

Dominion-Provincial Relations

never reproached the hon. member for Laurier for not having always lived in the province of Quebec, and I resent his interpretation of what I said. There are patriots everywhere in Canada, I will grant that.

Mr. Chevrier: I thank the hon. member for the explanation he just gave. But, in the statement you made earlier, if I misinterpreted your words—

An hon. Member: As usual.

Mr. Chevrier:—which I have put down here, that is to say: "We are pursuing the eminently patriotic character". Then, I accept the correction made by the hon. member.

But, Mr. Chairman, I was getting to another point showing the inconsistency of the hon. member's statement of a moment ago. He said at the beginning of his remarks: I am against federal grants to universities, but I have voted in favour of them.

What logic on the part of that member. What logic on the part of the other members from the province of Quebec who support him. They are opposed to federal grants to universities but they vote for them.

An hon. Member: You are against the bill and you vote for it.

Mr. Chevrier: How can you, in the—

An hon. Member: Explain your logic.

Mr. Chevrier:—circumstances, understand the logic of those people.

The hon. member for Bellechasse has questioned not only my motives, but those of every member of the opposition. He has no right to question the motives of an hon. member. He can discuss a bill or an amendment, but he has no right to make such remarks as he made a moment ago. Not only was he out of order, but it was a departure from his usual courtesy.

The hon. member for Bellechasse also said he still considered fantastic—just as he did at the time of the debate on the resolution—the definitions contained not only in the order in council passed by the former government, but also in the agreement between the Minister of Finance and the Canadian universities foundation.

Mr. Johnson: That is not true.

Mr. Chevrier: However, Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member for Bellechasse read the definitions contained in order in council P.C. 123, he forgot to say that the 1952 order in council had been passed only after a joint commission, of which the ministers of finance of the federal government and of the

province of Quebec were members, had designated the qualified universities. Moreover, the conference of universities acted as advisors to the minister.

Do the hon. member for Bellechasse and his colleagues forget that it was two former ministers of finance, namely Mr. Abbott and the present lieutenant governor of the province of Quebec, the Hon. Mr. Gagnon, who set up that commission and who are responsible for the definitions found in order in council P.C. 123, and also in the agreement between the Minister of Finance and the Canadian universities foundation.

The hon. member may be an expert on criminal law, but I doubt his proficiency in civil law, and I am even more doubtful as to his experience and knowledge of constitutional matters. I think we on this side of the house have just as much right as he and his colleagues to ascribe to the words of the bill the interpretation and meaning—

Mr. Fortin: The meaning that suits you best.

Mr. Chevrier:—which we consider proper.

But one thing the hon. member for Bellechasse completely overlooks is the correspondence exchanged between the two Prime Ministers, and the statement of the Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker), from which I shall quote a portion presently, and which imposes a condition on the province of Quebec—

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): No.

Mr. Chevrier: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance says no. Let me remind him that on December 10, 1959, the Prime Minister of Canada made a statement of which every term and condition is incorporated in the bill before us. Here is the statement, or rather the press release, issued at the time by the Prime Minister, and I quote:

(Text):

If the government of a province requests the change to be made in respect of that province, and undertakes to provide additional grants to the universities in that province on a scale equivalent to the present federal grants of \$1.50 per capita, then parliament will be asked to authorize an increase of one per cent in the abatement made in the federal corporation tax in respect of that province, from 9 per cent to 10 per cent. This increased allowance for a provincial corporation tax would be in lieu of federal grants for universities in that province. It would be necessary for the provincial legislature then to impose an additional corporation tax equivalent to the reduction in the federal tax and to authorize the payment of the additional grants to the universities.