

*Health Resources Fund*

the hon. member who has just spoken did not raise this point of order during the remarks of one or two previous speakers, even though I thought their remarks were most interesting and most useful. While I might possibly have had the intention of straying from the point of order during these remarks, I did not have the opportunity of doing so. Perhaps the hon. member for Calgary South has some of the faculties of a mind reader. If that is the case, he will be in a position to make an even more useful contribution to the work of this house on other occasions.

I wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, that there are a number of things in the bill which are not covered directly or indirectly by the resolution. By reference to clause 7 of the bill, aside from the amendment, you will find there are certain things referred to which are not referred to specifically in the resolution on which the bill is based. For example clause 7 paragraph (a) refers to the submission to the minister of a program for the development of health training facilities in a province, and in paragraph (b), to such information respecting health training facilities in respect of which a contribution is requested. If you look, Mr. Chairman, at clauses 10 and 11, you find a reference specifically to the method of operation, and again you will see no specific reference in the resolution to this useful activity.

Certainly if these clauses are in order, and no one has suggested they are not, then I suggest to you that the amendment put forward by my colleague from British Columbia is no less in order. I think the reason the clauses in the existing bill to which I have referred can be said to be in order, in so far as the resolution is concerned, is that they refer to the administration of the fund or the method of administration of the fund in respect of both the federal and provincial aspects. I suggest that the amendment introduced by my colleague from British Columbia is along the same lines. It calls for writing into the law specifically something which I consider very important with regard to the method of administration of this very useful health resources fund.

I suggest, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is in order. If it is in order, and if it carries, it will have the effect of helping to make known to the people of Canada the source and application of a large part of their federal taxes.

23033—438

**Mr. Basford:** I should like to speak to the point of order. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in raising his point of order drew an analogy between the N.D.P. amendment which was ruled out of order earlier this evening, and this amendment. I suggest there is no analogy. The grounds upon which the N.D.P. amendment to the income tax rebate bill was ruled out of order do not apply to the amendment I have moved.

The N.D.P. amendment to which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre made reference was an amendment to a bill which provided a rebate to the provinces, of certain corporation taxes on privately-owned utility companies, and that is all it provided. The N.D.P. amendment went further than that, and provided how these corporation taxes that were being rebated were to be spent. You, Mr. Chairman, confirmed by Mr. Speaker, very properly said that the amendment was beyond the provisions of the bill.

This is not the case here, Mr. Chairman. There is no analogy between the N.D.P. amendment and this amendment. This amendment was carefully drawn within the provisions of the resolution that was adopted the other day prior to the introduction of the bill. The resolution provides for contributions from the fund to the provinces. This amendment was drawn, as was the bill, with the resolution in mind. The bill has provided for a fund and has provided for contributions from that fund to the provinces. Clause 7 refers to three conditions for the payment of contributions from that fund. I suggest this amendment simply provides a fourth condition. Clause 7 is clearly within the terms of the resolution, and the amendment is not, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre argued, outside the provisions of the bill. I say, therefore, it is in order.

**Mr. Douglas:** In answer to the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard I merely want to point out that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni added a condition relating to the disposition of the corporation taxes which were to be collected from certain private power utilities. His amendment was ruled out of order.

The amendment now moved by the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard also attaches conditions, conditions which were not in the original bill. We are not, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said, terribly exercised about it. We simply feel it is unwise