

Dominion-Provincial Relations

remember how very often the hon. gentleman would make a great deal of noise about a point of law only to discover at the end that there was no point to his argument at all. I say this to him respectfully, because this evening in the remarks which he made so loudly and with such eloquence I do not think he made any attempt to reply with any degree of seriousness to the objections which were posed by those of us who sit on this side of the house to certain aspects of this bill.

Mr. Fulton: And for which you all voted.

Mr. Chevrier: The Minister of Justice made a point of interrupting me by saying that this was a bill for which we all voted. Yes. The Minister of Justice may not remember that on a similar occasion, when he and his colleagues sat on this side of the house, they did worse than that.

Mr. Fulton: On what occasion? Give chapter and verse now.

Mr. Chevrier: When there was a discussion of the National Housing Act in 1954 during a period of four days the hon. gentleman and his friends criticized the government day in and day out and then, when the vote was taken, they voted in favour of the measure.

Mr. Fulton: No constitutional issue there; no provincial election then.

Mr. Chevrier: More than that, Mr. Chairman, there was, during the discussion of that bill—

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Chevrier: I am surprised that the Minister of Justice is not able to sit there and take it.

Mr. Fulton: You are surprised and disappointed.

Mr. Chevrier: I am disappointed at you. If you will only listen to what I have to say perhaps the disappointment will be on the other side. I was about to say that on third reading of that bill there was an amendment moved by a member of the C.C.F. party that the bill be not read the third time, because of an amendment concerning interest. Again the members of the Conservative opposition who criticized our conduct so strongly tonight through the Minister of Finance voted on third reading, on the amendment, with the government of the day.

An hon. Member: Discuss the bill.

Mr. Chevrier: Yes, I am going to discuss the bill, do not worry about that. But the Minister of Finance did not discuss the bill. He raised a smokescreen, and for 40 minutes

[Mr. Chevrier.]

all he tried to do was to attempt to show that there was a division between us in so far as our attitude is concerned.

An hon. Member: He convinced you.

Mr. Chevrier: There is no division. I intend at this stage to put on record—

An hon. Member: Smokescreen.

Mr. Chevrier: There is no one better than the Minister of Finance at being able to raise a smokescreen around an issue such as this, though he has not been very successful.

An hon. Member: You voted for it.

Mr. Chevrier: Apparently hon. members on the other side of the house do not like this.

Some hon. Members: Oh.

An hon. Member: We love it.

Mr. Chevrier: At least they should do us the courtesy of listening to this speech in the same way as we listened to speeches from the other side of the house. However, if hon. members opposite want to interrupt, let them go ahead and do so because I can speak a great deal louder than they can. I may not be able to wave, the way the Minister of Finance does, and hop, step and jump as he did this evening, but at least I intend to talk to the bill if I am given an opportunity to do so.

The Chairman: Order. May I remind all hon. members that it is not permitted by the rules to interrupt the hon. member who has the floor without first obtaining permission, nor is it permitted to interrupt while the chairman is speaking. I would ask for the co-operation of everyone so that this debate may proceed in an orderly way and so that the hon. member for Laurier may proceed to discuss the bill which is before us.

Mr. Chevrier: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your intervention and I will proceed to answer the point which was raised, namely that there was a difference of opinion between the Leader of the Opposition, and myself and the members of our party. Apparently the Minister of Finance had completely forgotten what I stated as recorded at page 3284 of *Hansard* of April 26, 1960, and I quote:

In conclusion I should like to summarize the attitude of the official opposition toward the main parts of the bill. We support the increased payment to the province; that is, the extension of the rate of 13 per cent of the standard individual income tax for a further period of two years, although such an arrangement is not what the provinces were led to believe they would get from the present government before the last general election. Next, we are also in favour of the university grants paid out of the federal treasury, which were started by a Liberal government and distributed through the Canadian universities