

*Dominion-Provincial Relations**(Translation):*

Does not the hon. member for Bellechasse see in that statement an interference, a condition which has been incorporated in the bill, as a result of this press release from the Prime Minister?

**Mr. Fortin:** It is a press release; it is not the bill.

**Mr. Chevrier:** Well, Mr. Chairman, how can the hon. member for Bellechasse make in this house statements such as those he made a few minutes ago?

Besides, I take time here to say that he did not reply to the assertions we made yesterday and today, because he repeated exactly what he had already said, that those definitions, and especially that about the "university level", were fantastic. He has not changed his views in the matter. Consequently, if the definition is fantastic, why is he supporting the bill? Is it because of the interim period of two years; because he hopes that in two years from now a satisfactory agreement will be reached between the federal and provincial governments? If that is his reason for supporting this legislation, he should tell us so.

However, Mr. Chairman, there is more. There is one thing the hon. member for Bellechasse has completely overlooked. I refer to a part of the bill that we cannot tell about often enough, that the bill incorporates the agreement between the Minister of Finance and the Canadian Universities Federation and, in so doing, because of those words that we want to eliminate from section 2 and, notwithstanding the claims of the hon. member for Bellechasse and his colleagues, it binds the province of Quebec to the project and to the agreement signed by the Minister of Finance and the Canadian Universities Federation, not only with regard to the terms of the agreement, but also with regard to the definitions.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say that the hon. member for Cartier was quite justified in moving his amendment, and the proof of it is in the statement the Minister of Finance made before six o'clock.

I do not know if the hon. member for Bellechasse was in his seat at that time; if not, I will remind him of the words of the hon. Minister of Finance, who, on the amendment, had this to say:

*(Text):*

This is the reason this provision is here. It is in order to ensure equality. Otherwise, whereas distribution in the non-prescribed provinces must be on the basis of equality among the universities of the province on the basis of the student enrolment, if this were not applied to the prescribed province it would be open to such a province to apply the funds in any way it saw fit.

[Mr. Chevrier.]

*(Translation):*

So, Mr. Chairman, to use the very words of the Minister of Finance, the prescribed province, according to this section, is not free. It will not be free to distribute the money as it would like to.

It seems that this is an adequate answer not only to the hon. member for Bellechasse, but also to the Minister of Finance, as I pointed out, incidentally, at the beginning of my remarks. This is why we support this amendment.

*(Text):*

**The Chairman:** Is the committee ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Yes.

Amendment (Mr. Crestohl) negatived: yeas, 27; nays, 85.

**The Chairman:** I declare the amendment lost.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I am rising to take issue with one statement which was made by the hon. member for Bellechasse, a statement which was not in accordance with the facts. The hon. member for Bellechasse said that when universities grants were first established by the St. Laurent government the minister of finance of that day arrogated to himself the power to decide—or the governor in council gave him power to decide—what were universities, what was the definition of "students" and other matters of that kind. That is not in accordance with the facts at all, as can be shown by the correspondence of that time.

On October 25, 1951 Mr. St. Laurent addressed a letter to every one of the premiers of the provinces in which he notified them of this vote of money by parliament I do not intend to refer to any part of this letter except that which concerns the point raised by the hon. member for Bellechasse. I have a copy of one of the letters in front of me now in which Mr. St. Laurent said:

The actual method of computing the grants which the government recommended to parliament and which parliament authorized, makes available for distribution within each province a sum equal to the officially estimated population of that province multiplied by fifty cents per capita, and provides further that this sum shall be divided within the province, among the institutions of higher learning recognized by the provincial authorities in proportion to the registration at those institutions of full-time students of university level.

The letter went on to give a list of institutions as they were understood and to ask the premier of each province to make any comment or corrections on that list. I am sure the hon. member is well aware of that. An entente—which we did not mind in the