

## Supply—Labour

ever, the federal government should not remain in those programs indefinitely, because it would lead to administrative difficulties in the long run.

And further on:

Thus, the federal government could propose other joint programs if they should prove necessary.

This last paragraph is a cause of concern to me, because it seems obvious that the Liberal party, if it should unfortunately return to power, intends to set up other joint programs and disregards the views of the provinces in this matter.

Besides, Mr. Chairman, the hired thinker, the thinking master of the Leader of the Opposition expressed himself most clearly on this subject in his book "The Canadian Federalism". On page 254, I find this paragraph that I want to read into the official report.

Finally, the fight against recession requires a preliminary phase of preparation, especially when a program of public works is involved. You have to be prepared to prevent crises. Public investment projects are fully effective only when it is known beforehand what they will cover, when and how they will be carried out. Since the provinces are unable to finance such projects by themselves and since the federal government cannot take them over exclusively, the implementation of joint programs to prevent a recession calls for previous agreement between the various levels of government.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask you to pay close attention to the end of the paragraph which condemns the autonomist attitude of the province of Quebec. I should like to have the comments of the hon. member for Levis after I have finished reading the following:

Every time the federal government has tried to discuss such projects in the past, some provinces have refused to co-operate, with the result that we have no agreements at present and we are far from being properly protected against any crisis that may occur.

I would be most happy to see how the hon. member for Levis can reconcile these words with those expressed by Mr. Maurice Lamontagne, his leader's adviser. The hon. member insisted, last night, that taxation powers be returned to the provinces, a view which is not shared by Mr. Lamontagne. Here is what he said—

**The Chairman:** At this stage, I feel it is my duty to interrupt. Much as I want the hon. member to have every possible chance of answering questions which have been raised in this house, nevertheless, I do not think he should go farther away from the item before us. His observations should relate to this item and he should set aside references and comments not connected with it.

**Mr. Tremblay:** I thank you, Mr. Chairman. In compliance with your request, I am quite willing to deal, as much as possible, only with the matter we are now discussing.

I merely wish to insist on what the hon. member for Levis said concerning the return of taxation powers brought about by the withdrawal from the joint schemes he mentioned. Here is what Mr. Maurice Lamontagne had to say and which seems to illustrate the Liberal policy:

In a system marked by economic instability, the federal government cannot consider taxation only as a source of revenue: it becomes above all an economic control instrument towards stability.

**The Chairman:** It is precisely at that point that I intervened to ask the hon. member to abide by the rules I had laid down and I do hope he will do so.

**Mr. Tremblay:** I thank you. I now come back to the subject matter.

I was saying, at the beginning of my remarks, that the C.C.F. and Liberal members—

**Mr. Denis:** And the separatists.

**Mr. Tremblay:**—showed, yesterday evening, perfect unconstitutional collusion, in connection with this additional amount for the technical and professional training program, in criticizing education in various provinces, and in indicating that the federal government had certain responsibilities in the field of technical and vocational training programs. The federal government's responsibility is that which the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys has defined a moment ago.

Before closing my remarks, I should like to come back to what the hon. member for Essex East said about the matter, which seems to me very ambiguous, and which is to be found on page 1801 of *Hansard*:

I suggest to the minister it is possible without violating the constitutional provisions of the British North America Act for the federal government to take cognizance of this fact.

Well, expressions such as those seem extremely ambiguous and appear to extend beyond what is strictly constitutional the responsibility of the federal government.

I repeat that I shall be very glad to hear the hon. member for Levis explain to us how he reconciles his attitude with regard to joint programs with that of Mr. Maurice Lamontagne and with the attitude adopted by his party for so many years, which finally brought about the constitutional crisis the Conservative party has tried to solve ever since it came to power.

In this connection, I would very much like to hear also from the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Brassard) who, I imagine, does not go so far as to share the opinion of his colleague from Hull (Mr. Caron), who considered that provincial jurisdiction in educational matters did not extend beyond elementary teaching.