

accurate count, but I believe there are approximately 200 lawyers on Parliament Hill, taking in both the House of Commons and the Senate.

**Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West):** You can never have too much of a good thing!

**Hon. Mr. Brooks:** That is taking in everybody!

**Hon. Mr. Phillips:** I notice that many of these are ardent supporters of medicare and, in fact, some of them even go so far as to go along with the idea that it is a sort of cardinal sin for a medical man to charge a patient for services rendered. I would like to suggest that these people now take the opportunity of volunteering to provide free legal aid for all those who need it. This is the golden opportunity for the members of the legal profession. Their numbers are representative from Newfoundland to Vancouver.

**Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West):** This may be a *non sequitur*, but we now have it.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** We have been doing this for the last 30 years.

**Hon. Mr. Phillips:** We will have to publicize that a little more, because not many people are aware of it.

**Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West):** You can get a lot of free legal advice here.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** We will send you bills from now on.

**Hon. Mr. Phillips:** I get enough bills now—and I do not mean those we consider in the house.

In my remarks I want to make clear at the outset that I have no basic objection to the principle of the bill, but I do have certain disagreements in respect of the planning of it, which I will discuss for a few minutes.

The bill I think was prepared in haste. I understand that in 1919 medicare was part of the platform of the Liberal party. That was before I was born. I called the library to obtain a history of the Liberal party, and was referred to one written by Mr. Pickersgill. That left me with some doubts, so I decided to inquire of the more senior members of this chamber. I asked Senator Rattenbury if that was the case, and he, in turn, referred me to Senator Davies who told me that he has a distinct recollection of medicare being in the 1919 program.

**Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West):** You should have asked the honourable senator from Carleton (Hon. Mr. O'Leary).

**Hon. Mr. Phillips:** I can recall when Mackenzie King revived the matter again in 1937, and I remember my father making his usual complimentary remarks about Mackenzie King and medicare at that time.

In 1945 there was a great movement on for medicare in Canada. This, I think, was associated with the "from the cradle to the grave" coverage of the Labour government in Great Britain at the time. This did not come about because there was disagreement with the provinces. I believe it was a good thing, because the extreme socialism in England then, in my opinion, had a great deal to do with that country's difficulties today.

Canada, on the other hand, proceeded more slowly and on a somewhat different pattern. Firstly, we had the national health grants, then hospital insurance, and now we have medicare. We are all sort of bedded in a patchwork quilt of socialism, and a number of politicians keep reminding the people that these benefits are free. I dispute that fact, and I would like to illustrate my point by this reference to hospital insurance. Through the Canadian Dental Association we had a hospital insurance policy which cost \$48 a year for family coverage. Admittedly, the first \$25 was deductible—that is, it was paid by the patient—but that insurance coverage provided private room accommodation. Hospital insurance came into effect, and in the province in which I live we paid a premium of \$48 a year, in addition to which the federal Government paid about 60 per cent of the cost of the program in that particular province, and we went from private room accommodation down to ward accommodation. This illustrates clearly, I think, the fallacy of believing that these benefits are free and cheaper when operated by a government agency. The socialists continue to advocate more and more social measures on the basis that they are free.

In case some honourable members opposite think I am being partisan, I will say here that although I think the Liberal party has a patent on most political sins, it has not exclusive use of them all. Those of us who are proud to call ourselves Conservatives must admit that our party commits a few sins along this line too.

We have all become familiar with Stanley Knowles' setting himself above God with his socialistic blessings, but I sometimes wonder whether the present Minister of National