

inces. It is my opinion that such a conference is the kind of forum at which the question of pharmacare costs should be raised. I believe that many members of this House as well as many Canadians in general recognize the problems and the benefits which may result from a universal pharmacare program. I am hopeful that the conference of health ministers will take this question into consideration very seriously.

In addition to the forthcoming conference of health ministers, a further conference has been arranged to consider the Canada Assistance Plan and a whole series of welfare programs now operating in Canada, whether federally initiated or provincially applied and initiated. The one thing we have asked all the ministers to bear in mind during the initial discussions on welfare problems in Canada is that they should set aside for the time being questions of jurisdiction so that they can look at the whole problem and develop a formula which will benefit all Canadians. We could then zero in, determine who is responsible for what, and how the programs would be implemented. It is hoped that the result of such an approach would be to provide better welfare services in Canada, better programs which would reduce the amount of red tape, giving Canadians easier access to the kinds of assistance which are really necessary.

As has been mentioned many times in this House, the Speech from the Throne referred to the provision of a guaranteed annual income to those who are unable to work, and undertook to provide some other assistance to those who are able to work but who cannot find jobs. Certain of those who are in need in that group—and there are many of them; the handicapped, for example—could well be classified as unable to work, yet at the same time there may be many handicapped people who think it is in their interest to work, that it would be good for them if they did so. This is the kind of question which has to be resolved. I am hopeful that in the over-all review which will next take place during Easter week, the kinds of representations made here today will form part of that consideration.

**An hon. Member:** If you are hopeful, sit down and vote.

**Mr. Cafik:** The hon. member says that if I am hopeful I should sit down and vote. I have thought about that, Mr. Speaker, and it is my opinion that these are not questions which should receive consideration by the federal government alone. After all, we do live in a federal state, and in the cause of preserving national unity and co-operation with the provinces it is only fair and reasonable, and I believe it, is expected of us, that we negotiate these matters in a conciliatory way, allowing the provinces to participate with us, so that we will arrive at a position whereby a maximum number of people in Canada will derive benefit from the deliberations of the provincial governments and the federal government.

The resolution suggests, really, that we ought to give consideration to providing, at the federal level, assistance to those who are in need in respect of drug costs. That, Mr. Speaker, is already being done under the terms of the Canada Assistance Plan.

### *Bell Canada*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. The hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) on a point of order.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary has just indicated that in the resolution there is no reference to the provinces. I will not read the whole resolution, in consideration of the member, having only a few minutes left, but I refer to the resolution as follows

—the government should consider the advisability of taking steps, by itself for in co-operation with provincial authorities, to ensure that he is supplied with such drugs.

**Mr. Cafik:** I have already pointed out in respect of this question that the Canada Assistance Plan passed by parliament does in fact provide the vehicle for the achievement of the objectives of this particular motion.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. It being six o'clock, the hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business has expired. I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock tonight.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

## MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

### COMMUNICATIONS

#### BELL CANADA—RATE INCREASES

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Leave having been granted to the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) to move the adjournment of the House pursuant to Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the decision of the Canadian Transport Commission to grant Bell Telephone almost all the rate increases it requested in its application A and the need for the government to suspend the application of the decision immediately, and to consider rescinding it as unacceptable and contrary to the public interest.

Accordingly, the motion is as follows: the hon. member for York South, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), moves:

That this House do now adjourn.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Reid) on a point of order.

**Mr. Reid:** Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions through the usual channels as to the procedure we might follow this evening. I believe it would be agreeable for the lead-off speakers from each party to have 15 minutes, for succeeding speakers to have 10 minutes and for the House