

*Supply—Labour*

Ontario will require 10 years to provide the additional teachers needed to match the increased accommodation that is going to be provided by the end of this year.

One of the problems arising out of this whole business is the responsibility of the federal government because we put a limitation on the period during which the provinces could benefit from the legislation. All these facilities have to be provided and in being by the end of this year. The provinces cannot afford to pass this up. Of course many cannot afford to take advantage of this opportunity, either, and are caught between the upper and nether millstones. They must try to adapt their finances and plans to accommodate this extra program. Some have telescoped into one year a plan that would probably have been spread over four or five years.

I wish to put these two questions to the minister. Has the minister satisfied himself that the provinces are able to integrate this program into the different systems, and is the department satisfied with respect to the ability of the provinces to train and acquire the additional teachers who will be required to carry out the expanded program and teach the additional number of students?

**Mr. Starr:** Mr. Chairman, in reply to both questions I would say yes. Elaborating on the second point, I would say that the date of termination applies only to the federal participation of 75 per cent up to March 31, 1963, and then there is a continuation of participation of up to 50 per cent after that date. The federal contribution of up to 50 per cent of the cost of training teachers carries on for as long as the legislation is on the books.

*(Translation):*

**Mr. Brassard (Lapointe):** Mr. Chairman, it would be ungracious of me not to accept the kind invitation which the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Tremblay) extended to me a short while ago. He asked what is my stand on the estimate now before us. In other words, he asked me to do what he himself did not do in the course of his remarks.

My stand on joint plans is very clear: it is the same as that of the leader of the Liberal party.

I should have liked to hear other Conservative members from the province of Quebec, the Secretary of State (Mr. Dorion), the Minister of Transport (Mr. Balcer), the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Pigeon), and especially the hon. member for Chambly-Rouville (Mr. Johnson).

[Mr. Carter.]

The hon. member for Roberval has quoted an excerpt from Mr. Lamontagne's book on joint plans. I hope he understood perfectly that Mr. Lamontagne in that paragraph refers to depression and recession times. I think there is an important difference of meaning there. Perhaps the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys (Mr. Flynn) should read this paragraph. In my opinion the difference is important.

**Mr. Flynn:** I have read the whole book.

**Mr. Brassard (Lapointe):** That was the first comment I wanted to make. The second deals with the joint plans policy we adopted in 1961 and which is supported by Mr. Lamontagne.

This is one of the basic differences between the Conservative and the Liberal parties. We are not prisoners of the past and of outmoded formulas. The very name of our party indicates that we keep our eyes open, that we are looking forward and that we are trying to adjust ourselves to the present and to the future. This is one of the basic differences between the two parties.

The item discussed today is not the result of a new policy, because ever since 1951, the federal government has contributed financially to the construction of technical schools in this country. In fact if we go back a little, we from Quebec know that it was a few years before the previous government would accept that participation of the federal government and that, even when it had been accepted, some people kept on talking against those federal grants for the construction of technical schools.

**Mr. Flynn:** Are you talking about the Bilodeau-Rogers plan?

**Mr. Brassard (Lapointe):** I did not hear the hon. minister's question.

**Mr. Flynn:** Is the hon. member talking about the Bilodeau-Rogers plan?

**Mr. Brassard:** I am talking about the plan adopted in 1951, under which financial assistance was provided for the construction of technical schools.

Besides, such attitude is not new. The same thing happened in Quebec with the Colombo plan, the university grants and the trans-Canada highway. Yet, the Conservative members from Quebec came here and supported wholeheartedly an increase of the appropriations in that field, but they did not go back to the scarecrows they had spread about in the province of Quebec for some years.

**Mr. Deschatelets:** Shame.

**Mr. Dupuis:** Nonsense.