

Interim Supply

when I am finished and contradict me, let him do so. He was going to ask a question. I do not think he has risen on a question of privilege. He has not addressed the Chair and I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I have the floor and I have only 20 minutes left. I have a lot to say as far as the constitution is concerned, and I would appreciate it if the minister would resume his seat and allow me to proceed.

Mr. Pickersgill: I have it right here and I can read it right away. I think I can satisfy the hon. gentleman completely.

Mr. Woolliams: Have you asked permission of the Chair to get on your feet?

Mr. Pickersgill: I thought I had permission but, of course, if the hon. gentleman does not want me to—

Mr. Woolliams: Would the minister then be prepared to agree to the extension of my time by the amount of my time he is taking now?

Mr. Pickersgill: Delighted. I love to hear the hon. gentleman speak.

Mr. Woolliams: Fine.

Mr. Pickersgill: Here is what the Prime Minister said, Mr. Chairman, as found on page 9547 of *Hansard*:

Mr. Speaker, in so far as the delegation of federal powers to the provinces is concerned there is no difference.

He was referring to the delegation of federal powers to the provinces. I believe there is a slight difference with regard to the delegation of provincial powers to this parliament but in so far as the delegation of federal powers is concerned, that is decentralization, the Prime Minister said yesterday that the formula was identical with the Fulton formula, and I believe that can be ascertained by any person competent to read.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Page the *Winnipeg Free Press*.

Mr. Woolliams: For two reasons I am not going to be as nasty as the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate. First, he has been ill and has just returned to the House of Commons. Second, I have always looked upon those men who were members of the house before I arrived here as my seniors. Therefore I am not going to hand back that kind of sarcasm.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: Hon. members can laugh. I see that one of the backbenchers on the other side has now moved up to the front bench but that is neither here nor there. You can laugh, but I say to the minister that when he implies I am not competent to read I will let the record speak for me. That is what the minister implied. I am not going to be sidetracked, but I will say in answer—

Mr. Pickersgill: I did not imply that.

Mr. Woolliams: —to the minister—

Mr. Pickersgill: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might be allowed to apologize to the hon. gentleman. I was not implying for one minute that he was not competent to read. I was just suggesting that perhaps he had not yet had the time to do so.

Mr. Woolliams: Again we have sarcasm and we have the boys who laugh at the sarcasm. I will answer in this vein. The other day I picked up an article which was very critical of myself and another member because we had said certain things in the house. I should like to say, and I hope the press is listening—I do not like saying this because many on the other side are my friends—that when we were on the government side of the house there was never anything to equal the howling and shouting of the backbenchers of the Liberal party at this time. You laugh, you scoff, you shout. If a member does work to prepare a speech he might as well pack it up, because he is howled and shouted down by the backbenchers in the Liberal party. I see one of the distinguished members of the Liberal party sitting back there, and I am sure he will agree with me that if you differ with what I say and have something to say yourself, you should have the decency and courtesy to get on your feet and argue like gentlemen rather than howling like wolves. I come back now to what the minister said.

An hon. Member: Say something intelligent.

Mr. Woolliams: You say “is that intelligent”. I am not going to be sidetracked. I ask the chairman to bring the committee to order. I intend to finish my remarks in spite of the howling and shouting in which members on the other side are now engaged.

This is my answer to the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate. I have not checked this, but when this matter was first brought before the house it was my interpretation of the Prime Minister's language that he meant