

Supply—Labour

by some members opposite who indulge in too great a complacency. But some hon. members have tried to involve me in the discussion of a project which I feel did not, as was indicated by the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys (Mr. Flynn), called for an examination of the principle of the act, since we are now asked to vote an additional amount required so that this technical and vocational training program may be carried out as it should be.

I do not know that it is relevant to bring up the general principle of the act as well as the general economics of the act. It seems to me that this is simply a matter of finding out from the minister concerned to what extent and under what conditions those additional millions we are asked to vote would eventually be spent. However, the hon. member for Levis (Mr. Bourget)—following the example of hon. members of the ex-C.C.F. party, now known in the province of Quebec and elsewhere as the New Democratic party—extended the debate and set out to examine the general principle of the act, bringing up the economics of all those measures. That is why I should like, for the information of the Liberal members, to make some remarks which I hope are as much in order as those of our excellent comedians opposite—I regret that this is not a parliamentary expression—I should rather say our very good friends opposite.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Levis challenged us last night to take a stand on that question of joint plans. I should like right now to calm his over-scrupulous conscience and put the facts before him.

As far as I am concerned, never have I stated that those joint plans should be abolished. I have never made such a statement but, in the election campaigns in which I had the pleasure to take part, I have been critical of the federal fiscal policy of the Liberal party. I have said and promised to my constituents that the Conservative party would throw off, as the Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys said, the yoke under which the Liberal party had held the province of Quebec. That is our stand and it is in that light that I promised to insist in this house on the rights of the provinces. That is what we have done, I think, and as for results, the public will be in a position to assess them in due time and, I hope, in a very near future.

Mr. Bourget: So do we.

Mr. Tremblay: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Levis challenged us to speak out on that question, but he did not do so with a view to enlightening this house in a positive and efficient way. He did not do so with a view to clearing up the confusion

[Mr. Tremblay.]

which his party has maintained, but simply in order to save face and with the clear intention of saving the Hon. Jean Lesage, who having previously been an anti-autonomist has now shifted to a verbal autonomy, and who would like to get us involved in a conflict which he has himself helped to bring about and maintain when he was the instigator of all those centralizing measures which the province of Quebec had to put up with and still has to put up with now.

The hon. member for Levis was very shrewd last night—that is as much as he can be—and in reading his pamphlet he gave us a foretaste of the odious propaganda of the Liberal party during the next general election.

He read us an advertising booklet in which his party states that it intends to give up joint programs. I understand that the advertising booklet he read last night mentioned that question of joint programs because Mr. Jean Lesage came here barely a few weeks after his election, draped in the cloak of autonomy, and said to whoever would listen to him that the province of Quebec wanted the federal government to withdraw from all the joint programs. That is why the members opposite are embarrassed today and must take a stand they always opposed when they were in power.

I challenge them to say the contrary, in particular I challenge them to ask Mr. Jean Lesage to claim now what he announced when he took part in the federal-provincial conference in 1960.

If Mr. Lesage has decided to withdraw from joint programs, he should say so, just like Mr. Duplessis used to tell the government in Ottawa what he considered to be an encroachment on the autonomy of the provinces.

Under those circumstances, we shall be extremely pleased to examine the concrete proposals made by Mr. Jean Lesage, but we hope that he won't turn about, as he did very recently in the matter of university grants. He had come here, all primed to the occasion, and he had requested much more than he is now claiming.

Mr. Chairman, coming back to my point about that article of the Liberal joint plan program, I would point out to the hon. member for Levis, who admitted his legal ignorance yesterday evening, that the article of his party's program is merely a diversionary measure designed to save face and minimize the embarrassment of Hon. Jean Lesage in Quebec.

This significant article reads as follows:

In this field, Ottawa must help set up such assistance programs throughout the country; how-