

—meaning section 133 of the British North America Act—
—be dealt with without the consent of the provincial legislatures?

That is the question and this is the Prime Minister's answer, given as Minister of Justice.

Legally I say it can.

Mr. Speaker, that is the remark which has been discussed.

Mr. Martin: Why does the hon. gentleman not read the whole statement instead of one excerpt?

Mr. Fleming: If the hon. minister had been in the house or had read *Hansard*, he would know the Prime Minister read at very great length from what he said on June 18, 1946. I repeat, for the benefit of the minister, that the Prime Minister omitted to read that most significant statement in the passage he read. I do not think that omission was accidental. That is the contention which fell from the lips of the right hon. gentleman on that occasion which has given rise to so much disturbance in certain parts of this country and which ought to be a matter of genuine concern to all parts.

Mr. Cruickshank: In all parts; what parts?

Mr. Fleming: In the parts with which the hon. gentleman apparently is not acquainted, but should be.

The Prime Minister has said the province of Quebec likes its facts straight. I wonder if the Prime Minister did not get the facts straight from the people of Quebec last July when the results of the provincial general election were announced. Strangely enough, although this subject has been discussed on many occasions, to the Prime Minister's certain knowledge, it has taken him nearly three years to rise in his place in this house and attempt to put an interpretation on remarks that he made on June 18, 1946. Let there be no mistake about that.

Mr. Martin: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, my time is limited, and I will not ask for any extension. If the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Martin) will wait until I finish, I shall be glad to answer his question.

Mr. Martin: The hon. gentleman has said—

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I wish to continue.

Mr. Martin: I should like to ask—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

The Address—Mr. Fleming

Mr. Fleming: Whether the Minister of National Health and Welfare likes it or not, I say that remark from the Prime Minister was a perfectly deliberate and studied remark. It was, however, in accord with the contention the Prime Minister, then Minister of Justice, was making not only then but in the previous days of debate on that same subject.

Mr. Martin: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has just now made an insinuation that the Prime Minister deliberately tried to deceive this House of Commons.

Mr. Fleming: I did not.

An hon. Member: What is the point of order?

Mr. Martin: That is the point of order. I say that is unparliamentary language, and that the hon. gentleman should withdraw it at once.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I understand that the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming) has stated that he did not make the statement that the Prime Minister had deliberately tried to deceive this house.

Mr. Fleming: I did not say that. I did not use the word "deceive". What I said was that the Prime Minister's statement was a perfectly deliberate statement; that is, that the statement he made, which I have just quoted, was a deliberate statement. He was not caught off guard.

Mr. Martin: I rise to a point of order. I am subject to the judgment of the house, but if the hon. gentleman now says that he did not seek to convey the impression, by the words he used, that the Prime Minister had deliberately deceived this house, or if he now withdraws that insinuation, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw nothing, because I did not make that remark. I wish the Minister of National Health and Welfare would pay attention to what is being said instead of concentrating on making interruptions and trying to delay me. What I said was that the statement of the Prime Minister was a perfectly deliberate statement. He was not caught off guard. What he said was completely in keeping with the argument he was making in the house that day and in the previous days of that same session. It was a deliberate statement. The consequences of that statement of the Prime Minister, which was a deliberate statement, have been incalculably mischievous and harmful to the whole of Canadian unity, and those remarks have given rise to a distrust and disturbance of feeling for which he is entirely responsible.

He did not do that without due warning on that occasion, because he had ample warning from those who followed him.