

in the affirmative or negative. Will the province have to accept the definitions contained in the agreement made between the minister and the Canadian universities foundation in the light of the terms of the bill which the minister read, namely lines 18 to 25?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member again is slurring over the words "not inconsistent with". This legislation does not at all, as he suggests, impose the terms of the agreement with the Canadian universities foundation upon a prescribed province. It simply says that for the province to qualify as a prescribed province there must be terms and conditions not inconsistent with those contained in the agreement.

Mr. Chevrier: May I ask a further question? Has the premier of Quebec been consulted with reference to this particular clause, the words that have been under discussion and the question I asked earlier?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I spent some considerable time earlier reviewing all the exchanges that have occurred between the federal and provincial governments in this respect. There is nothing more I can add to that.

Mr. Chevrier: I know what the minister did and I know the minister said at one time that he did not show the bill to the premier of Quebec. I am now asking him if the premier of Quebec was consulted with reference to the words which are contained in the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Cartier.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I think I was quite clear on this matter. We are just going over this again and again and again. We are just going around the tree in circles again and again. I made the extent of the discussions quite clear. I went into some detail, I thought, in connection with the meeting I had with Premier Barrette in February and I pointed out that the bill had not been drawn at that time. I knew what the bill was going to contain and I had a preliminary draft but there was no bill shown to the premier of Quebec at that meeting.

The hon. member for Laurier asked me later about the premier of the province reading the bill. I had to tell him that I have no control over the reading habits of the premier of Quebec. All I know, as I told him, is that the bill had not been printed when I discussed it with him.

Mr. Pickersgill: Perhaps the minister would permit me to ask a question and also to draw his attention to the fact that the hon. member for Laurier is not asking him about the bill at all but rather about the conditions that

are in the bill. He is asking the minister whether the premier of Quebec was made acquainted by the minister with the conditions that were going to be put into this bill, not with the bill. We do not care whether he saw the bill. We want to know whether he was told what these conditions were going to be and whether he, as the Solicitor General told us he did, agreed with them or whether, as Premier Barrette says, he had no understanding of them at all.

Mr. Balcer: Here we go again.

Mr. Pickersgill: That is what we are asking and we are entitled to know. Did the minister tell the premier of Quebec when he met him what the general conditions were going to be that were going to be put in the bill?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I have already said, if not four certainly three times, that at that meeting in Quebec the premier acquainted me with the legislative intentions of the Quebec government and I acquainted him with the legislative intentions of the federal government.

Mr. Pickersgill: And no agreement was reached.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I have to point out again, I guess it is now the fourth or fifth time, that this legislation does not contemplate any agreement between the federal and provincial governments. It is federal legislation dealing with federal taxation and, so far as the legislation of the province of Quebec is concerned, the legislature passed its legislation respecting support of universities in that province in the exercise of its own constitutional rights. The two jurisdictions have proceeded each in its own proper constitutional sphere, with due respect for the constitutional rights and prerogatives of the other.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, it is very interesting to hear the Minister of Finance tell us now that the Prime Minister was talking through his hat when he wrote the premier of Quebec on the second of February and had this to say in his letter. You gave me permission, Mr. Chairman, to refer to these letters on clause 2. This is what the Prime Minister, who is absent in London now, said and what the Minister of Finance says is nonsense tonight:

I am glad to learn that your government agrees to the general principle for settlement of the problem and if further clarification is needed to secure agreement in detail—

The Prime Minister evidently did not know what was going on. He did not know that no agreement was necessary. He did not know that each was going to proceed in his own