

*Dominion-Provincial Relations*

of those agreements in existence between his predecessor, Mr. Harris, and the Canadian council of universities, and that that agreement defined the basis of distribution by the national council of Canadian universities. It is this agreement and the definitions contained therein that have been so strenuously opposed by members from the province of Quebec. It is the definitions contained in this agreement that have been declared in this house by Conservative members of parliament from the province of Quebec as being an invasion of the field of education; in fact, I believe the words which were used were "an invasion of the structural field of education". It is unquestionable that the words which are contained in this bill incorporate this agreement and make it binding upon the prescribed province.

The Minister of Finance can argue as much as he likes, but the words are there, namely that the prescribed province which has not entered into a tax rental agreement—that is Quebec—under which satisfactory arrangements exist in accordance with and subject to terms and conditions not inconsistent with those contained in any agreement entered into by the minister and the Canadian universities foundation. This is the agreement which I hold in my hand. Therefore, I submit with all the force at my command that the province of Quebec, if it becomes a prescribed province—and it has, to use the words of the minister, established itself as a prescribed province—will be bound by the terms of this agreement. Of that there can be no doubt. I have not heard anything to the contrary. Although I have challenged those members who stated during the course of this discussion that order in council P.C. 123 which was passed in 1952 and which is the same as this agreement of 1960 in so far as the definitions are concerned—I have not heard a word from them to the effect—

**An hon. Member:** You will.

**Mr. Chevrier:** My hon. friend says that I will. If he intends to say something about that I hope he will make a statement and explain away the fact that if it was an invasion of the field of education in 1952 to pass order in council P.C. 123, why is it not an invasion in 1960 to pass this order in council with the same definitions.

My hon. friend from Charlevoix and those associated with him, try as they may, will not, in my opinion, ever be able to wiggle out of the strait-jacket in which their colleague, the Minister of Finance, has placed them.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** How imaginative!

**Mr. Chevrier:** The minister has gone a step farther in his remarks and he has given [Mr. Chevrier.]

the reason why this provision is in the bill. He explained it prior to the committee's rising at six o'clock. He said:

It is in order to ensure equality. Otherwise, whereas distribution in the non-prescribed province must be on the basis of equality among the universities of the province as determined by student enrolment, if this were not applied to the prescribed province it would be open to such a province to apply the funds in any way it saw fit.

These words are a limitation upon the province.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** No.

**Mr. Chevrier:** The minister himself has stated that.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** No.

**Mr. Chevrier:** In his own words the minister has indicated that if this were not applied to a prescribed province it would be open to such a province to apply the funds in any way it saw fit. He said, "Parliament surely intends that there should be equality of treatment in all parts of Canada". That is another difficulty in so far as this clause is concerned.

In my estimation this forces the province to distribute its grants in a certain way. It puts a penalty on the taxpayers in that province if it does not follow the agreement with the foundation, and all we are trying to do by moving this amendment, by the removal of those offensive words, is to give the province back its autonomy.

(Translation):

**Mr. Dorion:** Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to most of the remarks made by the hon. member for Laurier (Mr. Chevrier), which were, so to speak, a second edition of what he said the other day precisely with regard to that part of the act where a change is sought in accordance with the terms of the amendment submitted by the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Crestohl).

First of all, may I be allowed—and I think now is the time to do so—to correct certain statements that were made, first by the hon. member for Laurier and then in a slightly more shaded and mitigated form by my good friend the hon. member for Cartier. Both presented as a definite fact that the principle of federal university grants had been finally consecrated because we had voted for adoption of the bill on second reading.

Mr. Chairman, either my hon. friends have taken no interest in my own statements in this house, which as a matter of fact were echoed by some of my colleagues, or they have voluntarily and deliberately ignored