

for 1968-69 will be about the same. But provinces are not any richer than last year. The federal government is cutting down its contribution to \$57 million for the 1968-69 year, a reduction of \$14 million, whereas the provinces—

**An hon. Member:** No—

**Mr. Asselin:**—my hon. friend says no. He should look at the figures over there. There is a difference of \$14 million between 1967 and 1968. Let him jot it down. If he wants to refute my statement and if I am mistaken, I shall stand corrected, but the figures I have here have been audited by both the federal government and the province of Quebec.

● (9:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, social security is a field in which, as has already been said, there is jurisdiction overlapping. We know that social security, under the constitution, comes under provincial jurisdiction and we are aware of the circumstances under which it has been given up to the federal government for a number of years. Now, the province of Quebec spent \$464 million in 1967-68 for social security. In 1968-69, it will spend \$407 million. The federal grants to Quebec for that item amounted to \$10 million in 1967-68, but for 1968-69, no grant has been provided for.

I am glad that my hon. friend is coming closer in order to listen to me more attentively. He was too far away before.

Mr. Speaker, the same applies to all the Canadian provinces. The same difficulties and the same problems in the field of education are found in Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta and all the other provinces. They are facing serious financial problems, and the federal government refuses to concede a single point with regard to the fiscal arrangements made with the provinces.

Mr. Speaker, there is another subject which I should like to deal with tonight, and I am very glad to see that the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) is here tonight. I should like to talk about the tendency on the part of the present government since it came to power to interfere increasingly in matters under the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces.

The other day the Secretary of State made a statement in the house concerning E.T.V. He said that his department would soon set up a task force of experts to go around the country making inquiries on E.T.V. I am sure

*The Budget—Mr. Asselin*

the minister would be one of the last to contradict me when I say that education falls exclusively within provincial jurisdiction. Naturally, the federal government has rights with regard to means of communication. The honourable minister told us in his statement that his department intended to give licences to private companies to operate E.T.V. and that, at the same time, the province could not be guaranteed the same privilege, that is of having a licence to avail themselves of the services of E.T.V.

Recently, the Quebec premier protested against this further intrusion of the federal government in provincial matters at the federal-provincial conference held in Ottawa last February. Quebec said very clearly to the former government, which has been slightly altered, that E.T.V. fell within provincial jurisdiction. The federal government has jurisdiction over the means of communication. But why quarrel and create tension between the provinces with regard to education when the minister tells us in his statement that licences will be granted private companies? Still, he did not guarantee that the provinces, should they make similar requests to operate an E.T.V. system, would be treated by the federal government as it will treat the private companies.

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** Will the member allow me a question?

**Mr. Asselin:** Certainly.

**Mr. Pelletier:** I have already heard the member say three times that I said in this house that the federal government would grant E.T.V. permits to private companies. That assertion has just been made three times in a row and does not correspond in any way to the statement I made the other day; I wonder where the member got this information.

**Mr. Asselin:** Of course, Mr. Speaker, I have to take the word of the Secretary of State, but many statements have been made outside the house, in addition to those made in this house or in the committees. Would the minister like to contradict me about what his department is planning to do, namely grant licences to private companies to allow them to go into educational broadcasting when the