

Medicare

This is not a policy or a provision contrary to the bill. The bill is designed to secure the co-operation of the provinces and we expect that co-operation will be forthcoming. This statement is merely an argument or a prophecy and it is not a provision or principle contrary to this bill because the bill does provide for co-operative arrangements with the provinces in the financing of this program.

Paragraph (b) of the amendment reads:

(b) recognizes the principle of voluntary choice by the individual;

The suggestion here is that in some way the provisions of the bill do not recognize the principle of voluntary choice. I argue that obviously the provisions and principles of the bill are fully compatible not only with the principle of voluntary choice by the individual but the principle of voluntary choice by the medical profession itself. I merely make the point with respect to paragraphs (a) and (b) that there is no policy or provision proposed in either of these two items contrary to the provisions of the bill. Both are quite compatible with the provisions of the bill.

With respect to paragraphs (c) and (d), I merely wish to refer to a further point raised by May to the effect that the principle of relevancy in an amendment governs every such motion. The amendment must strictly relate to the bill which the house, by its order, has resolved upon considering. I argue that paragraph (c) is irrelevant merely by pointing out that the matter of medical research is provided for in the estimates of the Minister of Industry. We have already passed a bill this session, the health resources fund bill, dealing with this other matter of providing capital facilities for the training of an adequate number of doctors and other medical personnel.

Paragraph (d) reads:

(d) immediately provides for those persons who are unable, for financial reasons, to provide medical services for themselves.

I might say that this house has already taken action this session through the Canada Assistance Plan to provide for this very item. All I am saying in respect of paragraphs (c) and (d) is that they are irrelevant to this bill because each of the items dealt with in (c) and (d) is irrelevant to the scope of the bill.

Hon. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): I submit to you, sir, that there is a very recent precedent which establishes that the amendment now

before the house is clearly in order. The most recent precedent is, of course, the amendment moved on August 30, 1966, in this session, an amendment to the second reading of the bill to provide for the resumption of operation of railways, when all the points which were made by the minister today were made at that time and disposed of. I do not propose, therefore, to detain the house at any length. Perhaps I might deal briefly with what the minister has said. He rested his argument, first, once more upon only one section of the citation in May—I am referring to the seventeenth edition of May, page 527—where we find not only what was read by the minister but also words to the effect that a reasoned amendment may express opinions as to any circumstances connected with the introduction or prosecution of the bill or otherwise opposed to its progress. In my submission, sir, the criticisms contained in the amendment are supportable equally upon that second ground set forth in May as upon the first, notwithstanding what the minister has said.

The only other portion of the minister's argument with which I might deal is that portion in which he sought to suggest that subparagraphs (c) and (d) of the amendment are not in order because they are not relevant. It was quite obvious from the minister's argument that was not the point he was seeking to make. It was that in his view subparagraphs (c) and (d) are not sound; that is what he was saying. In other words, he was saying that part of the amendment should not be allowed because he does not agree with it. This is a matter of argument and does not make the amendment out of order. It is a matter for debate and vote, not a ground upon which the amendment can be ruled out of order. I submit to you that subparagraphs (a) and (b) as well as subparagraphs (c) and (d) express opinions on circumstances connected with the introduction or prosecution of the bill and are therefore, along with the whole amendment, clearly in order on the basis of the citations that have already been put before you.

Mr. Baldwin: The hon. member for Kamloops has been most persuasive in his argument and has dealt adequately with the points raised by the minister. I have some comments to add in a complementary way with regard to paragraphs (c) and (d). The minister has suggested that (c) and (d) are not relevant because in his opinion they have been dealt with adequately in other legislation introduced in this house earlier. I think