

thing as an Official Opposition. There is only one opposition, and other parties. It is a concept that we always say the Official Opposition and the other opposition. There is in the British parliamentary system only one opposition, it is Her Royal Majesty's Loyal Opposition; the others are simply parties.

They have chosen to attack only Liberals. As we say in law "face value". It is, I regret to say, almost ridiculous. It is like everybody else, the three NDP parties, as my colleague said, were perfection on earth. Mr. McKenna in New Brunswick and M. Bourassa in Quebec and, as far as Newfoundland is concerned I will pass, no comment.

[*Translation*]

Finally I would like to say that Quebec is certainly not a novice at health care administration. The minister and the cabinet are doing everything they can to have the best health care system in the world.

[*English*]

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, I understand that you found the amendment of the member from Eglinton in order, which means that all the words after the word "system" are deleted.

Can you explain to me whether that means it would be in order to discuss the particular policies and practices and statements of particular provincial governments or provincial officials, or would it not be in order?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I find no problem with that. I think that is relevant.

Do you have another point of order?

Mr. Heap: One further clarification.

The objection being made by some members of the Liberal group was that we should not be talking about certain premiers and their statements, and so on. I had supposed that the purpose intended by the amendment, which you have accepted, was to rule those out of order. Therefore, I thought it would perhaps be in the same way out of order to introduce criticism of people who had made that criticism.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will watch the debate very carefully, and if I feel that members are stepping out of line I will call them back to relevancy.

Supply

If the hon. member for Saint-Denis would come to a conclusion, please.

Mr. Prud'homme: I will come to a conclusion, and I always like listening to my dear esteemed colleague from Toronto.

It is only a comment I was making for the true meaning and intention of what was put to us for discussion. The true meaning of what was in front of us for discussion has been put aside by Mr. Speaker as a result of our amendment. So I will bow to that and be more relevant.

I can say that this House expresses its concern at the threat to Canada's health care system. People always like to do some Quebec bashing. I was only, as a good member of Parliament from Quebec, as you would expect from a member from Ontario, defending my government when it needs to be defended here. That is what I was trying to do.

Having said that, I will come back to that later on in my speech, most likely. But I wanted to say that I was extremely stimulated by the comment made by my colleague from Eglinton—Lawrence. That was why I spontaneously got up while I was preparing for an amendment that was already put forward by my colleague, and I thank him for that.

I shall come back during the debate, if time allows.

• (1620)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Volpe: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Saint-Denis. I feel obliged to accept his compliments and I hope that in future if something I say makes him want to take part in the debate, he will do so. That would make me quite happy.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North): Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for my hon. colleague. He talks about the fact that we should talk about the record. I would ask him to make a couple of comments about the record of the federal Liberal government when it was in office as it relates to the cutback in expenditures for health care. He is very careful to say that it is the Tories who have been cutting back on transfer payments.