Loans to Students

enabled to establish a higher quality of education and larger establishments of learning, and supply them with the staff and facilities which are needed. This is just a suggestion of my own, but I know it is shared by many in this house.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order that I might not be accused of holding up this legislation I am willing to sit down so that a vote might be taken on the amendment.

Mr. A. B. Patterson (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I think this is just the third speaker from this group in the three days of debate but it is not my intention tonight to speak on the bill itself. I only desire to make a very brief reference to the amendment. The leader of our party, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson), has already indicated that we intend to support Bill No. C-110, although there are a number of very obvious weaknesses in it. I am sure we all agree that the need for such legislation exists, so therefore we are prepared to support it. However, the amendment now before us is that Bill No. C-110 be not now read a second time, and for the reasons which are given.

We agree in principle with the objectives to which this proposal is directed, but we are opposed to the delay which the adoption of the amendment would occasion. Because of that fact it is not our intention to support the amendment which is currently before us.

I had intended to call attention to a number of statements made by the leader of our party but I do not propose to do that at this time. However in speaking briefly on this amendment I want to emphasize that we believe that the facilities of the Bank of Canada should be used for this purpose. This was stressed by the hon. member for Red Deer and also by the hon, member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Côté). We support that proposal but we also realize that if this amendment were to carry it would delay implementation of the legislation and deprive many young people of the opportunity of securing loans which are needed for this coming school year. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, because of that consideration we are going to vote against the amendment, but we will of course support the legislation.

[Translation]

mingue): Mr. Speaker, I see that it is pretty provinces in the educational field. [Mr. Slogan.]

would allow for better facilities and staff near 10.30 p.m. and since my remarks would which I think make for a better education for take me beyond regulation time, I wish to our professional people. Thus we would be propose the adjournment of the debate. As a matter of fact, I beg to remind you that it is now 10.30.

> Hon. Guy Favreau (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the house would agree to sit a few minutes more—if we could thus dispose of this amendment-in order to listen to the hon. member for Pontiac-Témiscamingue whose speeches are always interesting.

> Mr. Martineau: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but I cannot accept the suggestion just made by the Minister of Justice.

[Text]

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair must call it 10.30 unless we have unanimous consent to continue.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If we have unanimous agreement I am prepared to submit the question.

[Translation]

Mr. Martineau: This being the case, Mr. Speaker, I shall accept what looks to be the unanimous opinion of the house and my comments will be quite brief.

I did not propose to speak at this stage of our discussion, but since it appears that the intention is to end this evening the debate on the amendment, I must express certain views and explain why we, on this side of the house, or at least the Conservative members from Quebec, have to oppose the amendment brought forward by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier).

It is a well known fact that we, on this side of the house, are not very happy with the provisions of the bill, and for very good reasons, which have been eloquently, masterfully, clearly and fully stated by members as competent as my colleague from Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière (Mr. Paul), as well as by our provincial leader, the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer), the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Pigeon) and many others who have dealt with this bill.

It is quite clear that this bill violates the spirit of the constitution, because it affects Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Témisca- the clear and exclusive jurisdiction of the