

Dominion-Provincial Relations

foundation or, as I suggested last year, through a provincial universities foundation or council, because such grants are in the public interest; they are not financed by a specific direct tax, and they are not accompanied by any conditions affecting education.

So far as the constitutional basis of the proposed new arrangement for federal financial aid to universities through the provinces is concerned, we believe this is an attempt to go beyond the jurisdiction of parliament. We do not feel that anyone in this house should be an accessory to what seems to us a violation of the constitution, even if such violation were to last for a period of only two years. Therefore we feel that the government should either satisfy the house that the bill is completely constitutional or give us an assurance that the necessary modifications will be made during the course of the discussion to bring the bill within the jurisdiction of the federal parliament.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Will the hon. member read on a little further.

Mr. Chevrier: The minister asked a question and I indicated that when we got that assurance then we would consider our position. But the point I am making is that there is no difference of opinion on what was said by myself on this occasion and what was said by the Leader of the Opposition. The Minister of Finance sought to raise a difference of opinion but there was none, and I repeat now that we voted for the second reading of this bill because we believed in equalization payments. We voted for the second reading—

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, surely it is not in keeping with the rules of this house for an hon. member, after a vote is taken, to get up and give his reasons for voting as he has. There is a rule of the house which precludes any reflection on a vote. The vote on second reading has been taken and we are not now debating second reading; we are in committee of the whole on clause 1. It is not open to any hon. member now to rise and make a speech indicating the reason why he voted for a bill after speaking against it, or in any other way. That is completely contrary to the rules and proceedings of this house.

Mr. Chevrier: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, the clause we are on is clause 1 which deals with equalization. I was saying that we voted for the principle and if that offends my hon. friend I do not think it offends against the rules. However, let me put it in this way. I say that we are in favour of the bill because we believe in equalization payments.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, clause 1 of the bill has nothing to do with equalization. It has to do with revising agreements at the option

of any province which has signed an agreement and now wishes to go on the new alternative basis which is proposed.

Mr. Chevrier: The first clause deals with an amendment of the arrangements under the Federal-Provincial Tax-Sharing Arrangements Act which is a continuation of the tax-sharing arrangement and which includes equalization payments. I should not be interrupted by the minister, because I believe I am in order.

Mr. Chairman, we believe in university grants, as I said in the statement which I read out. We believe in a continuation of the St. Laurent formula and we believe also that the principle laid down in this clause 1 is one which we can support.

However, there are many hon. members in this house, and I refer particularly to the Quebec Conservative members, who opposed the payments of grants by the foundation, as set out in the definition, within the province. That is why the government has submitted to the house this bill. It is a method which we think raises serious doubts, serious doubts of a constitutional nature which I do not intend to repeat because I put them on record during the course of the original discussion.

In due course, however, we propose to move an amendment to this bill which we think will remove the objectionable features of the bill and which will offer a new method of distributing the grants which we believe is more acceptable and will do away with the seriousness of the objections which I placed on *Hansard* on an earlier occasion.

There are, it seems to me, a number of objections which have not yet been removed by the Minister of Finance during the course of his statement. The words which I mentioned in this bill, "in the opinion of the minister"—for example.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, that is in a later clause of the bill. We are discussing clause 1 and surely it is not open to the hon. member to stray around and discuss all the clauses at the one time. He is talking of a provision under clause 2 of the bill and we are on clause 1.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, could I say a word on the point of order raised by the Minister of Finance. It is a time-honoured practice in this house which has never been more frequently asserted than by the hon. gentleman who is now Acting Prime Minister that on clause 1 of a bill—I may say this was upheld by your predecessors, Mr. Chairman, and also upheld by you only yesterday when the Minister of Finance raised a point about the resolution stage of a tax resolution—there is a general debate about the provisions and the attitudes of the parties to the