

**Mr. Lambert:** This is perfectly fine but, so far as I am concerned, in this particular form this bill is unacceptable to me and I intend to vote against it.

**Mr. L. M. Brand (Saskatoon):** Mr. Speaker, I have spoken extensively on the amendment and on the resolution preceding the bill. The only real reason I have for rising at this time is to correct some of the misstatements that have been made concerning our stand in this debate and to try to tell some of those whose perception seems somewhat dulled, either by lack of knowledge or party affiliation, exactly what we believe on this side of the house.

This is a bill to authorize the payment of contributions by Canada toward the cost of insured medical care services incurred by provinces pursuant to provincial medical care insurance plans, and we agree with the principle. As I said the other day in this chamber, we in Saskatchewan will certainly welcome the additional funds that will be available as a result of this bill because they will enable us to improve the plan now in operation in that province, a plan which I must repeat once again, and I hope for the last time, was brought about after a great deal of discussion between those giving and those receiving the services, a plan which, because it was based on this premise, is working and despite its deficiencies is at the moment working very well.

I must say that when I listened to the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) speak yesterday it reminded me a great deal of the type of provincial politicking I heard in past years when that hon. gentleman was heading the government of Saskatchewan. I do not think there is any room in this house for provincial politicking, and his attempt to show that our stand is something other than it is, is nothing but cheap politicking.

I agree with the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam—I am sorry he is not in the house—that this is one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before parliament, and that is why we on this side of the house are attempting to show the government what changes we feel should be made in the bill in order to make it a good one.

I remind the hon. member once again that when we introduce amendments, and of course our amendment on second reading has been defeated, we are not attempting to kill the bill any more than the members of the N.D.P. were trying to kill the bill to end the railway strike when they moved a subamendment. They wanted that strike to end as

### Medicare

much as we did but they did not think the bill was good enough. Then they accepted our amendment.

Is there a difference between railways and medical services? Should we give more consideration to legislation dealing with the health of individuals than to legislation ending a railway strike? This is something which the hon. member is not thinking about very carefully.

As recorded at page 8870 of yesterday's *Hansard* the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam said:

I therefore find it difficult to understand why the Progressive Conservatives should now be against this legislation.

This, of course, is absolutely wrong. On the same page he is also reported as saying:

Therefore I think the members who come from Saskatchewan will have to do some explaining as to why they are opposing a piece of legislation which would have such beneficial effects for their province.

That is a complete reversal of the truth.

**Mr. MacEachen:** May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

**Mr. Brand:** It will be a pleasure.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Are we not entitled to conclude that the Official Opposition is opposed to the bill in view of the statement made a few moments ago by a leading front-bencher of that party that he intends to vote against the bill? Are we not entitled to conclude that the party is opposed to the bill, or are we to conclude that the party is divided?

**Mr. Brand:** I think the minister will understand, as I said originally, that we are not opposed to the principle of the bill but we think the bill is a bad one.

Since the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam has said that the members who come from Saskatchewan will have to do some explaining why they are opposing a piece of legislation which would have some beneficial effects for their province, I invite the hon. member to look at my remarks in *Hansard* two days previously.

**Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** May I ask the hon. member a brief question?

**Mr. Brand:** Provided it does not take up my time.

**Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Is he prepared to go back to Saskatchewan and advise any members of his