

*Dominion-Provincial Relations*

This is an accurate report of the meeting at Joliette according to *Montreal-Matin*; and it says quite the opposite.

Can we not, therefore, accept the minister's word?

**Mr. Loiselle:** The Union Nationale gospel.

**Mr. Johnson:** The hon. member for St. Ann (Mr. Loiselle) should keep to politics on the municipal level.

(Text):

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Surely I had the floor and I was seeking to reply politely to a question asked me very politely by the Solicitor General and I think I should be allowed to reply to that question without all these interruptions which have nothing to do with that question.

Here is the account which appeared in the newspaper *Le Devoir* of the speech made by the premier of Quebec in opening his campaign:

(Translation):

Mr. Barrette said that there was never any question of an agreement with Ottawa, but a decision taken by an autonomous government to settle a thorny problem. Thus, he said, by proudly expressing our will, we succeeded in recovering for Quebec \$10 million in taxes per year and the \$25 million lying in Ottawa coffers.

We even got the federal government to admit that it will vacate the field of education, thus finally winning out after years of struggle.

(Text):

That is what Mr. Barrette said and here is what the Solicitor General said on April 26, as reported on page 3286 of *Hansard*, where he was speaking in French:

(Translation):

We have kept our word admirably, because Premier Barrette himself believed that this bill is consistent with the terms of Mr. Duplessis' proposal, which was submitted again by Mr. Sauvé, and later by Mr. Barrette himself.

**Mr. Tremblay:** Where is the contradiction, then?

(Text):

**Mr. Pickersgill:** If the Solicitor General does not think that that was a clear statement, clearly intended to convey the impression that the premier of the province of Quebec was satisfied with what was going to be brought before this house, it certainly conveyed that impression to my mind and it conveyed that impression to the mind of my hon. friend, and it seems to have conveyed that impression to the minds of all those hon. gentlemen here who applauded the Solicitor General.

**Mr. Balcer:** May I ask the hon. member a question?

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Certainly.

**Mr. Balcer:** Can you tell me at what time Premier Barrette said he was not satisfied?

**Mr. Chevrier:** Mr. Chairman—

**An hon. Member:** That is right; get your helpers to work.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a copy of *Le Devoir* of Monday, May 9, reporting Mr. Barrette, presumably textually, a newspaper of which I doubt hon. gentlemen opposite would question the reliability. If they do want to question it let them go ahead. If they suggest that this newspaper deforms the news, then that is their suggestion, not mine.

**Mr. Johnson:** Mr. Chairman, on a question of privilege, I take exception to the statement of the hon. member in relation to his remarks about the authenticity of this newspaper's articles. He is referring to the authenticity of certain remarks of their editors or their reporters, not the authenticity of the paper itself and of all their reporters. I would ask the hon. member to stick to his contention and not go beyond it.

**Mr. Chevrier:** You are better sitting down than standing up.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Mr. Chairman, that was so obviously not a question of privilege.

The premier of Quebec says there is no understanding, nothing whatever, and the Solicitor General says this is a magnificent example of understanding. It is very like that new, third constitutional theory we heard from the Minister of Finance last night. It is a kind of mysticism that plain, simple people cannot understand.

Coming back to the point, I say that before we are asked to approve clauses 1 and 2 of this bill that incorporate this new scheme we should be told by the government whether or not this scheme is satisfactory to the present government of the province of Quebec and in what fashion the federal government learned it was satisfactory to the provincial government.

This is something which must be unparalleled in our parliamentary history. We are asked to enact legislation to meet a problem in one of the ten provinces. We are told by a minister here in the house that this meets the problem, that he knows it meets it, and that the provincial government has said so. We are told by the premier of the province of Quebec that there is no understanding whatsoever. It should be impossible for any government to come into the house and ask hon. members to take a position of that sort. Can anyone imagine Mr. St. Laurent doing a thing like that? Can anyone imagine what the Minister of Finance would have said if Mr. St. Laurent had tried to do it?

**Mr. Brassard (Lapointe):** Another flag.