

Canada Health Act

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): The question is as follows:

[*Translation*]

Miss Bégin, seconded by Mr. LeBlanc, moved:

That Bill C-3, an Act relating to cash contributions by Canada in respect of insured health services provided under provincial health care insurance plans and amounts payable by Canada in respect of extended health care services and to amend and repeal certain Acts in consequence thereof, be read the third time and do pass.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

[*English*]

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): Then by the unanimous agreement of the House the vote will stand deferred until 4.45 p.m.

An Hon. Member: Call for the yeas and nays.

[*Translation*]

All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

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

[*English*]

In my opinion the motion is carried.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): I should point out to the House that to have a recorded vote more than five Members would have to rise to oppose the motion.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. McDermid: The motion was unanimous.

Mr. Ellis: There were no nays.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): The House has put the Chair in somewhat of a difficult position. There was a clear indication of unanimous consent of the House prior to putting the question that there be a recorded division at 4.45 p.m. The House then, as a formality, went through the process of putting the question and called the yeas and nays. Since there were no nays heard by the Chair, it is very difficult to do other than record that the motion was carried. However, there were more than five Members who subsequently rose. I would suggest that was a clear indication that there was to be a recorded division of the House at 4.45 p.m. this afternoon and I so rule.

[*Translation*]

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock later this day.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p. m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

POSITION ADVOCATED BY MINISTER OF JUSTICE

Mr. Bud Bradley (Haldimand-Norfolk): Mr. Speaker, in Regina over the weekend the Hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) stated that, if he becomes Prime Minister, one of his priorities will be to try to persuade NATO to de-emphasize the deterrent aspect of nuclear weapons. He stated: "I think we should place greater reliance on conventional arms. It would be expensive, but that is a small price to pay to reduce the balance of terror."

Where has the Minister been for the last 15 years, Mr. Speaker? Where was he when his Party and Government unilaterally reduced our commitment to NATO by half? Where was he when the Armed Forces budget was frozen for three years, thus crippling critically needed re-equipment programs? Where was he when our men and women in uniform left in the thousands because of his Party's policies?

The Minister said that if a strengthened commitment means increasing the size and budget of Canada's Armed Forces, he would be willing to do so as long as other NATO countries would do the same. Our NATO partners are doing just that, and have been doing so.

The Progressive Conservative Party has consistently stood for a strong commitment to NATO, a strengthening of our forces, and greater emphasis on equipment replacement. I welcome the Minister's support of our policies, although I would rather have him express these views here in the House of Commons and in cabinet meetings. Recently we have witnessed public repudiation of government policies by many Liberal leadership hopefuls. Now, along with repudiation we have hypocrisy.