

*Medicare*

party who may happen to be in the legislature—I am not sure whether there are any—that they may be wiped out there too as in British Columbia—

**Mr. Haidasz:** They have one.

**Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** —if they insist on importing into the Saskatchewan medicare scheme the proposals contained in the Conservative amendment just defeated?

**Mr. Brand:** I am glad the hon. member asked me that question because I will point out to him now that already in the Saskatchewan plan we have many of the features of the Conservative amendment. If you like, I will go into them for you. I will go back to the amendment—

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I just want to clarify this situation. I am not sure whether the hon. member's words have helped me. Will he tell me whether he intends to vote against this bill when the question on second reading is called?

**Mr. Brand:** If the minister would read my remarks of the other day I think he would find an answer to that question, and perhaps if he listens a little further he will get the answer.

● (5:20 p.m.)

**Mr. MacEachen:** Yes or no. Are you?

**Mr. Brand:** I think if you look at *Hansard* of two days ago—

**Mr. Aiken:** Don't be anxious. We have 18 months.

**Mr. Brand:** That is right. I know that the minister is extremely anxious to have the bill put through but he is being stymied by members of his own party. So far as the first part of the amendment is concerned, having to do with securing the co-operation of the governments of the provinces of Canada, I suggest that the comment of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands would have no affect in respect of Saskatchewan. Then there is the second part—"recognizes the principle of voluntary choice by the individual". Yes, it does. It allows doctors in Saskatchewan to practice in or outside of the act. I have very grave doubts indeed that the bill before us now allows this because it insures the services of the doctors, whereas in the act under which Saskatchewan's medical plan operates it is the people who are insured

[Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

against the cost of illness. This is a different thing entirely. There is this freedom in Saskatchewan but I do not see it in the present bill.

Then clause (c) of the amendment is as follows:

makes adequate prior provision for sufficient medical research, the training of adequate numbers of doctors and other medical personnel;

I am sure that our representative in the legislature of Saskatchewan will be happy to suggest the training of more doctors. The other day I made a suggestion as to what we would use the money for which will be available under this bill, the \$11 million, \$14 million, or whatever it is going to be. I suggested that the way to use it is to set up medical research and other facilities in the province of Saskatchewan so that we can train more doctors. Clause (d) of the amendment says:

immediately provides for those persons who are unable, for financial reasons, to provide medical services for themselves.

As you know, there is provision for this in our province and there has been for many years, so I really do not know what the hon. member was talking about.

We believe we need the co-operation of the provinces. We must have it. When the minister speaks in ending the debate, perhaps he will tell me how we are going to have portability if we do not have all the provinces in the plan. If I should leave the province of Saskatchewan which now meets all the requirements, how could I take my coverage with me to the province of Quebec if they were not in the plan? How can you make it portable without having all the provinces in it?

**Mr. Aiken:** You can force them.

**Mr. Brand:** I am glad the hon. member mentioned that. I looked up some words in the dictionary just so that some of our friends in the New Democratic Party would understand what some of these things mean. I have taken these definitions from the Concise Oxford Dictionary. Compel: to bring about by force. Is this what the hon. member would have us do? Would he have us bring it about by force? Compulsion of course arises from this: to compel.

If I may go back, there was a discussion about what the Hall Commission report said concerning universal availability. When the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) referred to the press release put out by