

*Dominion—Provincial Relations*

is my opinion that this bill will be passed on the ground of common law alliance.

Clause agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

**Mr. Speaker:** When shall the bill be read the third time?

**Mr. Howard:** Next sitting.

**Some hon. Members:** Now.

**Mr. Speaker:** Now?

**Mr. Howard:** I should like it to be read on the next day.

**Some hon. Members:** Now.

**Mr. Howard:** I rise on a point of order. If I rise to discuss third reading now, presumably we shall reach six o'clock and the third reading will then be adjourned and the bill will fall to the bottom of the order paper. It is not my intention or desire to have that happen. That is why I asked that it be allowed to be read a third time the next day.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed that this bill be read a third time at the next sitting of the house?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

---

**AFTER RECESS**

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

**FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL TAX-SHARING ARRANGEMENTS ACT**
**ALTERNATIVE ARRANGEMENTS FOR UNIVERSITY GRANTS—EXTENSION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RATE**

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Fleming (Eglinton) for the second reading of Bill No. C-56, to amend the Federal-Provincial Tax-Sharing Arrangements Act.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** I had drawn attention to the fact that although the debate on this measure began on April 26, the Liberal opposition did not know at that time how it was going to vote. The debate was resumed on May 4; the opposition did not know then how they were going to vote; it was resumed on May 5, and only as that day passed, and the Leader of the Opposition was finally able to declare himself, did we learn how the Liberals opposite intend to vote on this measure.

[Mr. Peters.]

As an old friend of the hon. member for Laurier, I think a serious injustice has been done to him by his leader. The hon. member could not possibly have made the speech he did make in opening the debate on this measure for the opposition on April 26 without expecting that he and his associates would vote against it. Otherwise, what he said on that occasion, and the attitude he took, become utterly incomprehensible, and I do not think the hon. gentleman takes incomprehensible positions. Similarly, another front-bencher on the other side, the hon. member for Levis (Mr. Bourget) does not ordinarily take incomprehensible positions but he, like the hon. member for Laurier, has been left in an impossible position by the way in which the Leader of the Opposition has now pulled the rug from under his feet.

There is a question of responsibility in this house for utterances made in it. I intend to digress for a moment and offer this comment on the speech made by the hon. member for Laurier in launching the debate on behalf of the official opposition. I am reading part of an editorial which appeared in a well-known Liberal journal, the *Toronto Star* of April 30:

The Hon. Lionel Chevrier, former Liberal transport minister, is exaggerating when he describes the new federal-provincial university grants program as—

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I am rising on a point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** I was about to rise on what, I imagine, is the same point. I think it would be out of order to cite the opinions of a newspaper reflecting on statements of an hon. member made in the course of a debate in this house.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** Mr. Speaker, there are parts of this editorial which I think fully comply with the ruling you have given—

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** How could it?

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** We read editorials in this house—

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Not commenting on a debate before the house.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** I am not reading a portion which comments on a debate; I am reading an observation on a position taken in relation to this question.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am afraid the minister has ruined his position by reading the first part of the editorial. It is true that a good deal of editorial comment on the policy which is enshrined in this bill has been used, and that would be in order. However, anything that is attributed in a critical way to an individual member in a debate here goes beyond