

*Dominion-Provincial Relations*

government as a debt due Canada, as set out in the terms of this bill. Neither can I believe that—

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** On a point of order, again we are having a repetition of the same thing as we had before and which is turning this discussion into, if I may say so, a very disorderly proceeding. The hon. member is referring to clause 2 all the time and he is discussing the specific provisions of clause 2. Now, what does this mean? It means that it will not be open to any hon. member in this house to correct the errors in which the hon. gentleman is now engaging without equally breaking the rules of the house.

It is one thing to permit a general discussion; it is a very different matter for the hon. gentleman, taking advantage of that cover, to proceed to discuss in detail the language in the specific provisions of clause 2. With great respect, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman all the way through has just been taking licence and advantage of the rules of this house. I believe this licence has never been accorded to any hon. member before and it cannot be accorded to him without serious damage being done to the rules of this house and the rights of every hon. member.

**Mr. Chevrier:** If I may, I thought your ruling had been quite clear a while ago, but in case the Minister of Finance is not aware of the terms of his own bill I bring to his attention again, as I did earlier, that we are dealing with an amendment to clause 6 which has reference to tax rental agreements and that the last part of this brings into operation clause 9A, which is the second clause of this bill, parts of which I have been discussing not in detail but in general. I submit, sir, with deference, that I should be allowed to carry on.

I was at the point of saying, when I was interrupted, that neither could I believe that the Quebec premier—

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** Mr. Chairman, before the hon. member goes on to slur over the point and pursue his cheery way, may I suggest again that the hon. member is not engaging in a general discussion; what he is doing is engaging in a specific discussion of the specific terms of clause 2 of the bill and, with great respect, I think he should not be permitted to break the rules of the house in that regard.

**Mr. Chevrier:** Could I be allowed one other comment? The minister, if he has no objection to what I am discussing, should, it seems to me, on the first clause allow it to be discussed. He rose repeatedly last night, as he

is rising now, not on a serious point of order, it seems to me, but in order to stop the discussion. When we get to clause 2 the Minister of Finance will put forward another reason why, under clause 2, I cannot deal with the matters I am dealing with now. I know him too well. He is very proficient at raising points of order, but I submit again that I should be allowed to proceed because I am strictly within clause 1 in accordance with the ruling made by the Chair.

**The Chairman:** I have already expressed my views generally with respect to this matter. I am not convinced that the question the hon. member is now discussing, namely the existence or non-existence of an agreement between the premier of Quebec and the Minister of Finance, would be in order in the general discussion under clause 1.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Would you hear argument on that point?

**The Chairman:** If the hon. member will permit me, I gave permission to the hon. member for Laurier to proceed after he explained that he could not discuss clause 1 without referring to clause 2. He may have strayed away a little from the ruling I gave but at the point he now is I assume he will soon complete his argument and I think we will save time by letting the hon. member finish.

**Mr. Chevrier:** The chairman is quite right. I had arrived at the point where I was about to conclude when the minister interrupted me. I was about to say that also on the third point could I believe that the premier of Quebec had accepted the condition contained therein. I want to add that if the account given by the Solicitor General does not correspond to the facts then we must accept the statements made by the Quebec premier as to what really did take place.

The only reference to federal action made by the Quebec premier has to do with the tax abatement of 1 per cent referred to in the letter I mentioned a moment ago, and this provision is not even in the bill. The Quebec premier has never referred to the condition contained in this bill. As far as the premier of Quebec is concerned, this bill does not exist. He says that no agreement, no understanding, has been reached with the federal government. Therefore if we accept his interpretation of the facts the federal government in introducing this bill is imposing a unilateral arrangement in a province that may well be unacceptable to that province. Because of the two contradictory interpretations of negotiations directly related to this bill given by the premier of Quebec and the Solicitor General, surely the house is entitled