## Medicare

house and what is happening in Canada. He was quoted in an article in the Globe and Mail of July 11, 1966, headed, "Crerar Urges Western Liberals To Back Away From Socialism."

It goes on to say that he would not attend a party conference in Saskatoon next month where policy would be developed for this year's national Liberal convention. He said:

I would tell them they are supposed to be a Liberal gathering. They should get back to the sound principles of Liberalism, and compulsion in areas in which it is the right of the individual to decide isn't one of them.

He then goes on to speak about another piece of legislation which the Liberal party brought in and which was supposed to benefit the elderly and the retired in Canada. He said:

The only objectionable feature of the Canada Pension Plan is that it is compulsory. How you can reconcile compulsion with Liberal philosophy is beyond me.

These are the words of a man who has spent a great many years both in this house and in the other place, a man who, in spite of his years, had an understanding of the conditions prevailing in this nation, a man who was interested, as we all are, in the welfare of all Canadians.

We have an amendment before us proposed by my colleague, the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Rynard) which, if it were accepted, would make this piece of legislation more palatable to all of us in this house. First of all, it deals with the co-operation of the provinces. We all realize the importance in this great nation of working in unity with the municipal, provincial and federal governments. Unless we do that we cannot hope to bring in legislation for the good of all the people. Today three provinces have their own voluntary medical schemes because they realized the necessity of making available to their people a medical plan of their own choice. Most of the provinces have medical schemes for people on low incomes who do not have the means to look after themselves. These plans allow the people to choose the plan to which they wish to subscribe.

I was rather interested in Premier Johnson's statement that he was not going to have the middle class harassed by social legislation, or words to that effect. Who are the people affected by legislative programs of this type? It is the poor people, people on minimum incomes, those on very small or no

[Mr. Howe (Wellington-Huron).]

assistance. A medical care program does not mean anything to wealthy people because they have the means to look after themselves. It is the small storekeepers, the farmers, men working in the factories and professional men who are affected by this type of program.

Quite a number of the provinces feel that they cannot participate in a medical plan unless the federal government carries most of the load. Therefore it does not look as if this legislation will receive much co-operation from them.

The amendment also deals with a concept I have already mentioned, namely, the freedom of the individual to select his own plan. We have seen in this house governments who believed they could spend the people's money better than the people could themselves. I was interested to read a publication which we all received on our desks entitled "Industry", for June, 1966, published by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. I quote from an article headed "Call Back Yesterday".

The following editorial first appeared just ten years ago in the June, 1956, issue of "Industry" under the caption "Worth Pondering":-

At that time the minister of finance was Mr. Walter Harris. The article continues:

Mr. Walter Harris came up recently with a revealing statement and an interesting comment, both of which deserved a good deal more prominence than they got.

The statement: "One-third of the annual income of the Canadian people is taken away from them in the form of federal, provincial and municipal taxes"

The comment: "This is a situation worth pondering.'

There is another comment farther down which I should like to quote because it deals with the concept I mentioned earlier regarding the right which people should be given of choosing their own plan. It reads as follows:

The doctrine that governments can spend the people's money better than the people themselves is not a new one. But it remains highly fashionable. More so than ever.

Mr. Speaker, that was in 1956. You were not here then but we all remember how the front benches revelled in the surpluses which they were able to build up year after year by taxing the people for money to run the ordinary services of the country. This got through to the people and created the situation which we inherited in 1957, the tight money policy and increasing unemployment. The arrogant crew over there thought they could spend the people's money better than the people themincomes who are in most cases given free selves. Are not compulsion and insistence on