

the problems between the two governments, we are entitled to know whether or not both governments are satisfied.

An hon. Member: They are.

Mr. Pickersgill: Are they satisfied? What is the evidence? The latest evidence we have on this subject is Mr. Barrette's speech of last Sunday in which he said there was no understanding, no agreement and no accord. Surely we are entitled to know what the situation is.

Mr. Chevrier: Mr. Chairman, during the course of the statement by the Leader of the Opposition he put a question to the Minister of Finance which was not answered. I should like to put it to him now. It was this: Does the government still advocate substituting for tax-sharing and equalization the kind of allocation of tax fields which it talked about when it was in opposition? This will be found on page 3590 of *Hansard*.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, the rule is that discussion has to be strictly relevant to the clause under consideration. This subject has nothing whatever to do with this particular clause.

An hon. Member: You are afraid to answer.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): There is a raucous voice over there of an hon. member who is engaged in a breach of the rules of the house. Perhaps the hon. member does not know that, but it is high time he did learn.

Mr. Chevrier: I find that the chairman has been rather careful in having the rules observed this evening, so I think he should be left with that jurisdiction, not the Minister of Finance. Could I ask the minister another question? Could the minister give the house an assurance that this provision that is under discussion now is not a violation of section 93 of the constitution?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): It is not a violation of the British North America Act at all. This bill is constitutional in all respects.

Mr. Chevrier: The question I put to the minister was whether it was a violation of a particular section, section 93.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): It is not a violation of any provision of the constitution. The only thing it seems to violate is the sense of the hon. members opposite in trying to maintain and continue a situation of very great injustice to one province in this country.

Mr. Chevrier: Can the minister say, if it is not then a violation of the letter of the constitution, it is also not a violation of the spirit of the constitution?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I consider that this measure is a fulfilment, not only of the letter of the law, of the constitution, but is a fulfilment of the spirit of the constitution. It is necessary that this should be done because the legislation that existed before certainly did violence to the spirit of the Canadian constitution.

Mr. Chevrier: I am sorry the minister finds it necessary to make a speech in answer to every question I ask. However, that is his privilege, and I suppose I can do the same thing. I should like to ask a number of other questions before we dispose of this clause. One of them is this: Is the minister in favour of federal grants to universities in principle or only as a temporary solution for a period of two years?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Order; I have up to now permitted an exchange of questions and answers between the hon. member for Laurier and the Minister of Finance, but I must draw the attention of the committee to the fact that these questions are not relevant to clause 2. A discussion of the constitutionality of the bill in general was a matter for debate on second reading. Here there is no relation to any part of the clause under consideration, and I would rule that these questions and answers are out of order.

Shall clause 2 carry?

Mr. Chevrier: No, Mr. Chairman, we would like to have a division on clause 2.

Clause 2 agreed to; yeas, 87; nays, 26.

On clause 3—*Alteration of act in its application to fiscal years ending March 31, 1962.*

Mr. Chevrier: I should like to ask the minister on clause 3 the question I put to him earlier and which he said was out of order. I think it is in order here. Does the government still advocate substituting for tax-sharing and equalization the kind of allocation of tax fields which it talked about when it was in opposition?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): The views of the government relevant to the subject matter of this bill are adequately expressed in the terms of the bill.

Mr. Chevrier: May I ask whether the government will continue the policy announced by the Prime Minister in Manitoba during the election of 1957, namely that the Conservative government would maintain the principle of equalization?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): The Conservative government has not only maintained the principle but has extended it.