

*Medicare*

I know we are not discussing the means test at the moment, but the next sentence is important:

The health services will make enough demand on our resources. We must not waste them.

• (8:20 p.m.)

That is from the report of the Hall Commission from which the minister has repeatedly quoted in the numerous speeches he has made on the various phases of the bill. The minister went on to say:

To that argument made by Mr. Justice Hall in his commission report I merely add one further argument.

He then gives his interpretation of what was said about health services and universal coverage, namely, that voluntary coverage will not meet the problem of health care in Canada. What are we talking about? Are we talking about the bill now before the committee? Certainly that is what we are talking about.

**An hon. Member:** We are talking about subclause (f).

**Mr. Brand:** If the minister is not listening closely I will again bring him up to date regarding the point of order he raised. He pointed out that we must relate subclauses (d) and (f). He said that, and I think the chairman will bear me out. In his previous arguments on subclause (d), as well as in his point of order on subclause (f), he advised the Chair that the amendments were out of order because they expanded the definition.

I merely point out that he is on record in the house as saying that in fact no extra expenditure of money would be involved. I am sure the minister will not object if I quote his own words as recorded on page 9107 of *Hansard* of October 25. I would say that was a good day in the house. The minister was referring to the Alberta plan which he said was not good enough. He said:

—but I want to illustrate the argument that this approach will not provide medical care for persons who need it in the kind of approach that is contemplated.

A few lines before he said the same thing when talking about health care. He is equating the two. Also on the same page he said:

That is why we are advocating a universal system. It is not for ideological reasons, not, as has been suggested, because we are in favour of compulsion, but because it is the only system that will bring health care within the reach of all the people. And it will bring health care within the reach of all the people without the spectre of compulsion, so frequently raised in this debate and so demonstrably proven a red herring.

[Mr. Brand.]

It seems that there are quite a few red herrings here. The minister has been imputing them to every hon. member who has spoken on the subject.

One paragraph farther down the same page the minister said, speaking about health care:

I argue that the partial plan proposal put forward by the official opposition is unacceptable, not on ideological grounds, but because it will not reach the objective of providing medical care for those who need it most.

In other words, the minister merely rephrased what he said a few minutes before regarding health care. How can the minister in all honesty stand before the committee and claim that there is a difference between health care and medical care for Canadians or that the definition of a medical practitioner should be narrowed down? How can he say that we are going to spend more money when he himself pointed out that actually we are not going to spend any more money, that we will just be spending \$80 million and anything above this sum will be covered by the Canada Assistance Plan? I can quote him on that.

With regard to the point of order raised by the minister, I do not believe the amendment is out of order on this ground. We will not be spending extra money on this basis. The minister pointed out that health care and medical care are one and the same. He defined health care and spelled it out as being medical, surgical, obstetrical, optical and so on. In view of this I contend that the amendment is in order and should be accepted by the committee.

**The Deputy Chairman:** The Chair wishes to bring to the attention of the committee citation 397 of Beauchesne's fourth edition which appears on page 282 and reads as follows:

Amendments must be made in the order of the lines of a clause. If the latter part of a clause is amended, it is not competent for a member to move to amend an earlier or antecedent part of the same clause. But if an amendment to the latter part of a clause is withdrawn then it is competent to propose one to an earlier part.

In view of this citation may I suggest to the committee that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Simcoe East to subclause (f) be allowed to stand so that the proceedings may not prejudice subclause (d), that the committee proceed to the consideration of the remaining subclauses of clause 2, and that when consideration of the remaining subclauses is concluded we revert to subclause (d) and subsequently to subclause (f). Is the committee agreed to proceedings in this manner?