

*Dominion-Provincial Relations*

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

**Some hon. Members:** Now.

**Mr. Speaker:** Now. Agreed.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton)** moved the third reading of the bill.

**Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Bonavista-Twillington):** In the committee stage through which the bill has just passed, Mr. Speaker, we have made every effort we could think of—

**Mr. Fulton:** And some you did not even bother to think about.

**An hon. Member:** That is a cynical remark.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** The Minister of Justice (Mr. Fulton) is in one of his usually helpful moods. As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, we have used every device it is possible to use in the committee to record the position we take with regard to this bill—

**Mr. MacLean (Winnipeg North Centre):** How did you vote?

**Mr. Pickersgill:**—namely that a substantial part of the bill is simply a continuation of Liberal legislation, but that there has been introduced into it an element which we find to be of dubious constitutionality and an undoubted invasion of the real liberty, autonomy and rights of any province which takes this alternative which the bill seeks to provide.

**Mr. MacLean (Winnipeg North Centre):** How did you vote on second reading?

**Mr. Pickersgill:** The hon. member asks me how we voted on second reading. May I say that on second reading we voted for the principle of university grants and the principle of equalization, both Liberal principles. However, at the time we said we would do our best to take the objectionable features out of the bill in committee and we did so.

**An hon. Member:** Or tried to do it.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** We were not successful, thanks to the centralizing attitude of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fleming). I do not think there are likely to be pronounced in this House of Commons for a long time to come words that will ring around this country so much as did the words used by the Minister of Finance when he said that if he had accepted our amendment it would be open to the province to apply the funds—that is the funds that the province collected from its own taxes—in any way it saw fit. In other words, we tried to put the province in a position to spend its funds in any way it saw fit, because we believe in provincial rights; and hon. gentlemen opposite were determined to force a system of uniformity upon all the

**Mr. Pickersgill:** The hon. member asks provinces and insist that they must conform to an agreement to which they were not a party. That is the position. I tell you, sir, it will be a long time before anyone who genuinely cares about the rights of the provinces will forget the words of the Minister of Finance, that it would be open to the province to apply the funds collected by the province from a provincial tax “in any way it saw fit”. If a province cannot spend its money in any way it sees fit, where is there any autonomy?

I do not intend to engage in any tedious repetition.

**Mr. Pallett:** The hon. member is tedious without repetition.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I hope we can complete this matter tonight. However, I intend to move, seconded by the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Leduc):

That the said bill be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole for the purpose of reconsidering the removal from clause 2 of the provision that the arrangements for the payment by the province directly to institutions of higher learning should be satisfactory in the opinion of the Minister of Finance and in accordance with and subject to terms and conditions not inconsistent with the terms and conditions of the agreement between the Minister of Finance and the Canadian universities foundation.

**Mr. Speaker:** Before I put the motion, does any hon. member wish to comment on it?

**Hon. Donald M. Fleming (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I am encouraged by one thing. The hon. member said he wanted to see this matter disposed of tonight.

**Mr. Speaker:** I was seeking comments as to the merits of the amendment.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** That is my intention, Mr. Speaker. This amendment in my submission is not in order. It purports to direct the committee of the whole to reconsider the removal of clause 2 but it does not set forth the precise terms of the words that should be struck out or the precise terms of the words that should be added. This is vague and general. For those reasons it does not conform at all with the rules applicable to order as applied to amendments introduced on third reading.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** If there is any doubt about the matter I would refer Your Honour to citation 415 of Beauchesne's fourth edition which reads:

When a bill comes up for third reading a member may move that it be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole for the purpose of amending it in any particular.

**Mr. MacInnis:** What is the particular?