

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

Furthermore, I insisted to get a definite answer, simply because recent events led me to believe that the provinces and especially the province of Quebec—invited to submit the various problems they would want to see discussed during this federal-provincial conference, would like to debate the famous problem that has been the subject of a resolution which created a great stir; it was agreed to by the political commission of the Progressive Conservative party, agreed to by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill), agreed to by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell), and by all the others who are in favour of the two nations concept.

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. This is the third time the hon. member has made that statement in the House of Commons, twice in my absence, and it is untrue.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member rising on a question of privilege?

Mr. Churchill: Yes, sir. My question of privilege is this: This is the third time the hon. member has made that statement. Twice he made it when I was overseas and now he repeats it. It is untrue and should be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: Obviously, this is a question of debate. The hon. member makes a statement and the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) denies it. It is the duty of all hon. members to accept the statement made in this house by an hon. member standing in his place, in the way that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre has done. I take the liberty of reminding the hon. member for Lotbinière that he must, of course, limit his contribution to this debate to the essence of his question, which is whether a certain matter will be considered by the federal-provincial conference. This is what he should be discussing at this time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Choquette: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre has at long last repudiated the policy of his party.

The question I put and that I repeat this evening in more elaborate fashion is the following: As the Minister of Forestry and Rural Development (Mr. Sauvé) has indicated in a speech in Quebec city that the door is

open for a discussion of a much wider gamut of issues at the coming federal-provincial conference to be held in January, and as everyone knows that Marcel Faribault, who convinced the Conservative party at the Maison Morency to adopt the two-nations theory, is now one of the main advisers of Mr. Johnson and of the Quebec government, I want to know whether or not the Quebec government has asked that the two-nations concept, with all the implications it involves, be discussed at the coming federal-provincial conference.

Two founding peoples means that there must not be any more federal-provincial conferences in the future. If there are two founding peoples in Canada, it means that in the future we will have conferences where on the one hand representatives of the French-Canadian nation will discuss with representatives of the English-Canadian nation on the other. That and nothing else is what the two founding peoples theory means, a theory adopted by the Conservative party, repudiated by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre who, tonight, is ashamed of that political group which betrays his hopes, his ideal, his philosophy. If the hon. member is honourable, let him dissociate himself from such a policy, that is all I can suggest to him.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I ask what the agenda will be, if it has been determined? What kind of agenda have the provinces submitted to the federal government for discussion in January next of the two founding peoples theory? Will the question of the two founding peoples concept be raised as it is expected by Mr. Johnson and the Conservative party or will the question of a centralizing federal system be raised, along the thoughts of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre and the hon. member for Carleton.

We would like to know those things, because they are important. We have had enough of the political hoax plainly shown by the Conservative party since its famous new look which we have noted this evening as being—

[*English*]

The same old look and the same old gang of the Conservative party.

[*Translation*]

This is the question which I am directing to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Speaker: Order.