

ly" because I am aware of the complications of the formulas.

For the federal government, having proposed these improvements and dragged the provinces into them, now to have served notice that the whole concept is going to be changed is—I think my hon. friend for Winnipeg North used the proper word—a case of torpedoing what the very party opposite presumably worked for for several decades. It is a case of turning the clock back.

What the Minister of Finance did on the night of June 23 when he gave the notice about the five year run out of the hospitalization program, and then gave notice of a bill to amend the Medical Care Act, first reading of which I understand is being called this afternoon, were acts which turned the clock back. The Minister of Finance tries to say in this House that none of these measures will interfere with universal hospitalization and medical care, that none will interfere with our effort to maintain high standards in these areas. The fact is that the cost of maintaining these standards will be shifted from the federal treasury, which is the one most nearly based on the principle of ability to pay right across the country, either to the provinces in their entirety or to some other basis the details of which we do not yet know.

● (1220)

I submit that there will be a very real risk of greatly increasing what hospital and medical services will cost not just the provinces rather than Ottawa but the people of this country, particularly the people in the provinces that are less wealthy than others. Therefore, we say that with the prospect ahead of us of a complete change in how hospital and medical care services are to be financed, with the whole question of what will be done with equalization of the revenues of the various governments in this country, this House ought to go slowly on a bill of this kind. We had some questions about it at second reading, but those questions have been underlined and heightened by the announcement made by the Minister of Finance on June 23. We are not prepared to see the gains won in the hospital and medical care field torpedoed by a government which wants to solve its immediate financial problems by taking this regressive step. Therefore, we think this bill should not be passed at this time and that is why we propose that the House should give it a six months' hoist.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): The question is on the amendment to the main motion. All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Olympic Financing

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the amendment negated on division.

Motion (Mr. Orlikow) negated.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Is the main motion agreed to?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

PRAIRIE GRAIN ADVANCE PAYMENTS ACT, NO. 2

AMENDMENT TO AUTHORIZE DEDUCTION FROM RECEIPTS TO PAY BOARD FOR OUTSTANDING ADVANCE

Hon. Jean Marchand (for the Minister of Justice) moved that Bill C-53, to amend the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act, No. 2, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Marchand, Langelier (for Mr. Lang) moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

OLYMPIC (1976) ACT

AMENDMENT COVERING ISSUE OF GOLD COINS

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-63, to amend the Olympic (1976) Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Motion No. 1, motion No. 2 and motion No. 4 appear to be acceptable from a procedural point of view. It may be desirable that motions No. 1 and No. 2 be grouped for purposes of debate, but if a division is demanded, each could be voted upon separately. Motion No. 4 might be debated and voted upon separately, if so required.

Motion No. 3 appears to be an amendment to the Canadian Bill of Rights; therefore is irrelevant to the present bill the purpose of which is stated in the recommendation of the Crown as follows:

—the present measure to amend the Olympic (1976) Act to authorize the issue of gold Olympic coins and to determine the selling price of the gold on the basis of the market price.

May's eighteenth edition, at page 508, reads:

An amendment is out of order if it is irrelevant to the subject matter or beyond the scope of the bill.

A like proscription is to be found in citation 406 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, as follows:

Amendments are out of order, if they are irrelevant to the bill, or beyond its scope—

That is with reference to motion No. 3. Is it agreed that motions No. 1 and No. 2 be grouped for purposes of debate?