

Furthermore, as explained in the Chair's ruling of March 16, 1971, when the opposition parties agree on the choice of subject for an allotted day, and I am quoting Speaker Lamoureux: "the spirit of fair play would require that the day not be taken away by means of an amendment".

The Standing Order requiring notice would be pointless if, after notice had been given, the motion were amended to make possible the consideration of an entirely new facet of the question.

There was further argument given of course this afternoon and I certainly listened to it, but I do not think I need to make further comment than what I have done. As a consequence, for these reasons I will have to rule the amendment out of order. That of course does not preclude another amendment being moved.

ALLOTTED DAY, S. O. 81—HEALTH CARE

Mr. Riis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Before I listen to my hon. friend from Eglinton—Lawrence, and I await his remarks with interest, I simply want to remind the House that today we are debating appropriation bills. One is \$1,175 million and the other appropriation bill is \$13 billion-plus. This is a very serious debate. Obviously this is an opportunity for members to register their concerns.

Depending on which speaker we are listening to, we are hearing concerns in terms of the erosion of health care in the country.

I was simply wondering if my friends from the government party plan to participate in the debate. It just seems to be inappropriate that we should have such an important debate without any participation from my colleagues from the Progressive Conservative Party.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may have questions as to why someone is or is not rising. I do not think the Chair can intrude. I am going to return the chair to my colleague.

As I have said, hon. members may wish to put another amendment, keeping in mind of course the comments of the Chair.

Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence): Mr. Speaker, several points have been made over the course of debate

Supply

in the morning and have carried on over the course of the afternoon. To show that we are not partisan at all in this debate and that we do have the interests of all Canadians at heart, I want to compliment the hon. member who just completed his debate because, quite frankly, it took me a little bit by surprise. Up until that point, the party that had been moving the amendment had been completely fruitless in its presentations, totally devoid of substance and completely off the mark when we were talking about medicare. What they had initially started to talk about was simply a finger pointing exercise. The hon. member in spite of his presentation had begun with a finger pointing exercise directed at provincial premiers of the Liberal Party.

He has now changed his tune. He wants to talk about the substance of medicare. The rest of his intervention read like an apology for what is going on in Ontario specifically, but with all NDP governments throughout the country. It is unfortunate that we are reduced to this kind of a debate. It is unfortunate that the hon. member for Oshawa was reduced to making an apology for members of his own party who have been indicating that they are the stalwart defenders of all that is holy and all that is sacrosanct in this country, including medicare.

All through the debate they have been more scarce than government members and government ministers. I am glad that there is at least one to listen so that we can get some of the things on the record.

My hon. colleague from Oshawa indicated earlier that he was willing to debate substance. He did that in response to my hon. colleague from Winnipeg—St. Boniface. While my colleague from Winnipeg—St. Boniface is not here to throw out the challenge again, and throw out the gauntlet for him, he has suggested that there is an opportunity for us to debate the substance of medicare and our relative position on it.

Since the NDP has reneged on the opportunity to do so in the House today, my colleague from Winnipeg—St. Boniface, or in fact anyone from this side of the House, is willing to debate the member for Oshawa, if he can muster up enough support of any other member from the rest of his caucus on the question of medicare and social assistance programs, anywhere. We will even go to Oshawa.