

*Dominion-Provincial Relations*

the expressions "university level" and "university degree". And to give practical application to this utterly fantastic power, the government, on January 9, 1952, passed order in council P.C. 123—

Of which I have here a copy.

—which gave a federal definition of those terms, and also for the terms "student" and "university".

And the hon. member for Bellechasse went on to say:

Just as a sample, let me quote the definition given of the phrase "university level":

"With regard to a province, a more advanced curriculum than is generally accepted in the provinces as a prerequisite university enrolment."

That, you must admit, was a dangerous definition, the terms being so vague and indefinite.

Far from improving the situation, those conditions and terms only made it worse.

And the hon. member added, a little further on:

That time, no further compromise was possible, and federal grants were spectacularly rejected.

(Text):

That is a very strange assertion to come from the hon. member for Bellechasse.

**Mr. Campbell (Stormont):** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. May I refer to citation 148 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, fourth edition. Surely, this is repetitious. Citation 148 reads:

(1) It is a wholesome restraint upon members that they cannot revive a debate already concluded; and it would be little use in preventing the same question from being offered twice in the same session if, without being offered, its merits might be discussed again and again.

(2) It is irregular to reflect upon, argue against, or in any manner call in question, in debate, the past acts or proceedings of the house, on the obvious ground that, besides tending to revise discussion upon questions which have already been once decided, such reflections are uncourteous to the house and irregular in principle in as much as the member is himself included in and bound by a vote agreed to by a majority; and it seems that, reflecting upon or questioning the acts of the "majority" is equivalent to reflecting upon the house.

With all due deference I contend that what the hon. member for Laurier is doing at the present time is completely contrary to the rule as set out in this citation.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** On the point raised by the hon. member for Stormont, I do not suppose you need any guidance because it has always been the practice in the house to treat the whole debate from the beginning of the resolution stage until the completion of third reading as a single debate.

**The Chairman:** It seems to me that citation 148 refers to repetition of debate during the same session but, generally speaking, the discussion of a bill is only one debate.

**Mr. Chevrier:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I was interrupted I was trying to indicate, and I had about reached the point

where I was citing the hon. member for Bellechasse, and I had referred also to the same argument made by the hon. member for Berthier-Maskinonge-Delanaudiere and in part by the hon. member for Charlevoix, wherein a great deal was made of those definitions, but I should like to tell the committee that those definitions had no legal status whatsoever. Those definitions were put in the order in council P.C. 123 for the sole object of calculating the grant and, it seems to me, that does not need a great deal of explanation in so far as this committee is concerned.

Indeed, if the federal government were to offer grants to the universities there had to be some kind of definitions and there had to be some kind of a basis upon which the grants could be paid. There had to be a definition of a university, of university level, of a university degree and of a student; otherwise, the grants could not have been paid, and that is why they were put in the order in council. Thus, those definitions were not in any way as stated by the hon. members in this debate, an encroachment upon the provincial field; but, Mr. Chairman, lo and behold there appears on the scene the Minister of Finance. On the eighteenth day of January, 1960 he enters into an agreement with the Canadian universities foundation, with the national conference of Canadian universities, and in clause 13 there appear the same words, "student, university, university degree and university level", with the same definitions, word for word. I will place on *Hansard* the French equivalent of what the hon. member for Bellechasse said was a fantastic intrusion and encroachment upon the provincial field.

Here in the agreement made between the Minister of Finance and the Canadian universities foundation is the definition of university level:

"university level", with respect to a province, means a stage of an educational program that is more advanced than the stage that is generally accepted in the province as the university entrance requirement.

And, in the French language:

(Translation):

University level:

With regard to a province, a more advanced curriculum than is generally accepted in the provinces as a prerequisite university enrolment.

(Text):

Word for word with what the hon. member for Bellechasse put on *Hansard*, the same argument as was made by the hon. member for Berthier-Maskinonge-Delanaudiere and in part the same argument as made by the hon. member for Charlevoix. Will these three members and the other hon. members from