

*Dominion-Provincial Relations*

**The Chairman:**—to the government generally. I do not think the rule with regard to imputing motives would apply in a case when it is addressed to the government or a party in general. I would therefore allow the hon. member to continue.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I would go further than you have gone and say that I made that interjection only because an hon. member behind me here who is a supporter of the Minister of Finance himself introduced the subject of a provincial election. I had no intention of speaking about a provincial election and I have no intention of speaking about a provincial election.

I will do the Minister of Finance the honour of saying that I believe he was quite sincere last year when he said he wanted to solve this problem. I have always thought he was quite sincere in wanting to solve this problem, just as I think my hon. friend from Laurier was quite sincere last year when he also said in the same debate he wanted to solve this problem and when he put forward a solution to the problem which is consistent with provincial rights. If I said anything in this particular which offended the tender susceptibilities of the Minister of Finance I withdraw it, because I have never doubted his sincerity or patriotism in this matter any more than I think he should question that of any other hon. member. I think every Canadian who is worth his salt wants to solve this problem, and I have always thought so.

I do not think it is very becoming in the Minister of Finance or in some other hon. gentlemen opposite to suggest when we are trying to uphold the constitution of our country that we are doing it for any other motive than the proper motive that any hon. member ought to have in this house. I have been very careful in every word I have said at every stage of this debate to avoid any kind of insinuations of that sort and I ask any hon. gentleman to scrutinize what I have said. I have never said anything about what motives may have actuated any provincial government because I do not think it is our business in this house and I do not intend to do so.

The hon. member for Laurier has brought up a problem here, and there is no sense in asking us to pass a bill that is not going to achieve the objective which the government and the rest of us have in mind. If this bill is not going to solve the problem; if instead it is going to constitute a further problem for the future and if, as we believe, it is of very doubtful constitutionality and is undoubtedly an invasion into normal provincial affairs, as we believe it is, we think it ought to be debated seriously, without insinuation or innuendo, on its merits.

[Mr. Fleming (Eglinton).]

We were told by the Solicitor General the other day in the passage read by my hon. friend, which I will not repeat, that the premier of Quebec and the government of Quebec agreed in advance to this bill and this scheme.

**Mr. Balcer:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I never said that. If the hon. member wants to quote my speeches let him read them from *Hansard*, not create them from his imagination.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Very well: I do not want to be unfair. Perhaps when some of the hon. gentlemen opposite calm down I will read it because, as I say, I do not want to be unfair in any particular to the Solicitor General.

**Mr. Starr:** What is the page in *Hansard*?

**Mr. Pickersgill:** In *Hansard* page 3286 April 26, 1960. This is the Solicitor General speaking and it is the passage which was read a few minutes ago by my hon. friend. I will read it again:

*(Translation):*

A few days before his death, Mr. Duplessis stated that he would be in a position to submit, in October, a positive proposition to the ministers from Ottawa. It was the Hon. Paul Sauve who submitted that positive proposition. Federal ministers discussed it with Mr. Sauve and, at the time of his tragic death, only a few details remained to be worked out, which was done during a private interview between Mr. Antonio Barrette, Mr. Sauve's successor, and the Minister of Finance, sponsor of the bill which is now before us.

We had claimed, under the Liberal administration, that it was possible to settle this problem in a constitutional way and to the satisfaction of the premiers of all the provinces.

**Mr. English:** It is indeed unfair not to take a cabinet minister's word and to give preference to an item published in the press.

I have here a copy of *Montreal-Matin* which says quite the opposite.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to be able to read the article published by *Montreal-Matin*—

**The Chairman:** Order. I regret to have to interrupt the hon. member, but the question raised by the hon. member for Chambly-Rouville (Mr. Johnson) did not refer to the minister's statement, but to the accuracy of a newspaper item which the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate (Mr. Pickersgill) was quoting. The hon. member for Chambly-Rouville was speaking on a question of privilege.

**Mr. English:** I rise on a question of privilege also. The subject matter was an article published in *Le Devoir* which had been previously quoted.