

Medicare

adopt and apply the theory we advocate, the Cr ditiste theory. But I said to the two colleagues who were with me in Iran, that it could not be done there because there is a production problem, and before that production problem can be solved, there is an education problem to be tackled. And when that education problem will have been understood by my friends of the N.D.P., C.C.F. and P.S.D., they will understand how good it is to live in Canada, how it would be possible to guarantee to every Canadian citizen, not only medicare but also security and liberty, because Canada can do it.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I said a while ago that this bill really does not make sense. Now, if that is the type of legislation the N.D.P. and C.C.F. members still want to move, they are wasting their time. We cannot make head or tail of it, because the bill is meaningless. The bill provides for provincial plans. I wonder whether the member can really grasp the difference between the bill as it stands now and plans that will be implemented in the provinces. That is what the members of the N.D.P., P.S.D. and C.C.F. forgot to tell the House of Commons. And that is why we of the Ralliement Cr ditiste support the amendment of the hon. member for Sherbrooke. I will tell the minister—who is animatedly talking with another member when he should be listening to me—because I do not want him to misinterpret the amendment moved by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, that we want the same rights for every province. If Bill No. C-227 goes through, and if three, four or five provinces still do not have any specific medicare plan, what will the federal government do with those funds? Did the minister tell us about that?

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. member for Villeneuve tell me on what basis fiscal compensation will then be offered to the provinces, which do not have a plan?

Mr. Caouette: According to the basis suggested in the Bill, 50 per cent of the costs incurred, is that it?

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): There is none.

Mr. Caouette: There is not, but that is precisely the point. The proposal contained in Bill No. C-227, provides for a contribution to medicare in a province, any province. But, under such circumstances, to refund any money to a province, its plan will have to be familiar. As long as the minister is not

familiar with a province's particular program, how can he introduce a bill like this, if he is not sure of himself? He has not explained this in any way.

● (9:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, we will surely vote in favour of the amendment moved by the member for Sherbrooke, seconded by the member for Lapointe. I would have preferred a member of the Ralliement Cr ditiste to second it. But, nevertheless, the amendment is logical. Therefore, even though that is not the doing of the member for Lapointe, it is still logical.

Mr. Speaker, we will support the amendment as moved, requesting that the government make the necessary tax equalization payments, between now and 1972, to those provinces; whether it be Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta or British Columbia, it does not matter. However, I feel the minister is not specific, and does not explain clearly the objectives of the federal government, which are, in the final analysis, simply and merely payment of 50 per cent of the cost of the plan to each of the provinces. However, will the minister not agree with me that these funds will be collected from the provinces, before they are turned over to them? Will he not agree also that the government will have to collect more tax money to pay the federal administration which will figure out the payments to be made to the provinces? Will he not agree also that it would be easier to grant the provinces their rights in fiscal matters and direct taxation thus enabling them to administer their own medicare programs? Why turn to Ottawa to decide whether a patient may be treated in Dolbeau? Why should we have to come to Ottawa in a proportion of 50 per cent for permission to admit a patient in a Gasp  hospital?

Mr. Speaker, this is double taxation, double administration and double undertaking by the federal and provincial governments. It is so true that a meeting was held recently at a national level, that is between the provincial and federal governments. Why? To discuss the possibility of reducing personal income tax? Not at all. To discuss whether it belongs to the federal or any provincial government in Canada to pick the taxpayers' pockets; this was the subject discussed and nothing else. And this discussion will go on and on.

Mr. Speaker, joint federal-provincial plans—I will say as the minister a moment ago—are nothing but quibbling. Discussion about who is entitled to do what is a sheer waste of time.