

Medicare

Countries where such programs were established without preparation or adequate planning were faced with financial problems bordering on disaster. In England, the national health service was supposed to cost \$390 million per year. After one year, however, its cost exceeded \$1 billion. In 1960, it had reached almost \$2 billion.

In Sweden, the initial cost of compulsory insurance, forecast 14 years ago, went up by 500 per cent. In France, the social security deficit reaches the fantastic figure of 1 billion N.F. The plan for the modernization and increase of hospitals and research laboratories in France is 30 years late, due to a lack of funds. Out of 150,000 hospital beds, 140,000 were provided before 1940. At the Lariboisière hospital in Paris, there are only 13 showers—one for 71 beds—150 basins, 56 water closets—one for 17 beds.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are a few considerations which indicate the complexity of a medicare scheme and the minister or the government should prove that governments are now in a position, considering present and future economic and financial conditions, to meet such obligations. But no explanation has yet been given in that connection. Indeed, that is why provincial governments have been protesting so strongly and so bitterly in the last several months. As a matter of fact, eight provinces have demanded a revision of Bill C-227, not only as far as the principle is concerned but also the provisions, the priorities and the phases to establish.

Ontario and Alberta have objected to the criteria, to the four conditions required by Ottawa. Manitoba has also made reservations. The three maritime provinces which took part in the meeting asked for improvements to this legislation, Bill No. C-227.

Even Mr. Ross Thatcher premier of Saskatchewan, a province already enjoying a provincial plan, has asked for a review of the bill before us because important things were left out for instance, the administrative costs. The province of Ontario has requested a revision of Bill C-227 for several reasons which are reflected in the amendment moved by the Progressive Conservative party. And the province of Quebec, through the hon. Jean-Jacques Bertrand, said that it would never accept the condition imposed by Ottawa.

Such is the situation. That is the spirit in which we consider this bill which is refused or criticized by eight important provinces in our country. But in spite of those protests,

[Mr. Allard.]

those warnings, those anxieties, the government is going ahead. It continues to increase the pressure, the confusion and the disagreement between the central administration and the provinces.

Ottawa must be strong, and have a strong government which must crush all the provincial governments, without any regard for their aspirations, their administrative wisdom, their social and economic environment, the characteristics of the people living in those provinces whereas in 1867, the Canadian constitution entrusted all those regional and local matters, including health, to the provinces. This is the course followed by the present government.

I appreciate that this is not the first time I raise the question, somewhat like St. John the Baptist who was preaching in the wilderness. I will not stop as long as the people of the riding of Sherbrooke will send me as their representative in this house, to defend the rights of the provinces and of Canadian citizens, and to warn the federal government, which is Liberal at the present time, to stop its omnipotence, to stop poking its nose into fields of all kinds, especially in fields where it has no business.

The present government advocates a very vicious principle. Let them remember a statement by a great Liberal of the past, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who said that it was absolutely wrong and unacceptable that this Canadian government, in a well-conceived federalism, should levy taxes which through distribution to other governments, would be spent by them.

Fundamentally this is extremely vicious. And this statement, this idea of federalism originated in the mind of a great Liberal of days gone by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The present Liberal government is devoid of consideration, of tactfulness, in short its members have no idea of true federalism. We are in a constitutional chaos, Mr. Speaker, a chaos which must be denounced because it goes against the aspirations and the wishes of the provincial governments.

What will be the outcome if the present federal government continues to push its way around in all fields? We will have a unitarian system of government, because the provinces will withdraw. Is this what the present government wants? No, but it refuses to meet with the provinces again in order to reach an agreement concerning the different standards.

Mr. Speaker, some provinces have made a list of priorities. For some, health is the most