

Dominion-Provincial Relations

the province of Quebec rise in their places and condemn these definitions? They are exactly the same as those brought into effect by the former administration in order in council P.C. 123. If these members are logical with themselves, if they are honest with themselves, then of course they will say that either they did not know about this or, if they knew about it, they should never have made the argument because if it was wrong to use those definitions in 1952, which in no sense was an attack upon the structure of education in a province, surely it is wrong to use them in 1960. It is word for word, phrase for phrase, clause for clause exactly the same. I challenge these three hon. members who entered this debate to rise during the course of the discussion and to tell us why there is not the same objection today in 1960 to the agreement between the Minister of Finance and the Canadian universities foundation.

(Translation):

Mr. Dorion: Mr. Chairman, I apologize for speaking from a seat other than mine. May I ask a question of the hon. member?

Mr. Chevrier: Certainly.

Mr. Dorion: If I understood correctly, what the hon. member for Laurier just quoted is part of an agreement between the Minister of Finance and the federation of universities. Am I right?

Mr. Chevrier: You are.

Mr. Dorion: In that case, could the hon. member not make a distinction between an agreement concluded by the concerned parties and an order of definitions given in a unilateral way by a minister of the crown?

Mr. Chevrier: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is a distinction to be made, except that, in this case, the agreement is mentioned in the bill and, in fact, the province is party to the agreement, even if it did not sign it. There lies our objection.

(Text):

That, sir, is the other point to which I want to come.

(Translation):

Mr. Asselin: It is far-fetched.

(Text):

Mr. Chevrier: My hon. friend says that that is pulling hairs. Just let him listen to this and see if it is because, after all, if what was done heretofore by the former administration is being done word for word by this administration surely it must be as bad, if it was bad, providing hon. members want to be consistent.

[Mr. Chevrier.]

(Translation):

Mr. Dorion: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry—

Mr. Chevrier: No, just a moment. I have not yet finished answering the question of the hon. member for Bellechasse.

Mr. Dorion: I do not want to pester the hon. member for Laurier, but—

Mr. Chevrier: Go ahead.

Mr. Dorion: Are Quebec universities members of the Canadian universities foundation?

Mr. Chevrier: Well, the agreement between the minister and the Canadian universities foundation, obviously, does not affect universities of the province of Quebec, but on the other hand, under this bill the province of Quebec is subject to the agreement between the minister and the Canadian universities foundation and is—

An hon. Member: Bound.

Mr. Chevrier: Bound, that is the word—thank you—as it is said in the bill. It is the point I wanted to make because, if you look at the wording of section 2 (4) you will see this: that—

(Text):

Satisfactory arrangements must be made for the payment by the province directly to institutions of higher learning in the province.

(Translation):

And listen to this:

(Text):

—in accordance with and subject to terms and conditions not inconsistent with those contained in any agreement entered into between the minister and the Canadian universities foundation.

This means that the province will be bound, although it is not a party to this agreement, by the terms that are contained in the agreement and therefore bound by the definition "student"; bound by the definition "university level"; to which the hon. member for Bellechasse took such strong objection; bound by the definition of "university degree"; and also bound by the definition of "university". These are definitions which the hon. member for Bellechasse found were so strong and so fantastic. He said that they were a fantastic provision. Here the bill goes much further than the hon. member may want it to go. From now on if this bill is approved the province in its dealings with the universities will have to comply with any agreement to which it is not a party—

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Oh, no.