

Dominion-Provincial Relations

for mercy on this amendment is not well taken. Those who introduce amendments in committee are responsible for justifying that they are in accordance with the rules of the house, and should not say that if they were corrected in some other way they might then become conformable to the rules of the house.

I pointed out when I was making my earlier statement that the amendment does not purport to strike out paragraph (2) of clause 2, and that clause 2 of the present bill authorizes a payment by the minister in the case of all provinces, except a prescribed province, of sums equivalent to \$1.50 per capita of population per annum. Now we were informed by the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate that there was going to be only one prescribed province and, therefore, if he is right for once, there will be nine provinces that are not prescribed provinces. Then, clause 2, as it stands, will authorize the minister to make a payment of \$1.50 per capita of population to the Canadian universities foundation for nine provinces and this amendment will come along and put a new clause 3 in which will authorize the minister to make a payment of \$1.50 per capita of population to any provincial university council, as they have defined it, in any province.

Therefore, wherever there can be found a provincial universities council, even up to ten of them, the minister will be authorized by this amendment to make payment to that province equivalent to \$1.50 per capita of population in that province per annum. We could finish up, it is quite clear now, with a charge on the treasury which will be almost double that provided for by the present bill. The hon. member attempts seriously to argue before you, Mr. Chairman, that such an amendment could be in order. It will be making new jurisprudence in this House of Commons surely if any such proposition is seriously entertained. The hon. member is a private member. He is introducing what can now be a charge on the treasury of this country amounting to something like \$26 million a year. That is what he is proposing. I do not need to refer to the British North America Act in order to point out how clearly that procedure lies beyond the power of any private member in the House of Commons speaking without the assistance of a royal recommendation.

(Translation):

Mr. Caron: Mr. Chairman, a moment ago, I quoted citation 408, which in my view is quite clear. Now, perhaps I might be allowed to make a suggestion. We are now discussing a point of order; the discussion cannot be

allowed to go much beyond this. If the Minister of Finance accepts that the amendment be moved, then we can discuss it thoroughly, and find out the views of hon. members to the right and to the left. If the government does not want to accept it, it can call for a vote, and thus reject it in due course. Just now, however, we are simply discussing a point of order, and whatever ruling is made by the chairman of the committee, no one will be satisfied.

An hon. Member: What standing order says so?

Mr. Caron: Citation 408 is clear, as I see it. But the minister has other views. So that we may clear up the essential point, namely whether or not the amendment is in order, let us discuss it thoroughly. It could still be rejected at any time by a vote, this procedure being always permissible when a bill is being considered in committee, for instance prior to second and third reading.

An hon. Member: What if the whole discussion is out of order?

(Text):

Mr. Chevrier: May I be permitted to say a word in connection with the amendment that was proposed? When the Minister of Finance rises on a point of order and speaks coolly and calmly I am always impressed, but when he makes noises, as he has done in this case, I begin to wonder about the validity of his point. In any event, Mr. Chairman, it was you who raised the point and not the Minister of Finance. The point you have raised is whether or not there may be additional expenditure because of this amendment. My submission to you is that the bill is divided into two parts, namely the extension of equalization payments and the university grants. Then again the university grants are divided into two parts, namely the grants that are paid via the Canadian universities foundation and those within the terms of section 2.

My answer to the point raised is this. The minister has already entered into an agreement dated January 18, 1960 for a period of two years with the Canadian universities foundation and the national conference of Canadian universities. Therefore in so far as those parties are concerned, there can be no additional payment. That is why I submit that the alternative we have put forward, it seems to me, could apply only to those not taking part in the agreement dated January 18, 1960. If that is the case there can be, I submit with deference to you, Mr. Chairman, no additional expenditure. All that this