

Supply—Labour

I should like the hon. member for Lapointe to explain to us his exact attitude with regard to joint plans. I also should like him to tell us once and for all before the wave of Liberal demagoguery swamps the province of Quebec, what attitude the Liberal party exactly did take in the past, what part of that attitude is today repudiated by the Liberal party and what the new principles and the new criteria of Liberal policy are in matters of constitutional relations.

That is what I should like to know, learn and hear from the very lips of those who promoted the constitutional disintegration of this country.

(Text):

Mr. Winch: Mr. Chairman, the discussion on supplementary estimate No. 636 has been lengthy, interesting and upon occasion somewhat heated. I have not risen to speak on this item until now, so I hope I will be allowed to say a few words about it. One of the reasons I felt I wanted to speak was the continuation of remarks such as those made by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. In discussing these supplementary estimates we are not discussing the constitutional issues revolving around education. These have been settled by the British North America Act.

Mr. Flynn: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Winch: Nobody has challenged the constitutionality—

Mr. Flynn: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Winch: Yes, as soon as I sit down you can ask all the questions you like.

We are interested in one thing only, and that is vote No. 636. Unfortunately, for some reason or other the debate on this estimate has evolved into a series of charges and countercharges and the trading of abuse, to some extent based on statements which are politically expedient or used as camouflage. If they have to be said at all, then they should be said on the hustings and not in the House of Commons. Vote 636, Mr. Chairman, is very definite, and is to carry out the purposes of the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act and the agreements made thereunder. The further amount required is \$28,400,000.

The first basic principle we have to accept is this. It is necessary and constitutional that, a further amount being required under an act previously passed, the government has come to us for that additional money. This is being done today. It is also a basic fact that we are

[Mr. Tremblay.]

now faced with a *fait accompli*. This money is already owing to the provinces or the municipalities or has been committed. I say, therefore, that this is a *fait accompli* because if this parliament does not vote this money then, if my memory is correct, those who sign the contracts on behalf of the government can be held legally responsible to pay the money. Let us not have all this talk about voting for or against the estimate before us. Certainly we can all agree on that, so let us not have any more talk about how you are going to vote. If you have been in parliament for any length of time, you know what you have to do.

This additional sum of \$28 million is required to carry out the purposes of the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act. We must then consider the question of the planning which has been done in connection with this expenditure, and properly so, and particularly how the purposes of the act are being carried out.

I do not know of anyone in this house, and certainly I do not know of anyone in our group in this corner, who is opposed to the principle of technical and vocational training. We have been speaking on the need for it for years. We completely support the principle, and we are glad the federal government has actually taken the position of offering to pay 75 cents of every dollar expended for capital equipment, construction and so on for vocational training.

However, surely this is the time for questions to be asked as to the planning that has taken place between the federal and provincial governments to ensure 100 per cent efficient use of these buildings, and to ensure the fulfilment of the purpose for which the act was originally passed. I believe these are very simple questions and they were clearly put, despite all the sham battle that was put up in an attempt to overcome what was said by the hon. member for Peterborough. The questions are there. Because we want to see these expenditures lead to efficient results, because the federal government has now accepted responsibility for almost \$200 million of capital expenditure for construction and equipment, we feel that the government can tell us they are not just offering this as a gift from Santa Claus but have done some planning in co-operation with the provinces so they can tell us we are not going to have thousands of empty classrooms and dozens of beautiful schools.

Surely this has been done in co-operation with the provinces who have knowledge as to their jurisdiction in connection with both teachers and curriculum. We are asking what the minister knows, because by the time we