

determination, but there is a procedural difficulty there which we face.

The reason I want to leave it without making a determination at this time is because there is a great deal of importance in what the hon. member has raised. As the minister has just pointed out, the matter of lock-ups is a rather recent development, and I think everyone has agreed that they have been established with the best of motivation. In fact the hon. member said quite specifically that this lock-up is no exception, that it is obviously for the best interests of members who wish to participate so that their performance in the House will be better, either in their own capacity or on behalf of their party. It is a recent development, and therefore this House has not addressed itself to the conditions which either ought to surround this kind of lock-up or not surround it, depending on the point of view taken.

It may be that with the expressions of interest, cited by the hon. member for York-Simcoe, of former finance ministers of very recent duration—both of whom have put their views on the record in a specific way—that they favour, as I am sure all hon. members do, greater consultation within the limits of possibilities on these matters, but no one has ever addressed himself to a series of conditions that ought to surround or not surround these kinds of lock-ups.

If the ministers' sentiments are broadly held on that side of the House, it may be that the consensus exists whereby some reference to a committee could be agreed upon in order that this matter be examined and reported back to the House with recommendations, without the necessity of establishing a question of privilege within the narrow strictures of privilege. Therefore I would like to leave it to see whether or not it can be explored over the next short while, as to whether or not some reference can be created or some vehicle found through which this matter can be explored for the benefit of the House in an attempt to set things down.

The hon. member has certainly raised a valid point as to conditions that ought to surround this kind of lock-up in so far as members are concerned. If it turns out that some agreed reference can be made, then so much the better. If some agreed reference cannot be made, then we will return to the question of privilege as raised by the hon. member, and I will then give all hon. members who are interested in the subject an opportunity to be heard at that time.

**Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon-Biggar):** Mr. Speaker, I simply rise on this particular point to accept your suggestion and to inform the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Jamieson) that we are receptive to a proposal by the government House leader as soon as it is convenient. We leave the matter in abeyance until that time.

*Health Resources Fund Act*  
**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[*Translation*]

**HEALTH RESOURCES FUND ACT**

MEASURE TO AMEND

**Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Health and Welfare)** moved that Bill C-2, to amend the Health Resources Fund Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be as brief as possible this afternoon so that the House will not have to suffer too long my raucous voice. I therefore want to underline the highlights of the proposed termination two years before expected.

We all recall that the Health Resources Fund Act was given royal assent on July 11, 1966, a little over 12 years ago. It was our colleague, the hon. leader of the government, who held the health portfolio and that piece of legislation was one of the high points of his career. It was voted to make up, in a sense, for certain things as regards the teaching of medicine and related professions, laboratory equipment and research facilities in Canadian universities and hospitals, although the federal government does pay 50 per cent of all health costs in Canada through the ten provincial governments.

[*English*]

This fund, hon. members will recall, was passed some 12 years ago under the Health Resources Fund Act and was allocated \$500 million to be divided into three parts—\$300 million was allocated to the provinces on a per capita basis, \$25 million was allocated to the Atlantic provinces for joint projects, and the balance, \$175 million, was put aside to be allocated by the governor in council for particular projects.

● (1542)

What is important to know is that, basically, the fund did the job it was supposed to do. Of the \$500 million appropriated under the act, 83.4 per cent has been spent or is committed and will be reimbursed on presentation of invoices, and that 83.4 per cent amounts to \$416,700,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to review rapidly the way in which that fund was spent. Approximately one-fifth of the fund went to medical schools and multi-purpose buildings in the health science complexes; another one-fifth went to university hospitals; some money went to affiliated hospitals; a smaller sum, namely, \$23 million, went to dental schools; and \$76 million went to nursing schools, auxiliary schools and other health manpower training centres. Of the money committed to this date, \$60.8 million remain to be paid in the next three or four years.

I should like to explain to members of the House that all the submissions which have been approved, and which therefore represent a contract between the Government of Canada and the provincial governments, will be fully honoured, despite the