

*Dominion-Provincial Relations*

an aircraft that did not fly. When we see the money that is made available for defence and think how defence is related to scientific education, how can we stop short of a solution to this problem of education?

One purpose in rising this afternoon is to urge this government, by every possible means, to undertake the establishment of a national scholarship fund and to take another look at the plight of the universities, especially those universities whose enrolment may be under 600 or 700 students, what are commonly called the smaller universities. I maintain that it is of the greatest importance that we give this problem the consideration it merits, and that we do so at this session. For that purpose I would suggest and urge that, as the late Paul Sauve did in the province of Quebec, we call together the heads of all the universities in Canada and let them present briefs to us outlining their problems and spelling out their needs.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I have allowed the hon. member a good deal of latitude beyond the scope of the present bill, but I do hope that he will not abuse the privilege but will confine his remarks to the question of university grants under this bill.

**Mr. Van Horne:** I am about to conclude, Mr. Speaker. My main purpose in rising was to try to dispel a few misconceptions that are creeping into this debate in order to make a political issue in the province of Quebec. One of the reasons we have 50 Conservative members from the province of Quebec is that the people felt sure that by sending Conservative members to Ottawa a solution would be found to the problem of the universities in Quebec. It was for that reason that a great many of these people gave the Conservative candidates in Quebec such majorities. This agreement never would have been possible under a Liberal government. This agreement is now an accomplished fact. This agreement passed the test of legality. It had been referred to the most eminent legal minds in the country, and their findings have been taken into very serious consideration by this government.

Let us not forget the plight of the universities, and let us spend more time dealing not only with the plight of our universities but with the plight of our young people who cannot afford an education. Let us get on with this plan.

**Mr. Brassard (Lapointe):** Would the hon. member for Restigouche-Madawaska permit a question? Will he assure the house that he will be here for the rest of the session, after having delivered a provocative political speech?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member's question does not seem to relate to the bill.

**Mr. Van Horne:** I think it does deserve an answer, Mr. Speaker. I did not hear it, so would the hon. member mind repeating his question? The only time I have not been in this house was when I was in the hospital.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member's question was out of order.

**Mr. Brassard (Lapointe):** It is on the record; you can read it.

**Mr. Crestohl:** May I ask the hon. member a question?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member has concluded his speech, and I have recognized the hon. member for Port Arthur.

**Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur):** I have some timidity in getting into this electoral campaign because of some remarks made previously in this debate by the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Graftey). I want to give the hon. member the opportunity to carry out his silent treatment by taking my time in commencing my remarks so he can leave if he wishes to do so. During the resolution stage of this measure I made some remarks in connection with this matter, and consequently there were certain reactions in various quarters. I do not intend to try to put any gloss on the remarks I made at that particular time. I still stand behind them.

I do feel that the argument has reached the stage now where the hon. member for Laurier (Mr. Chevrier), supported by other members of the Liberal party, is urging the unconstitutionality of this amendment, and that we should have an assurance from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fleming) and other ministers of the crown that they are positive it is constitutional.

**Mr. Brassard (Lapointe):** We said we have doubts.

**Mr. Fisher:** The hon. member has interjected that they have doubts. I think the hon. member for Laurier was more positive than that, as positive as a politician can be in talking about something as sacred as the constitution.

The main reply for the government up to this stage of the debate has been from the Solicitor General (Mr. Balcer), and it seemed to me he was putting forward a theory which, in effect, meant two constitutions. In my opinion, and in the opinion of my associates, we are not too clear, as a result of the cross-fire, as to the constitutionality of the bill. As the hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Martin) put it, we are in favour of any measure that