

Dominion-Provincial Relations

people to make these calculations. They should be equally available to both sides of the house once the government has made up its mind. We are not asking the government to give us any of the information they used in these various projections for schemes they did not employ. We are only asking the minister to continue table 3 on page 7927 of *Hansard* for the whole period, and to make the assumptions that are made for the whole period. We know it will be hypothetical but it will give us the best possible information, as the government had, on which to base a decision.

I do feel the hon. member for Laurier is probably right. I think it is probably true that perhaps in the last year, as the hon. member suggested, Quebec might get a little something out of the new arrangement. As for Manitoba, I am not sure that they will ever get anything out of it; and I think it is pretty certain that Saskatchewan will not. In no circumstances that we can readily envisage would Saskatchewan do as well under the new formula in the next five years as it does under the existing formula. So Saskatchewan is apparently to be kept screwed down with the existing formula even if there are improvements for others. That is the new concept of equalization.

The minister suggested that the premiers thought this was a better scheme. I think I ought to read what the premier of Manitoba said about it, and I would like to put this on record from the premier's letter to the Prime Minister dated August 23 last. It is already in the appendix to *Hansard* of September 22, 1961. Mr. Roblin said this, and I am not reading the whole letter but the parts that relate to equalization:

It must be acknowledged that there are aspects of your announcement which represent a decided improvement over the federal-provincial agreement of 1957, and indeed it is estimated that Manitoba will likely benefit financially at least to some extent—

I stress those words "at least to some extent". The letter continues:

—during the course of the new arrangements even after the amendments of 1958 are taken into account. Nevertheless, I must again draw your attention to the fact that Manitoba is not to receive under the new proposals that proportion of the shared tax fields for which we believe we have made a convincing and logical case.

That was the case that the Prime Minister said yesterday was not logical. The letter continues:

Further, I must refer particularly to that portion of the equalization formula based on Canadian average yields. Manitoba reaffirms—

I think here the premier is speaking for all Manitobans regardless of party, because this is the Liberal position, not the Tory position.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): No, it is not the Liberal position.

Mr. Pickersgill: The letter continues:

Manitoba reaffirms its proposal to equalize to the highest Canadian province—

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): That is not the Liberal position.

Mr. Pickersgill: That is the Liberal position.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Since when?

Mr. Pickersgill: It has been the Liberal position since the convention of 1958. It was not the position taken by the St. Laurent government in 1956, and it was not what was promised by the present Prime Minister in 1960; but it has been the position of the Liberal party, which has changed its position on certain matters just as hon. gentlemen opposite have changed theirs. But we think we have changed for the better, whereas hon. gentlemen opposite have palpably, in this bill, changed for the worse. I am just drawing attention to the fact that Mr. Roblin has embraced in toto the Liberal position, because he would not dare to take any other course in Manitoba. He says:

Manitoba reaffirms its proposal to equalize to the highest Canadian province and we shall continue to work for its implementation.

I hope Mr. Roblin will get behind the party in this house that is working to that end and not working to thwart it. His letter continues:

This we regard as more in keeping with the basic principles—

He does not say "formulae"; he says "principles", the minister will note. He continues:

—on which these arrangements have been founded.

Under present circumstances, however—

I think this is pretty significant of the new harmony and the new spirit of good will, co-operation and agreement which is said to exist. Hon. members will remember that in 1957 the provinces were not going to be coerced into doing anything; nothing was going to be forced on them; they were going to agree. Mr. Roblin's letter continues:

Under present circumstances, however, there is no alternative but to take the steps necessary to implement the most advantageous of the options open to us under Bill C-122—

In other words, "We have to take it; we dare not leave it". There is just one other point I wish to make, Mr. Chairman, and it is this.

An hon. Member: You haven't made one yet.

Mr. Pickersgill: A good deal was made of the views of the premier of Newfoundland, and the minister just said that only one of