

care costs while at the same time maintaining our high standards.

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in support of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) it is my intention to dwell on only a couple of the aspects of this measure. They are aspects which have been underlined by those who have preceded me who spoke of their failure to understand the attitude of the government in bringing forward legislation of this sort at this particular time.

Others who preceded me in the debate, particularly the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk), have gone over the history of this medical "come on". They spoke of how a universal medicare plan was thrust upon the provinces in 1968 by a federal government without any thought of permitting the provinces to determine how it was to be applied or to determine any of its principal characteristics.

In 1968 the provinces were offered the scheme on a take or leave it basis. Since the services, generally speaking, were needed, and since generally speaking the Canadian people felt they should have a general health care service across the country, and since the cost support base then proposed was very attractive, the whole scheme was accepted—on trust. I say on trust, Mr. Speaker, in the belief, presumably, that that trust would be lasting; that the trust in the Pearson government which made the proposal would endure in a successor government of the same ilk. How the provinces have been let down! That belief has been dashed. Now we have a successor government repudiating, reneging on an agreement made not ten years ago, only eight years ago, with the provincial governments.

For 20 years hospital care has been provided under an agreed 50-50 formula; for eight years medicare has also been supplied under a similar formula. They are universal schemes: no means test is needed; all treatments and semi-private facilities are totally covered.

As the minister rightly said in his opening statement, as a result of the Conservative inspired plan of 1958 for hospitalization, and the 1968 scheme taken on trust, developed by the Pearson government and foisted on the provinces, with ample dollops of financial icing as inducements to join, the net result is, by and large, that Canada has a good hospital care and medicare system, perhaps one of the best in the world.

Is the minister suggesting, through the introduction of the present bill, that all the infrastructure is in place and therefore the financial inducements, the financial sharing arrangements may be withdrawn? Is that what lies behind this motion? If it is, such an assumption is entirely wrong—it is wrong—wrong. What was once a medicare "come on" has become a medicare "cop out". On the strength of that cop out I should like to cop out too, and call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, would the amiable Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council

Adjournment Debate

(Mr. Blais) be able to advise the House what the business will be for tomorrow?

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I just knew the question was going to be asked. Tomorrow we are going to deal with Bill C-68, the same order of business as we are dealing with now. May I also take this opportunity to advise hon. members that there has been agreement that during private members' hour tomorrow we will deal with Bill C-264.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—REASON FOR DELAY IN STARTING SEARCH FOR MISSING FISHERMEN—POSSIBLE REASSESSMENT OF SEARCH AND RESCUE CAPABILITY

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, on February 24, as reported at page 11191 of *Hansard*, I directed a question to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) with respect to the air-sea rescue attempt to locate the missing fishing vessel *San Juan* which had been reported missing the previous Sunday.

What concerned me and prompted my question was the fact that the *San Juan* was officially reported missing at 7.50 p.m. on Sunday and it was not until 11.15 p.m. that night that the Canadian coastguard ship *Bartlett* in St. John's harbour responded to an all-ships alarm and commenced the search. Furthermore, it was not until noon of the following day, Monday, that search aircraft were dispatched from Halifax or Summerside, Prince Edward Island, to the scene which was 500 miles to the east.

I wanted the minister to tell the House, and particularly the people in my province, why it took so long to get this search under way. The minister's reply indicated that either he inadvertently misled the House or he had been misled. The information he gave to the House was not in accordance with the information that had been released by the air-sea rescue service in Halifax. Further, the information which came from the air-sea rescue centre in Halifax was at variance with information given by eye witnesses of this most tragic mishap.

● (2200)

This is the third fishing vessel to be lost off the east coast of Newfoundland since the beginning of this year, six people now having lost their lives. This dramatically and tragically emphasizes how inadequate is our air-sea rescue capability on Canada's east coast.

In Newfoundland, especially eastern Newfoundland, we depend on facilities 500 miles to the west, in Halifax and Summerside, Prince Edward Island. Our distance from these facilities means that there is a serious and critical time lag in getting a search and rescue operation under