

Dominion-Provincial Relations

of the people of Manitoba. That is the root of my objection to this whole bill, and that is where I quarrel with the Minister of Forestry.

I say, and I said earlier, that when the Atlantic provinces grants were established we were told they were to be in addition to equalization, not in substitution for equalization, and in 1958 they were in addition to equalization. New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland all got the same increment of equalization, the same three points that the minister talked about yesterday in his speech. They got that just as did all the other provinces, but they got this other in addition. What the government has done this time has been to change the principle of equalization for something which is not equalization at all but an averaging down of the poorer provinces. That is not equalization. Equalization means to make something equal, not to make it unequal, and the whole device here is to make the thing unequal. Because it was so unequal for the Atlantic provinces \$10 million was added to the Atlantic provinces grants in substitution for, not in addition to, the equalization which they were losing by this new and disadvantageous formula.

That is the point. Now, it just so happened that that formula was much more disadvantageous to the province of New Brunswick than it was to the other three Atlantic provinces. It just so happened that it was and is, and that is what my hon. friend from Gloucester was complaining about; that is what the premier of the province is complaining about. In the light of the Prime Minister's pledge, it seems to me this is what every citizen of New Brunswick has a right to complain about. Every citizen of Manitoba has a right to complain about the deal that province has received compared with what the Prime Minister said in July would be the foundation of this whole system.

I could not argue against the additional \$10 million for the Atlantic provinces grants. According to the minister's tables, the total payment is increased by \$18 million, which is all to go to one province. That is all this bill does; it increases the payments by \$18 million over what we are paying this year. It is true that British Columbia and Alberta lose absolutely, and what they lose the four Atlantic provinces gain. It just happens to add up to about the same amount. What I am saying is that the right thing to have done was to carry out the Prime Minister's pledge of July to increase the equalization on that basis which was fair to everybody, and which was genuine equalization. If the government felt that all it could afford was \$18 million

as an increase, that could be another \$8 million distributed among the provinces when they felt the Atlantic provinces should have this \$10 million. In other words, what should have been done was to keep the Atlantic provinces grants separate for the purpose for which they were established, the purpose which I have always supported, and the purpose which I have always given the government credit for; to meet the additional need that could not be met by equalization. It is surely prostituting them to use them as a substitute for equalization because you make the so-called equalization formula so bad.

That is the real trouble. It also makes it so unequal as between New Brunswick on the one hand and Nova Scotia and Newfoundland on the other, no one can help but feel that it is not just unless the previous system was not just. I do not think anyone would argue that New Brunswick was getting too much under the previous system; at least I would be very surprised if anyone would so argue.

That is the basic criticism that I have to make on clause 1. There are a couple of other things, of course, that the Prime Minister said which I do not think can really be overlooked. I will leave the question of Saskatchewan to others, beyond saying that Saskatchewan is apparently going to have to be content with the old system throughout the whole period.

That brings me to a point at which I should like to repeat my request of yesterday, which was echoed by the hon. member for Laurier; namely, that we should be given a projection over the whole five years of the old system and the new. We are being asked to pass what is in many ways the most important statute this parliament could possibly pass, and we are entitled to all the information available to the government to illuminate this matter. We are entitled to know just what the relationship of each province would be between a continuation of the present system and the substitution of the new system. Otherwise we cannot determine whether what we are doing is fair or not fair.

I cannot understand the reluctance of the government to do this. I do not know because I have seen such tables, but I have had enough experience in these matters to know perfectly well that they exist. Nobody is going to expect the end results to turn out to be exactly the same as the estimates in these tables. We are grown men and women. We all know these are estimates, but we are entitled to those estimates. This parliament, which is being asked to make a decision, is