

Dominion-Provincial Relations

a result of this definition? I want to know how many members of parliament from those provinces will vote for this amendment.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): As the hon. member is aware, Alberta and British Columbia lose something under the new equalization formula. The province of Saskatchewan opposes it because, as the hon. member is aware, that province has substantial resource revenues.

Mr. Pickersgill: Was this not also opposed by the government of New Brunswick?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I believe so. I do not recall it personally.

Mr. Pickersgill: I think the correspondence which has been tabled shows that it did.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I thought the hon. member was asking about the positions taken at the conference.

Mr. Benidickson: I wonder whether all the members from the provinces of British Columbia and Alberta are happy about approving this particular clause of the agreement, which seems to have a very severe and adverse effect upon the revenues of those provinces, and perhaps those of New Brunswick, too.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): The hon. member is wrong, I think, in saying it has a severe effect on those provinces. I do not think the effect could be said to be severe having regard to the guarantees which are given to all the provinces. Alberta and British Columbia are both provinces where the yields from this source are higher than the national average. But, of course, they are protected by the guarantee that they will receive in any year not less than they receive in the fiscal year 1961-62.

The hon. member's reference to the position of New Brunswick is not accurate, because although that province now appears to be objecting to the inclusion of resource revenues my clear recollection is that New Brunswick does derive benefits under the new formula from the inclusion of resource revenues.

Clause agreed to.

On clause 3—*Payments to provinces.*

Mr. Chevrier: Mr. Chairman, since the minister refuses to give the projection over a five year period, for which we have asked on several occasions, I should like permission to table a hypothetical illustration of provincial receipts for the period 1962-63 to 1966-67 under the new system and under the present system. This table shows the difference between the two systems in relation to the 16-9-50 formula and the 20-9-50 formula.

[Mr. Benidickson.]

The Deputy Chairman: I should advise the hon. member for Laurier that nothing can be tabled while we are in committee. He might wish to have this table included in *Hansard* as part of his speech at the point at which he has offered the table to the committee.

Mr. Chevrier: That would be quite satisfactory.

The Deputy Chairman: Does the committee give unanimous consent to the printing of this table in *Hansard* at this point?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): With respect, Mr. Chairman, I think we must know a great deal more about the nature of the table before it is placed on the record. The hon. member has not given the sources or the terms of the projection. We have had a great deal of discussion this afternoon about the matter of projection. The statement was confidently made this afternoon, I think by the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate or if not by him by the hon. member for Laurier, that in 1956 Mr. Harris, the then minister of finance, placed on the record a projection, year by year, over the five year period 1957-62. That assertion was made.

I thought there was something in that statement that did not ring true. I took an active part in the debate on the Federal-Provincial Tax-Sharing Arrangements Act in the summer of 1956, and I had no recollection of Mr. Harris having given any such projection. I have been making inquiries since, and I am told that he did not place on record any such projection. I am told further that he was invited to do so and said that he could do it for only one year. In other words, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Harris at that time followed the course of giving the house a projection for the first year of the five year period according to the best calculation that the Department of Finance could make at that date, and we have done the same thing now.

I say that anything beyond that is hypothetical and speculative, and with great respect I think we should not be asked to place such information on the record. Certainly if the hon. member asks for consent to put it on the record without reading it we must be told a great deal more about the sources of the table he is dealing with and the basis of his projection, because this will involve a number of assumptions and we should be told about those; otherwise the figures he is proposing to present to the committee have no validity whatever.

Mr. Chevrier: Mr. Chairman, there would be no request such as I have made to place these figures on *Hansard* if the minister had