

*Dominion-Provincial Relations*

Would the Minister of Finance tell us whether there really was an agreement or not? I am sure everybody would be interested to know whether such an agreement exists. I have here the last letter—

**The Chairman:** Order. It seems to me that the hon. member's arguments are still quite close to clause 2 of the bill, and I wonder whether it would not be better for the committee to vote on clause 1 before dealing with clause 2, which seems to be the only one of interest to him. In committee it is impossible to start a discussion all over again on second reading. It is permissible to make a few remarks of a general nature on clause 1, but no go so to repeat the whole debate on second reading. When we come to clause 2, or to any other clause, it can be fully discussed.

I wonder whether it would not be better, in the interests of orderly discussion, to reserve the remarks which the hon. member is now making until we examine clause 2.

**Mr. Chevrier:** I have a suggestion to make to the Minister of Finance. I might perhaps make it in English.

(Text):

If I may I should like to make a suggestion to the Minister of Finance in English and it is this. In order to assist a more orderly discussion in the debate I suggest that we suspend discussion of clause 1 and go on to clause 2 on the understanding that we may have a general discussion on clause 2. The reason I make that suggestion is this. We have an amendment to propose later on. If it were approved it would require a consequential amendment to clause 1. Otherwise the chairman is going to be perhaps in the difficult position of being obliged to rule. None the less, I think the hon. member for Gatineau and those who will follow him should have the general latitude that is allowed under clause 1. I make that suggestion in an effort to be helpful.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** The rules of the house make ample provision for proceedings with reference to bills that come before the house, Mr. Chairman. I suggest that we simply follow the rules of the house. So far as clause 1 of the bill is concerned, if the hon. member has an amendment to introduce and if it is relevant, then I suggest that he introduce it. So far as discussion of clause 1 is concerned, Mr. Chairman, you have indicated that you are prepared to countenance some general discussion. Any other discussion, in my respectful submission, must be strictly relevant to the terms of clause 1.

I do not propose to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Laurier under which

we would reverse the order of the clauses and start jumping around the bill. The provisions of clause 1 of the bill are quite clear. They are simply enabling provisions in relation to the revision of any existing agreement that any province has entered into for the purpose of renting fields of taxation to the federal government. Clause 2 apparently is the clause that principally interests hon. members opposite. But surely that is no reason for departure from the rules of the house. If there is discussion relevant to clause 1, I suggest that we should proceed with it. If the discussion that hon. members wish to initiate relates to clause 2, then let us follow the proper procedure and adopt clause 1 and then proceed to clause 2.

**The Chairman:** May I point out that of course the practice has allowed general discussion on clause 1 of the bill; but nevertheless the rule of strict relevancy applies and it is not permissible to revive a debate on second reading. It therefore seems to me that the remarks of the hon. member for Gatineau were relevant only to clause 2 and were not of the general nature that I have in mind that could be included in remarks on clause 1, and not referring especially to clause 1. I would therefore ask him to wait until we reach clause 2 in order to continue in this line of discussion.

(Translation):

**Mr. Leduc:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since we must discuss only the items concerning clause 7, here is what it says:

1. Subsection (3) of section 6 of the Federal-Provincial Tax-Sharing Arrangements Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I will deal with the sharing of taxes and it is precisely because I want to discuss the sharing of taxes that I would like to know whether the government of Quebec has signed an agreement with Ottawa because, according to the statements of the premier and according to the act adopted in Quebec under which an additional tax of 1 per cent will be raised on the income of the corporations, there is no mention whatsoever that a part of this amount should be paid back to Ottawa.

**Mr. Balcer:** There is no mention either of an agreement in the bill.

**The Chairman:** I believe the point again raised by the member for Gatineau (Mr. Leduc) is not related to clause 1. The only place where there could be a relationship with the provincial act to which he referred is in clause 2. But clause 1 refers to a general agreement, a general method of tax-sharing. I believe the point he raised