

*Medicare*

bills paid, and I want mine paid. However, as members of parliament, and I include members opposite, we have a higher responsibility than to just sit back and say that we all want medicare; we all want our bills paid. We have to protect some of the basic, constitutional rights of the people. In spite of this, we have this passive acquiescence opposite on so many constitutional problems, and this has caused problems within that party. This will be taken as a precedent in the future in connection with a field that is as basic as education.

A future government is going to look at this medicare bill, and will take the lack of a constitutional stand as a guide line. There will not be too many members who will be able to stand up and say, "This is a very bad thing because it cuts into provincial jurisdiction, so we really should complain." The members of the government of that day will then be able to say: You sat silent on medicare which covers a fundamental provincial responsibility. This should be a provincial problem because the ability of the people of a province to handle this basic problem of human need varies from province to province. The Minister of National Health and Welfare knows this better than anyone else. My province cannot provide the services that Ontario can provide. Perhaps with federal guidance, federal co-operation and consultation, we can get a good plan that will work across the board. However, we cannot have it forced down our throats.

We did not have hospital insurance forced down our throats. Many members opposite were not in the house when that bill came forward. I know that right hon. Mr. St. Laurent was a political scientist, and many years ago there was a formula on these things. This is all being swept away. I spoke about health insurance, and that involved another government in another day. I come back to another field within the jurisdiction of health and welfare, and it represents a complete contradiction of this phrase "co-operative federalism". This Madison avenue ballyhoo has given that phrase a fine sound, but what does it mean? Does it refer to what happened at the health resources fund conference? The health ministers of the provinces were to discuss their needs with the federal government, but then the day the conference was to meet there was an announcement in the newspaper that the federal government had \$500 million to be applied in a certain way. This announcement

was made before the health ministers from each province had discussed and defined their needs. Is this co-operative federalism? When the Prime Minister talked about this \$500 million, Mr. Speaker, I noticed it was to be spread over 15 years and there were to be special regional payments for the maritime provinces.

I know that at one time in Nova Scotia we thought, perhaps somewhat selfishly, that we were going to get the benefit of the \$20 million. We liked the sound of that. Once again, however, an announcement was made without consultation with the health ministers of the provinces, and we hear that in Newfoundland they are going to build a medical hospital and a medical education centre, and that in New Brunswick there is going to be a medical health centre to train doctors. We need those doctors, but we have an institution now in the maritimes which has been performing that service for the maritimes and the rest of Canada in a very admirable way. I do not believe the Minister of National Health and Welfare would object too much if I say that institution has provided doctors for this country and for the United States. We need more doctors, and we could utilize them in Nova Scotia. We could utilize this \$20 million in Nova Scotia; but this is a selfish point of view, and the fund could have been apportioned after there had been consultation. But no, Mr. Speaker, co-operative federalism means the answers beforehand and the dictation afterwards. That was certainly the case with the statement that was made about health resources.

• (9:00 p.m.)

I do not imagine I have disturbed too much the very able and amiable Minister of National Health and Welfare, though as far as this legislation is concerned he is more amiable than able. He is a man who is logical, and who before he came to the house devoted his attentions to an institution which also had some logical people inside it. This is why I am a little disturbed that the minister is acting in such an illogical way on a matter affecting provincial jurisdiction, and in an area where provincial members speak out every day for the people who want their bills paid.

We have a responsibility to the future and must be guided by the past. If the minister has been guided in this legislation by the action which was taken on health resources, then he is ignoring the past. He is ignoring Mackenzie King and Louis St. Laurent, two