of the Liberals. They should have learned something from the experience of these recent years but it seems that far from learning anything—as I said previously in my speech—they did not forget anything and did not learn anything either.

It is evident that this centralizing philosophy of our opponents is in direct opposition to our own policy which insists on the respect of provincial rights and on the safeguard of the confederation agreement.

It was rather hard, Mr. Speaker, to find a solution to that problem of assistance to our universities. Are we going to start once again another similar debate? Are we going to let a Liberal group infringe upon the rights of the provinces in the field of education and restrict their rights in the field of primary education, which after all is what the Liberals suggested in the resolutions adopted at their recent convention.

Mr. Speaker, I think that my time has expired and I resume my seat.

(Text):

**Mr. Walter Pitman (Peterborough):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin my remarks by quoting the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fleming) in his speech when he presented his baby budget to this house last December as reported at page 1015 of *Hansard*:

The government has its sphere of responsibility; the citizen has his.

No words could have greater truth; no words could possibly be less disputed by any party in this house. To begin in a rather philosophical mood, may I say that this is the problem that is facing every government

[Mr. Seigny.]

in every part of the world. Every government has to face the problem of freedom and efficiency. Freedom without efficiency may well create anarchy and chaos. It may mean freedom to be unemployed; it may mean freedom to be without education or opportunities; proper housing and so on. On the other hand, efficiency without freedom may mean that a man has lost his most precious possessions, namely that of initiative and that of personal opinion. Hence every government seeks to find a place between and a balance.

I would suggest to this house humbly tonight that we on the North American continent have not had to find this balance and that we have not had to face the stark reality of thinking dynamically about government since the second world war. This is the situation largely because prosperity has been handed to us on a silver platter. We have been able to have freedom and not to worry too much about efficiency simply because after the second world war the world sought our products. We were in a position of advantage, and not until the last few years has this position been in any way endangered.

The United States of America has had a similar advantage. Hence I would suggest tonight that this continuous concern about whether the United States unemployment is higher than that of Canada really has little relevancy. I would suggest tonight that neither of these nations is in a position to add much in connection with this problem of deciding what kind of government activity Canada needs.

A United Nations survey declared a short time ago that Canada and the United States are the only two nations in the world with a high economy which are unable to solve the problem of unemployment. I think this is a significant statement which makes somewhat unreal the great deal of concern we have had expressed over the last couple of days in connection with comparisons with the United States. It appears that we are both in the same boat and that neither country has come to grips with this problem. I believe it is we who are out of step with other nations in the world that have found solutions to unemployment because, since the second world war, we have not been driven to thinking and re-thinking our position, we have not sought these same solutions.

Yes, indeed, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fleming) spoke truly when he said that the government has its sphere of responsibilities.

I would ask tonight whether we have stopped thinking dynamically about the possibilities and the flexibilities of our democratic system in dealing with our economy in the