

*Health Resources Fund*

discuss the personnel at some length, but with respect to this amendment I do not see how the minister can go back and say to the provinces, "I am going to be the sole arbitrator as to the money you spend. If your plan does not agree with me, then out it goes." In this way he would be interfering with the B.N.A. Act and provincial jurisdiction over education.

This fund will provide \$500 million, which is about the same amount as the province of Ontario plans to spend in a ten year period. Every member of parliament knows, or should know that this is the contribution of the federal government.

● (8:00 p.m.)

This grant is made over a period of 15 years. My feeling is that this should be tripled. I believe it is the feeling of those who have spoken in the house from all parties that we must buck up our research. I would certainly suggest to the minister and the federal government that they should be underwriting research entirely; this should be in the hands of the federal government and it should supply the research tools, because it is of national concern and should be a national health policy. I do not see how you can say to a province: I am going to be the sole arbitrator of this situation. I think this is wrong, because then you would be entering as I have said before the field of provincial education, and perhaps municipalities as well who may contribute.

**Mr. Barnett:** Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully to the argument advanced by the hon. member for Simcoe East. I believe he misunderstood the purport of the proposed amendment. If I understood it correctly, the idea is not in any way to alter or change the terms under which money will be made available to the provinces for the purposes which are set out in the bill, but rather to clarify the situation in respect of the source of these funds.

Perhaps the hon. member for Simcoe East, representing an Ontario constituency, has not encountered the kind of situation some of us have encountered, where we find that large sums of money from the federal treasury are put into projects and then heralded as being entirely provincial projects. Certainly as a member from British Columbia I am very much aware of this situation, so far as the contributions made from the federal treasury for the construction of the trans-Canada highway are concerned. Certainly in

British Columbia, except for the occasional time when a private member of the House of Commons raises his voice to point out a few of the facts of the situation, the people are led to believe that the trans-Canada highway was built by the provincial M.L.A. for the constituency of Kamloops.

In this connection I should like to point out that in some other jurisdictions this kind of situation does not apply. While on a trip down into some of the states of the United States last year I recall that where certain inter-states projects were under way there was a large notice board which set out exactly in figures the allocation of funds between the federal treasury, the state treasury, and so on. There was none of this business of making it appear that it was all being done as a personal favour by some particular member or official of government.

If I understand correctly the purpose of the amendment, it would seem its intention is to provide that under the health resources fund the payments which were in fact made from the treasury of Canada would be so designated that the people in a particular province would not have the impression that these facilities were being provided entirely as a gift of some particular minister of a province. With my experience as a member of the House of Commons, who has not been a supporter of any of the federal governments which have been in power while I have been in the house, and not having been in the position of being a political supporter of the government of my own province, I should like to say that I think such an amendment as this might have a rather salutary effect in serving to keep the records straight in the minds of the people of Canada with regard to where their tax dollars are being spent, and from what source they are being spent. From that point of view and in the light of the experience some of us have had, I think this is an amendment which certainly is worthy of serious consideration in this house.

**Mr. Byrne:** Mr. Chairman, I should like to support wholeheartedly the amendment put forward by my colleague from British Columbia. Several months ago I had occasion to speak on a bill. It was a private member's bill providing for certain grants to the provinces. At that time I pointed out that the province of British Columbia—that is, the premier and his administration—were not duly recognizing the amounts of moneys that were being handed over to the provincial administration for