

or a base for discussion on a point which has found favour on both sides of the House. Perhaps if members looked a little closer at these amendments we would not get statements that only display a lack of knowledge with regard to procedural amendments.

The reason I want this and the other amendment discussed is to reiterate the point of view put forward in part by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) the other day on second reading. This appears at page 438 of *Hansard*. We discussed the degree of negotiation that takes place under federal-provincial financial agreements. There is a great picture painted. The minister stated this afternoon that the regulations were made after consultation; then he said after "information" to the provinces. "Information" is the word, not "consultation."

This bill represents an agreement reached between the government of Canada and the governments of the provinces. However, they failed to see that the whole of clause 32 unilaterally reserves power to the government of Canada to change the guts of this agreement, the heart and core, by making regulations which only it has to consider without calling in the provinces.

I now wish to turn to the definition of the revenue base, the expressions "revenue source," "junior matriculation" and "post-secondary level." We are talking about part VI of the act. When the federal government has the unilateral power of defining expressions such as "junior matriculation," "post-secondary level," "assisted, sponsored or contract research" and, finally, "operating expenditures incurred for post-secondary education by or in respect of an education institution or secondary institution", it can decide what expenditures it will support and what expenditures it will not support.

• (2020)

It is said the provinces have agreed. But any of the provincial ministers of finance or their equivalents will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that they were most unhappy about this agreement. However, there was nothing they could do about it. This is why I have brought forward the amendment we are considering, to show that this is not what was said by the Minister of Finance or by his supporters in the government. I believe the provinces are definitely unhappy about many features of this arrangement, but there is nothing they can do about it. They are caught. This is why, during the committee meetings, there was all this talk about additional domination by the federal government during every period of renegotiation.

I wish to support what has been said today by my hon. friend from Fundy Royal, by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) and by the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Kaplan) in their strictures against the growing practice of some of the provinces to talk as though we shall see the balkanization of post-secondary education, that we shall see graduated fees coming into effect for residents and non-residents or, what is even worse, that something terrible will be done with foreign students. I have never heard anything so chauvinistic as this idea.

There are different kinds of universities, some teaching disciplines which are not taught in certain provinces. Some students prefer to attend smaller universities. Why not? After all, the government of Canada rebates through

### *Federal-Provincial Arrangements Act*

the ceding of the four points of income tax almost 50 per cent of the provincial contribution to post-secondary education. But since this is assimilated into the revenues of the provinces, the provinces seem to think they contribute all this money. This is not the case.

One of the things we must avoid at all costs during the period of two years during which a new arrangement is being arrived at is the balkanization of post-secondary education. It may cost the government of Canada something more. No; I should say, rather, that it may cost the Canadian taxpayer more. I find it extraordinary that the provinces should make representations vis-à-vis the government of Canada or vis-à-vis other governments as though they were acting for foreigners, for strangers and gaining advantage for certain people as opposed to others.

I saw an instance of this the other day, expressed in headlines as the words of Premier Bourassa—that he had achieved "a triple victory over Ottawa." A victory on behalf of whom, against whom? A victory on behalf of Canadian citizens against other Canadian citizens? That is a shameful statement to make. It is a shameful attitude to hold. No Canadians can score a victory over other Canadians in such matters. We all pay the same taxes and we are all entitled to the same services. There are different administrations, different regional considerations, but I do not for one moment concede any strength or validity to those arguments.

It is for this reason I put forward the amendment. I do not intend to press it on the House. I trust that having now provided a forum for the discussion of this point, the House will permit me to withdraw amendment No. 1 and then consider amendment No. 2, to which I propose to speak very briefly. My seconder is not here at the moment but I know he would have no objection to this course.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Hon. members have heard the suggestion which has just been made. Is it agreed that the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) be permitted to withdraw the motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion No. 1 (Mr. Lambert) withdrawn.

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West)** moved motion No. 2 as follows:

—That Bill C-8, an act to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces, to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act, be amended by adding in clause 32 after the word "Act" in line 4 on page 31 the following:

"provided that any regulation made pursuant to any of the above paragraphs shall be subject to a negative resolution adopted by not less than the majority of the provinces both in number and in population at the first plenary session of first ministers of Canada and the provinces or of their respective finance ministers following the making of the said regulation."

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Before the Chair recognizes the mover of the motion, may I say I have some doubt about its procedural acceptability. Hon. members might be prepared to assist the Chair in this respect.

Perhaps the best way to say what I wish to say is by first of all reading part of clause 32:

The governor in council may make regulations—