

*Dominion-Provincial Relations*

(Text):

"university degree" means—

(Translation):

And you have there the meaning of the words "licentiate's degree", "bachelor", "master", "a doctor's degree":

(Text):

awarded by a university,

(Translation):

Therefore, the definition of diplomas is subordinate to the meaning of the word "university", whereas, at the time our friends opposite were in office, those powers were being exercised by the minister. He might conceivably have been someone—I am not talking about the ministers who preceded the present minister—who knew nothing of university matters who would have had to define those terms. In any case:

(Text):

a diploma awarded by a university at the end of a course for which one of the degrees mentioned in subparagraph (i) is an entrance requirement;

(Translation):

In other words, those expressions are subordinate to the demands of our institutions of higher learning, and henceforth they—and not some federal minister of finance—will define what a university is.

It has been said, Mr. Chairman—and here I want to quote my excellent friend from Lapointe (Mr. Brassard), in the best possible spirit, for he has been extremely generous to me—because of an old friendship which he still proclaims today, and I appreciate that. He said, in particular, in his speech on the very point I am dealing with, what I shall quote from page 3555, page 9 of the appendix of the official report of the house, dated May 4, 1960:

I am at a loss to understand on the basis of what sincerity the Quebec government failed to mention in its legislation the conditions imposed by the federal government in order to dispose of a grant established by a provincial legislation for a provincial purpose.

Of course, at least to some extent he was referring to the text that is being objected to today, as a text attempting to subject the provinces, and especially the province of Quebec, to the dictates of Ottawa.

There is one thing that my excellent colleagues from Lapointe and Cartier have overlooked, and it is that the present provincial legislation has been adopted.

How can it be assumed that a text established later than some already adopted legislation can be such as to impose its provisions on previous legislation?

And that is not all. Last night the Minister of Finance told us—and we could tell that he knows the provincial legislation on that matter—that this legislation has all the required conditions for the province of Quebec to take advantage of the tax abatement provided for under the present text of the act. In other words, it is clear that this is a quarrel on words, on technicalities which, in the final analysis, are not technicalities. It is claimed that, under the terms the deletion, of which is sought, a province—and Quebec in particular—has to obey the dictates of Ottawa, whereas the province of Quebec has already adopted its own legislation, and the minister has said it meets the requirements of the definition provided in this act.

Under the circumstances, who can believe that the province of Quebec is being subordinated to the dictates of Ottawa?

There is more than that, Mr. Chairman. Obviously, it can be concluded that the province stands to benefit from the alternative policy represented by this compromise—I use the word "compromise" on purpose—which was accepted on our behalf for a two-year period. How, I ask again, could the province of Quebec be affected by this text? Such a claim shows a total misapprehension of the Quebec school system, something I do not hold against my good friend the hon. member for Laurier, because he still has something to learn about the province of Quebec. Since 1860, in fact—we happen to be celebrating the centenary this year—we have had, in the province of Quebec, a particular educational system. We have no department of education; why not? Because at that time the people of Quebec tried to remove politics and electioneering from the school system in the province—and they are still trying to abide by that rule—and, at the same time—I am pointing this out to my friends from the other provinces—the people wanted to insure the greatest degree of justice to the minority in the province.

Now, under that system, under the policy which has always been followed by all parties which succeeded each other in the administration of the province, the definition of what constituted a degree, what the conditions for getting such degree were and what a university was, has been left completely, absolutely and entirely to our universities, to our institutions of higher learning. In other words, the provincial government may not interfere in any way in the structure of our institutions of higher learning. Therefore, what is the point of the argument advanced in justification of the amendment to the effect that the province of Quebec was not a party to the agreement. If