

Health Resources Fund

for the building of ships. Those subsidies assisted in building about one third to 40 per cent of the ferries which now ply between the mainland of British Columbia and Vancouver island. Let us suppose that we had introduced into that subsidies program an amendment which said there must be some kind of recognition for this 40 per cent contribution. I wonder whether we in this house believe we would not have taken part in the program of linking the mainland of British Columbia with Vancouver island if the federal government has insisted that it would not take part unless some kind of recognition went with it.

What sort of federal recognition would we require? Would it satisfy our needs if a bronze plaque were put on the ferry which said "Forty per cent of the cost of this ferry was put up by the federal government". In the case of the tourists going back and forth it would be a good idea, someone here suggests. Certainly it would, and it would be a nice thing if any provincial government would recognize a federal government contribution and do it willingly, working hand in hand with the federal government in such a shared program.

But I am sure hon. members do not believe that unless this were done we would not participate in such programs, and that we should force it to be done by legislation. Would we be satisfied if the bronze plaque were there, and the tourists dashed back and forth to it from their cars? Would this satisfy the need? Or would we like to hear the captain get on the bull-horn halfway across and say, "Forty per cent of the cost of this ferry was put up by the federal government"? Of course this does not have to be done.

As a matter of fact, what has to happen is that members of parliament in this house, if they want the nation to know what this government is doing in shared programs, must themselves get on the bull-horn and say, "Forty per cent of the work done on this project was put up by the federal government". If we do not do this when we go to our own constituencies, if we do not do it when we get on the platform, if we do not do it when we speak to our own people, it will never become known to them. I can tell members that provincial premiers and M.L.A.'s are not going to tell the people when they are on the vessel, crossing back and forth, and when they come to the bronze plaque, if we enforce its erection, they will put their backs to it and say, "See this fine

[Mr. Deachman.]

vessel. It was made and paid for by the government of British Columbia. This is what you get when you come to British Columbia." So I say to hon. members here: Toot your own horns; you do not need a piece of legislation to do it.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I hesitated earlier to raise any point of order about this amendment, lest it might appear that I was merely unhappy about the ruling given on the amendment moved earlier by my colleague from Comox-Alberni. However, the hon. member for Roberval has in his speech, although it was a speech with respect to the substance of the amendment, raised the very point that I would like to ask Your Honour to look at. When the last piece of legislation was before this committee the hon. member for Comox-Alberni moved an amendment which attached a condition to certain payments that would be made by the federal government to the provinces. You, sir, ruled that amendment out of order on the ground that it was irrelevant to the bill, that it was beyond the scope of what was provided in the resolution that preceded the bill.

I ask you, sir, for a better description of this amendment. It proposes the attachment of a condition to payments to be made by the federal government to the provinces. I have re-read the resolution that preceded the bill, and do not see in it any reference to this kind of condition. I do not speak with a great deal of feeling or fervour; I am not blowing the bull-horn, but it does seem to me that at least within the same sitting of the house we should have consistency; and because this amendment looks so much like the amendment that was moved earlier by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni I invite Your Honour's comments on it.

Mr. Cashin: Mr. Chairman, may I speak on the point of order. I can see where superficially the suggestion may be made that this amendment is out of order on the grounds that the previous amendment was out of order; but I should like to point out to you, sir, that clause 7 deals with conditions, and this amendment is substantially in line with those conditions in paragraphs (a) to (c) and is not a departure from principle, as was the amendment introduced earlier today which was ruled out of order by the Chairman.

I think, therefore, that this is merely an addition to clause 7 and does not substantially or in principle go against the intent of that clause. This was not the case earlier; we were