

*Supply—Labour*

they could use the ideas with no thought or planning or anything else of that kind. In fact they believed the solution was to put a free enterprise mask on their faces and try to carry out socialism behind their backs. That is how this government achieved this monstrosity that we face at the present time, the greatest of all the blunders they have made in the last five years. We find an expenditure of close to \$200 million to build the wrong kind of schools in the wrong places for the wrong purposes to teach students we do not have through the services of teachers who do not exist. If any government has done anything more insane than that, I should like to know when it was.

The only conclusion I can come to is that this government lacks the courage and the honesty to carry on with the free enterprise they talk so much about, and lack the brains and intelligence to take democratic socialist measures and apply them properly. The result is—and I think this was pointed out very ably yesterday by the hon. member for Peterborough and the hon. member for Port Arthur—that consternation is spreading throughout the country and that we are amassing a colossal debt without anything to show for the money spent. Finally they will make this government and the country a laughing stock throughout the world whenever anyone of any intelligence looks at the solutions we are trying to apply to these problems.

(Translation):

**Mr. Flynn:** Last night, Mr. Chairman, in spite of the objection I raised to the effect that the matter he wished to discuss was irrelevant because it concerned the principle of the act and indeed a matter of a wider scope than that principle, the hon. member for Levis took the opportunity of that discussion to set out part of the Liberal platform and put questions to ministers and to members from the province of Quebec.

The hon. member for Levis managed to set before the house the Liberal party's attitude concerning joint schemes and here is what he quoted at page 1862 of *Hansard*, page 4 of the English translation:

Although tax sharing is essential, other forms of co-operation between the provinces and Ottawa exist which will provide a better balanced development of Canada.

Such are the federal-provincial joint programs in the field of welfare, for example old age assistance, pensions to the blind and the disabled—

A little further, the hon. member stated:

[Mr. Martin (Timmins).]

A new Liberal government, after having made arrangements with the provinces, will withdraw from those joint schemes which are now well established everywhere. At the time of its withdrawal, the federal government will confer on the provinces direct taxation powers and increase its equalization payments to a degree equivalent to the federal contribution to those programs.

Mr. Chairman, I have already stressed that the statement made by the hon. member for Levis covered more than the principle of the legislation, that it dealt with a far reaching question which would best be discussed during a separate debate.

I would not want to follow the bad example set by the hon. member for Levis; consequently, I shall not enter upon an over-long discussion of the matter he raised. I think he will agree with me that the adoption of those supplementary estimates should not be unduly delayed, since they are urgent.

I merely wish to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Levis created the impression that the new formula of the Liberal party would apply to any joint program.

I say that the member for Levis is surely not speaking for the Liberal party when he makes that suggestion, because nobody will convince me that the Liberal party is ready to provide a compensatory formula for joint programs coming under federal jurisdiction.

These are joint programs that fall well within the jurisdiction of the federal parliament; there are some for which the responsibility can be shared and, finally, there are others to which some provinces object because they feel that those schemes deal with matters which are their sole responsibility.

Surely the hon. member for Levis will not tell me that his party has changed its policy to the extent of saying that it will apply a form of compensation to all the joint programs, whatever the problems of legislative jurisdiction they create.

For example—

**Mr. Bourget:** Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to interrupt the minister, but could he specify which joint programs or plans he has in mind? I would ask him to be more specific so that we may understand each other.

**Mr. Flynn:** Mr. Chairman, it is the hon. member for Levis (Mr. Bourget) who was not specific yesterday. I would suggest especially that he expressed a very general opinion on this bill. Now, does the hon. member for Levis mean to say that his alternative formula would apply to the trans-Canada highway?