

The Budget—Mr. Martin

notes. Does the hon. member not think that a question of privilege in that sense is one which does not belong to him but rather to the Leader of the Opposition? May I point this out to hon. members generally. We have listened to an interesting speech by the Leader of the Opposition. We are now listening to one which promises to be equally interesting by the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Mr. Knowles: He is always promising.

Mr. Speaker: Naturally some interruptions are in order, provided they are not disorderly. An hon. member must not be interrupted while he is speaking unless he gives his consent. I would not want too many questions of privilege to be raised when, in fact, they are not questions of privilege and are raised only for the purpose of interrupting the hon. member who has the floor. A moment ago I did all that I could to protect the Leader of the Opposition, who had the floor. I intend to do likewise with regard to the minister who is now speaking and with regard to any other hon. member who may take part in this debate. I should like hon. members to cooperate. If they do not agree with some of the remarks being made by the member who has the floor, I would ask them not to interrupt on a question of privilege when the question, in fact, is not one of privilege.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege—and I know in this case the minister will welcome the interruption—I wish to make it clear that I read nothing except quotations, and they were clearly indicated as quotations. I assure the minister that I was not implying that he is reading his speech. I confess that at the time I thought he was reading from something, and I asked the question actually wanting to know the source of the information. If the answer is that he is reading from notes, then that is the complete answer to what I asked.

Mr. Martin: Mr. Speaker, I assure you and the house that I shall not be reading for very long from what I have in front of me, because I think I am usually able to collect my thoughts without too much trouble. However, over the week end, after the exchange between the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, I did some homework. I find that homework is extremely interesting. I have tabulated a number of facts, and that tabulation is what I have been referring to and reading from. I think my hon. friend will find that, notwithstanding the heavy preoccupations which he, I and others had on Saturday, I did a fairly good job of homework.

[Mr. Speaker.]

The 1945 proposals had to do with fiscal agreements, social security and public investment. Under the heading of fiscal agreements we now have tax agreements with 9 of the 10 provinces. It is interesting to note, from the table I have before me, the payments which we were prepared to make in 1945 and 1948, compared with the payments to be made in 1956, and the extent to which, in the fiscal field, we have more than implemented what was proposed in 1945.

In 1945 we proposed to the provinces a formula which would have resulted, had it been in effect in 1944, in total payments to the provinces of \$206,800,000. In 1948 the payments to the provinces would have amounted to \$215,400,000 on the basis of the 1945 formula. The estimated payments in 1956 are \$320,350,000. Hence in the matter of fiscal agreements alone the government and the Minister of Finance have been able to provide to the provinces payments substantially greater than those proposed at the famous conference in 1945 to which our attention has been directed this afternoon.

Mr. Knowles: Have you those figures in constant dollars?

Mr. Martin: I have those figures in constant dollars, and if I had unlimited time I would go through the whole table. It is very interesting. But I shall take Ontario as an example. For 1944 the proposed payments to Ontario would have been \$68,600,000. In 1948 the proposed payments would have amounted to \$70,300,000, and in 1955-56 the premier of Ontario will have \$139,500,000 at his disposal for the services he wishes to perform. These figures make it clear that the federal government has in fact implemented the fiscal portion of the 1945 proposals for any province desiring to participate, and has done so at a level twice as generous as the most optimistic estimates of financial revenue accruing to the provinces as set out in the 1945 proposals.

Further, in return for these tax rental payments the federal government has not insisted on the exclusive occupancy of all the tax fields on which it insisted in 1945. While still insisting on the occupancy of the personal income and corporation tax fields, it now agrees to share other fields such as succession duties with the provinces.

Mr. Drew: It vacated the fields we suggested should be vacated.

Mr. Martin: I am sure I would welcome a question, but I would appreciate it if I could deal with this matter without interruption. In addition, the federal government has also vacated the gasoline tax and amusement tax