

Health Resources Fund

Well, Mr. Chairman, I say this amendment is worse than the first one, as far as provincial autonomy is concerned; it is argued that provinces are using moneys granted by the federal government in some provincial projects without stating the fact. Can you imagine that the federal government will give justice to the provinces in reimbursing the moneys due under the constitution and that they will then be called to go before the entire population to say: The federal government has been a Santa Claus to us, they have given us 50 per cent.

No, Mr. Chairman, we do not see things that way. We are not asking the federal government to be simply equitable and to return to the provinces the moneys to which they, the provinces, are entitled; we go further, we demand that the federal government get out of provincial taxation fields. We shall have to demand it for a few more years, but inevitably, they will be forced out by circumstances. How right it is to say: Who pays the fiddler calls the tune. The government claims to be paying the provinces and will try to assert itself and say: You will now do this and that, or otherwise, you will get nothing. They claim the provinces are free, but it is a case of take it or leave it. Believe or die. You are free to accept but if you refuse, you get nothing. That is the way things are done in Russia.

Mr. Chairman, I say that this amendment must not be voted by parliament. It is worse, it is more socialistic than the first, because it concerns education and our group is violently opposed thereto.

[*English*]

Mr. Nasserden: Mr. Chairman, we have heard some fantastic proposals during the past three years from the other side of this house, but never before have hon. members over there come out with such a barefaced proposition as is contained in the amendment proposed this evening. This parliament is set up to try to bring forward legislation which will benefit the people, rather than to attempt to bring forward legislation that will reflect the beneficence of any particular group here. It is certainly fantastic on the part of the hon. member for Kootenay East and the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard to try to suggest that our objectives at this particular time should involve informing the people of Canada that we are a great bunch of fellows because we are contributing 50 per cent of

money in respect of a certain piece of legislation, particularly at this time when parliament is in the straits it is in today and when people are wondering why so much time is wasted.

Why should we be bogged down at this time by this kind of proposition, emanating from the government side of this house? I believe the hon. member for Simcoe East presented a valid argument this afternoon. I do not intend to take up any more of the time of this institution discussing a fantastic proposition—one which may be considered almost silly.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, let me remind the hon. gentleman who has just spoken that the amendment under consideration was moved by a private member and does not necessarily contain ideas that are shared by everyone on this side of the chamber. Although I am a colleague of the hon. member and a next door neighbour of his in the city of Vancouver, I do not happen to hold the same views in respect of his amendment.

Let me deal for a moment with what we are expected to do in this chamber. This is the federal parliament of Canada and we are charged here with the responsibility of doing certain things in the national interest. We are charged with raising the standard of living of Canadian people through various welfare programs thrashed out in this chamber. We are charged with building links from coast to coast, such as the trans-Canada highway, in order that Canadian commerce and Canadian people can travel back and forth throughout the country. We are charged with maintaining our harbours, with the operation of ferries and many other things. If we do not fulfil our responsibilities in this regard we will fail Canada. Even though legislatures everywhere in Canada decided not to give us recognition for doing these things, we as Canadians and as members of parliament sitting in this house would in any event have to do them.

● (8:20 p.m.)

Indeed, you and I as Canadians would be proud to do those very things because we would know that in the long run we would be forging the links that made Canada. So I do not believe we can legislate ourselves into any position where there is federal recognition for a shared program and provincial recognition for a shared program. Let me give you an example. A bill brought in by hon. gentlemen opposite during the period they were in power provided some subsidies