

*Medicare*

anything else. Since it is all right for Saskatchewan, what about the other provinces in Canada? Since taxes will be collected from all parts of the country, is it not reasonable to assume, if the funds are used for research, for the training of doctors, for the bringing back of teacher-scientists for training of ancillary personnel—and you could go on—that the government should allow the provinces this money to take care of the plans they do have?

I think it is iniquitous that there should be an idea that the government will take the money from them, and then say: "Either you do exactly as we say or we will not give you any money at all." I think this is wrong. I should like to take a look now at our amendment, to show why I support this amendment. In this I am sure I will be agreeing to a large degree with the remarks made by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr). The amendment, as set out at page 8618 of *Hansard* of October 13 reads as follows:

This house, while of the opinion that provision should be made for medical services to be available to all Canadians at an adequate level on a prepaid basis, is nevertheless of the further opinion that no legislation for the provision of insured medical care services in Canada will be satisfactory unless it:

(a) secures co-operation of the governments of the provinces of Canada;

I merely echo the words of my colleague for Ontario when I say that surely this is basic to any plan, any plan that will work in this country. Without this co-operation how is the government going to get portability. It must have the co-operation of the provinces and these provinces should have the opportunity now to discuss this with the minister and with the government in the long, long time before this will be made law by the present government. Then turning to paragraph (b):

(b) recognizes the principle of voluntary choice by the individual:

• (7:10 p.m.)

I think that is also basic. The minister has said, and I can quote him if he likes, that there is no problem in respect of choice. When I questioned him on July 12 in the house I asked him how we could have a voluntary choice for the physicians when their services are insured. After all, the government is insuring people against the cost of medical care, as its bill suggests—and I will discuss this in greater detail at the committee stage—but then it goes on to suggest that physicians' services will be insured. Any

physician who takes out somebody's appendix or tonsils, or in the case of some members of this house, a larynx—and that might be very beneficial to mankind—he is performing an insured service? In spite of this the government outside of this act. How could he do so when everything he does in his profession is an insured service? In spite of this the government calls this an insurance program, and I cannot understand that.

What are they insuring? Are they insuring people against the cost of medical care, as members of the N.D.P. have said, or are they insuring the doctors' services so that each and every doctor will come under the direct control of the provincial government of the province in which he carries on his profession, and the control of the federal government as well?

The minister said that every doctor will be free to practise outside this plan if he so desires. Let me point out that in the province of Saskatchewan doctors can practise outside that provincial medical plan because doctors' services are not insured. In Saskatchewan the people are insured against the cost of medical services. This is a point which I will discuss in greater detail at the committee stage.

A great deal has been said about the fact that we should recognize the principle of voluntary choice by an individual. We should recognize that principle in those provinces which feel that this is the kind of plan they want. In spite of my objections I will, like the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Starr), support this bill because I believe in its principle.

Paragraph (c) of the amendment states that no medical care service will be satisfactory unless it—

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

Let me read into the record two paragraphs from the summary which appears at the beginning of the Woods Gundy report, which is entitled "Medical Research in Canada; An Analysis of Immediate and Future Needs". The first paragraph begins:

Medical research is essential to the provision of high standards of medical education, health services and health care. This fact must be recognized in any programs aimed at broadening health services and raising health care standards in Canada. If these are to become objectives of public policy, provision must be made for expansion of medical education in Canada and this, in turn, necessitates a greatly expanded scale of medical research effort.