

Senator CROLL: I understand what you are saying, but I understood from the last press release I saw that there was only one province that paid in more than it received, and not two. I do not mind your elevating the province of British Columbia, but the figures did not indicate it was in that category.

Mr. BRYCE: Are you referring to these figures we put out a couple of weeks ago about the allocation of revenue and expenditure?

Senator CROLL: Yes.

Mr. BRYCE: I do not carry them in my mind but this was a matter of great interest to one province, as you recognized.

Senator CROLL: Yes.

Mr. BRYCE: I would say just this, in observation on Senator Lambert's point, if it is in that connection. I think that Parliament—and the Government in its proposals put before Parliament—endeavours to deal fairly and equitably with Canadians wherever they may reside. Our taxes are supposed to be equitable regardless of residence. Our expenditure policies are supposed to be equitable, independent of residence. We have had a number of programs in the last 20 odd years. It even goes further than that. I suppose it extends right back to at least 1927 when the Old Age Pension Act was first introduced, where our expenditures are dependent on action of provincial governments. When that happens, the views and actions of provincial governments can influence what we spend for the benefit of the people in a particular province. Thus, you can get distortions that way. It strikes me that the right principle is for us to deal fairly with Canadians both in the levying of taxes and in making the expenditure, regardless of where they are. Now, in so far as we get into things that are dependent on provincial action, we are not entirely free to carry that principle to its logical conclusion.

Senator LAMBERT: The Rowell-Sirois Report sought to produce an equation which would be equitable to all, but it did not come to much. The war interfered.

Mr. BRYCE: The war interfered. The Rowell-Sirois Report was quite clear as to the shared-cost programs—I think they called them conditional grants—where they paid money to provincial governments to do this and that. But this is now a current issue not only of government policy but of government negotiations with provincial governments.

Senator LAMBERT: Do you agree that the effect of the war period, the financial calamity, had a great deal to do with accelerating the present trend?

Mr. BRYCE: Yes, sir.

Senator LAMBERT: I mean it the other way: the more considered judgment of the Rowell-Sirois Report was accelerated into something new?

Mr. BRYCE: Yes.

Senator LAMBERT: Whether it is economical or not.

Senator O'LEARY (*Antigonish-Guysborough*): We were discussing a particular problem about, more specifically, the senior provincial officers who have been recommended for the departments. Mr. Bryce, I am wondering if you feel that potential for such officers is available in most departments, or would there be heavy borrowing from one or two that we can think of?

Mr. BRYCE: When you say "potential" I take it you mean the potential candidates?

Senator O'LEARY (*Antigonish-Guysborough*): That is right.

Mr. BRYCE: I do not want to be too categorical on that, sir. Undoubtedly in many of the departments there are men who could be trained to do this work. Many of them have not had to learn the methods of accounting, the standards and guidelines for things like letting contracts and so on, in the way the officers