

Our concern with full employment is to ensure that people are saved the humiliation and hardship of involuntary unemployment, and to prevent the great waste of real output that unemployment entails, perhaps \$8 billion or more in the period just past. In many of the other areas our fundamental concern is with how the output of the economy is distributed. Our fundamental concern is with equality of the human condition, and to this end we wish to see progress towards economic equality.

Did the Premier of Manitoba receive any co-operation from Ottawa; or was he ignored, as other premiers on other occasions have been ignored? Here, in dealing with unemployment, we have a glaring example of unilateral action by this government. Let me cite several other examples. If we have in Canada a system of universal hospital insurance, it is partly because the province of Saskatchewan, under the premiership of my colleague the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), started such a program. Also, if we have a national program it is because a Liberal government told the provinces it was willing to finance hospital insurance on a 50-50 basis.

Some years later, under another Liberal government headed by Mr. Pearson, this same proposal was put to the provinces in respect of medical insurance. Every province now has a system of universal, government-operated hospital and medical insurance. Until now 50 per cent of the cost of both programs has been borne by Ottawa. These programs, in many provinces—certainly the have-not provinces such as the Maritimes—would never have been started had it not been for the pressure applied, and I commend the government for doing this, to the provincial governments in respect of entering this kind of a program.

**Mr. Drury:** That is co-operation.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Exactly. I will come to that in a moment. What has happened? The cost of operating hospitals and a medical insurance plan has been accelerated. Costs have been going up by about 14 per cent per year. Suddenly the co-operation which my friend the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) referred to, the consultation and discussions which the federal government had carried on with the provinces, disappeared. The minister can shake his head, but the ministers of health and the ministers of finance of the provinces know the real facts.

Suddenly the provinces received a proposal from this minister saying that the period in which Ottawa would pick up 50 per cent of the cost of hospitalization and medical insurance had expired. Suddenly they are told that in the new negotiations Ottawa is prepared to agree only to increases in its contribution based upon the increase in the gross national product. We are speaking now of an increase of 6 per cent or 7 per cent a year. What happened to the co-operation of which the President of the Treasury Board speaks? It has gone.

• (2110)

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the President of the Treasury Board that the provincial ministers of finance and ministers of health are just as concerned, or more concerned, than he is about the increase in cost. They want to find ways of slowing up or stopping these increases. Some of them have been proposing that the government's schemes

#### *Federal-Provincial Relations*

should not simply cover payment of costs for treatment of acute cases in general hospitals but should cover nursing homes, rehabilitation hospitals and other forms of alternative care.

They want to work this out in co-operation with Ottawa, but Ottawa says, "Oh, no. We are telling you that we are only going to increase our contributions in the very near future by an increase in the gross national product," which is approximately half the annual increase of the cost of hospital and medical insurance. That is the kind of co-operation which Ottawa is proposing to the provinces.

Let us look at the whole program of paying for post-secondary education. There has been an explosion in the number of young people who finish high school and go into our universities, colleges, community colleges and technical institutes. That is good; we need much better educated people than we have had in the past. But the costs have been growing at a fantastic rate. This year, Ottawa estimates that it will be paying to the provinces, as its 50 per cent share of the cost of post-secondary education, in the neighbourhood of \$534 million. That is a sharp increase over last year and the year before.

Again, the provinces are just as concerned about the rapidly escalating cost of post-secondary education as is the President of the Treasury Board. I am 99 per cent certain that the cost of education in every province in Canada is now higher than the total budgets of these provinces, 15 or 20 years ago. The provinces would be almost as stupid as the President of the Treasury Board if they did not realize that suddenly, in the last couple of years, a university degree is not an automatic guarantee of a job. Suddenly they begin to realize that if you have a BA, a BSc. or a Bachelor of Education you do not necessarily find a job. Suddenly they begin to realize, as they should and as Ottawa should, that we should be taking a good, hard look at the whole question of post-secondary education. Therefore, in the province of Ontario there is a commission, formerly headed by Professor Wright, studying the question of post-secondary education, and in Manitoba there is a task force headed by Michael Oliver, the new president of Carleton University, studying the question of post-secondary education. In other provinces, similar studies are being undertaken, and so they should.

But before these studies have been completed—and they are just beginning—before the findings have been digested, before recommendations have been made, before the provinces can possibly know what they will have to face in the next 10 or 20 years in the field of post-secondary education and what they can do, if anything, to arrest the spiralling cost of post-secondary education, again you have a unilateral decision of the federal government to cut back on the amount of money and on the percentage of the cost of post-secondary education which they have been paying until now.

I say that in these three fields—unemployment, health services both hospital and medical, and post-secondary education—what we have had in the last three years is a hardening on the part of the federal government. Unilateral decisions have been taken, some of them announced and some of them just implied—I presume, to be announced later; probably after the next federal election—that Ottawa is either getting out of shared-cost pro-