

### Supply

In the good old days, Ontario was a province that could share with other provinces in Canada that did not quite have the same economic and industrial base. It could share moneys without any difficulty at all. But today, in the middle of this depression, Ontario unfortunately has joined the ranks of those who do not have extra cash. Therefore, that poses the initial problem.

The second thing is that it is compounded when the federal Government of Canada reneges on its agreement. When the federal Government of Canada does not pay its fair share, the province of Ontario has more than a right, an obligation to join with other provinces and cry foul.

Those agreements are things that the provinces and the people of Ontario have a right to expect the federal government to respect to the very iota of intent. That is why they are crying foul. It is not one province, it is a lot of them, all at the same time saying that the federal government is not carrying its fair share of the responsibility. That is an argument this government had better listen to.

**Mr. Dennis Mills (Broadview—Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. When the member for Oshawa began his remarks, he cited remarks made by the Quebec premier on Bill C-120 where they talked about possible user fees. He quoted Premier McKenna and Premier Wells talking about this dilemma of health care. He was very selective in his remarks about Liberal governments.

It is very important that he remember what the NDP treasurer for the province of Ontario said on January 13, 1992, talking about this dilemma we have with health care and the difficulties we are all in. I am certainly not condoning the federal government's cutbacks in transfers to the provinces, but it is important that we have on the record what the NDP have said in the province of Ontario, and I quote: "Unless we get the system operating in a way that is in keeping with our ability to pay for it, we will see user fees or free enterprise medicine. God help us all". That was Floyd Laughren, the treasurer of the province of Ontario.

I am not trying to take a shot at the member for Oshawa or Mr. Laughren, but I get a little bit uptight when the NDP sometimes comes on like they are the only ones with answers and the only ones who really care about the health care system in this country. We all care. It is a difficult issue.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I do not know whether that is a comment or a question. The hon. member has an answer. If he would like to comment briefly, I will listen to him.

**Mr. Breaugh:** Mr. Speaker, very briefly. I want to apologize for reading into the record the quote from *The Ottawa Citizen* from Clyde Wells and the quote from Frank McKenna in the *The Globe and Mail*. I think we also read from *The Montreal Gazette*. I apologize for reading into the record of the House of Commons the direct quotes from newspapers across Canada of various Liberal governments.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Questions and comments are now terminated. Before I recognize the hon. member for Eglinton—Lawrence, the Speaker would like to make a ruling.

• (1550)

#### SPEAKER'S RULING

**Mr. Speaker:** As hon. members know, shortly after Question Period there was a further extension of a point of order which had been brought this morning relating to the amendment by the Official Opposition to the motion which has been proposed in this allotted day by the New Democratic Party. As I say, there was argument this morning and further argument this afternoon. I of course am indebted to all hon. members for their contribution. By the way, I have read back through the arguments that were made this morning.

The Chair has considered the arguments that were raised earlier today by hon. members on the proposed amendment by the hon. member for Winnipeg North. As stated in *Erskine May's* 21st edition, page 339:

The effect of moving an amendment is to restrict the field of debate which would otherwise be open on a question.

I am going to repeat that:

The effect of moving an amendment is to restrict the field of debate which would otherwise be open on a question.

The hon. member for Sudbury pointed out that the intention of the amendment was to expand the scope of the debate, and although it may be a laudable objective, unfortunately it is, in my view, out of order procedurally.

Other members, including the members for Winnipeg Transcona and Winnipeg North, mentioned a new proposition being introduced or made reference to citation 929 of *Beauchesne's* sixth edition. The Chair feels the amendment must not provide the basis for a different debate.