

Dominion-Provincial Relations

entitled to the information on which the government made a decision to upset the principle of equalization which the Prime Minister promised and substitute this melange for it. I appeal again to the minister to let us have these tables.

The Prime Minister made this statement, as found on page 9907 of *Hansard*:

The preservation and extension of the fundamental principles of freedom for provinces to tax as they see fit, of equalization based on broader determination of fiscal need and the fuller recognition of fiscal disabilities peculiar to the large eastern segment of Canada, will contribute to the financial strength and independence of the provinces and to equality of opportunity for Canadians throughout Canada.

All I want to say is that what this measure is going to do, as I am sure we will be able to show later in the committee, is to contribute to inequality throughout Canada rather than equality. I suggest that the minister show us any provision of the bill that gives any province more right to tax than it has now. I should like to see it. A great deal was made of that by the Prime Minister, and I suggest that we be given that information in black and white.

I believe I am finished except for one observation I wish to make with respect to the remarks of the Minister of Finance, which I had to read so hastily that I am not sure I have them clearly in my mind. I think the only thing I want to say anything about is the extraordinary argument that the minister made toward the end of his speech about what we would be doing in voting against this bill. He suggested that one would be voting against this or that benefit to this or that place, and that it was particularly ungracious of the members from the province of Newfoundland to vote against the bill.

I might remind the minister, whose memory in these matters is often a little short, that in the year 1956 he voted against a bill that increased the payments or financial advantages to the provincial treasuries of this country by \$100 million. He voted against that bill, and I do not think anyone suggested at that time that in doing so he was hostile to such advantages as might come from that measure. He voted against it, according to him, because he was opposed to the principle of that bill, and he gave very strong arguments in his opposition to that principle. It would not be proper for me to enter into those arguments now, but I think they were accepted at that time in good faith.

It is, it seems to me, a kind of perversion to suggest, because a member believes a measure is bad and a better measure could

be substituted for it and therefore votes against it, that this means that he is opposed to such advantages as there may be in the measure for certain sections of the country. After all, it is our duty here to make good laws. It is our duty to criticize defects in laws. If we think there is a fundamental defect in a law, as I think there is a fundamental defect in this law in the abandonment of the Prime Minister's pledge, in the abandonment of the real principle of equalization, surely it is our duty to vote against it. Although I am not taking exception because I know the Minister of Finance, I do not think we add to our debates by attributing other motives than those which exist.

(Translation):

Mr. Lafreniere: Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fleming) for the statement he made a moment ago, namely that a special bill will be introduced with respect to university grants, and especially for stating that the government will take into account that certain provinces cannot accept direct grants from the federal government for education purposes.

I trust that the hopes I expressed yesterday when I spoke in the debate, will then become a reality.

Mr. Robichaud: In the course of his short contribution to the debate on the second reading of this bill, yesterday, the hon. member for Restigouche-Madawaska (Mr. Fournier) referred to the "howling" of some members during this debate.

According to *Larousse*, "howling" is the peculiar cry of wolves and dogs. I hope the hon. member had not in mind the speeches that were made yesterday, for instance, by the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Flemming), the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fleming) and the Prime Minister himself (Mr. Diefenbaker).

The hon. member also charged that I had cast insult on Acadians and French Canadians, because I ventured to make my speech in one of the two official languages of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I need not be ashamed of my attitude and patriotism, both in and out of this house; I am not ashamed of my mother tongue, but that will not prevent me from respecting, as I have always done, both official languages in this country.

In those fields, Mr. Chairman, I have no lesson to take from the hon. member for Restigouche-Madawaska. As a matter of fact, I hold in my hand copy of a speech made by the hon. member at the Star theatre of Edmundston on August 31, 1961. Unfortunately, the rules of the house do not permit me to put on record what the hon. member said in