

Mr. Speaker: I am getting mixed signals from the loyal opposition. The hon. House leader.

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, there is only one Official Opposition in this House, if I might remind the Chair. I suggest to the Chair that my hon. friend from the left has made his point.

He talked about relevancy. The issue and the test ought to be, that if one is so certain of the substantive part of the case, the case ought to be made in order to give the test which has been drawn to the attention of the House, so that all members will then be in a position to make a final adjudication on the floor of this House.

To suggest, because one provincial government versus another provincial government is irrelevant and ought not to be put to the House is in my view backing off the debate and being very afraid to put the case before this House.

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park): Mr. Speaker, you mentioned that this was debated earlier. I was here through the whole morning, through the entire debate. Madam Speaker raised this but she did not allow any debate on the floor.

I went with the mover of the amendment to one of your advisers and we had a brief discussion. I used to give your adviser the same arguments as our House leader made and that is why I will not take the time of the House to repeat them.

Mr. Speaker: Just a moment. I may have received some gross misinformation. I thought that there was quite a number of members up on this matter. The hon. member has indicated that there was not. I am puzzled.

Mr. Flis: It is my error, Mr. Speaker. I understand there were brief interventions but the Speaker reserved to rule on it.

My argument to your adviser was that if the amendment is out of order, then the motion would also have to be ruled out of order because it is dealing with provincial matters, not the federal government.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps I can take the matter away and look at it carefully. I will come back as soon as I can. I thank hon. members for their interventions.

Supply

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S. O. 81—HEALTH CARE

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Karpoff (p. 8826).

Mr. Mike Breugh (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I believe I had something like 13 minutes left for my remarks.

I want to begin with a little bit of history which I think is important. Medicare began in this country in one of the poorest of our provinces in the middle of very depressed economic conditions by a government that did not represent a large population.

It is important to take it back to those roots. It clarifies something which is vital to understanding what medicare is all about. Medicare is not free medical care for anybody. Medicare is about the co-operative movement. It is about people bonding together to provide for themselves as a group those things which they really could not accomplish as individuals.

I watched *Canada AM* this morning. I saw a very prominent Canadian physician talk about free medical care. That is wrong. There is no free medical care in Canada that I know of. You and I, Mr. Speaker, all of us in Canada pay for our own medical care through our taxation process. It is a co-operative movement. It is not about getting something for nothing. It is about sharing all of our resources collectively to provide for a common need: medical care.

Until about 1977 there was an agreement in force between our provinces and the federal government that the cost of his particular program would be shared evenly between the provinces and the federal government on a roughly a 50 / 50 basis.

I happen to have been the health critic for the New Democratic Party in the Ontario legislature at the time when block funding was introduced. At that time many of us had a concern that centred around that shared cost.

There were many advantages, I suppose, to block funding, to changing the funding formulas. They became more complicated. Supposedly they provided more flexibility, but the one thing that concerned many of us was