

*Medicare*

that we will not have medicare in 1968. In fact we will not have medicare by 1970, not necessarily because we cannot train people, and not because we cannot find the help. We will not have medicare because the establishment, which really rules the Liberal party of this country, does not believe in it and does not want it, and all the hot air from all the young eagle-eyed reformers is not going to change that. But we will wait and we will listen, and we will hear what happens.

We can think about the uncomfortable position of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen). I extend him my deepest sympathy for the embarrassing position in which he finds himself. I can think back to how he introduced first reading of this bill, the eulogistic cries, the booming voice, the waving arms, introducing the greatest social measure in the history of Canada. Joy reigned supreme among the Liberal backbenchers. They thumped their desks and the house shook with the roar.

What a difference from his speech on second reading—sneaking into the house, making an apologetic, quiet restrained statement, slipping the bill before the house shamefaced and embarrassed. I can think of all the things the minister has said to us about medicare, and the firm commitment that it was going to go through. In the light of that, I think if he had any guts he would have resigned. If he had resigned he would have won the universal respect of the members of the house, and he would be well on his way to being the main contender for the leadership of his party, because he would have rallied around him all these so-called reformers.

But the minister did not do that. He swallowed the pill, and now we have this thing that is before us.

**Mr. Fairweather:** He would have had Andy Thompson with him.

**Mr. Scott (Danforth):** I am not sure that would be any great advantage at the moment.

The other minister we want to hear from is the Minister of Finance, and we are also entitled to hear from the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson). They should come into this debate and tell us why they are betraying their commitment to the Canadian public. After all, Mr. Speaker, it was the Prime Minister who made the commitment. He was the one who told Canadians they would have medicare by July 1, 1967. It was not the Minister

[Mr. Scott (Danforth).]

of National Health and Welfare who changed that; it was the Minister of Finance who changed it.

Therefore we are entitled to have both these gentlemen come into the house and explain why this change has been brought about—and I do not mean the nonsense we have heard about inflation, because the postponement is not an anti-inflationary thing. Neither do we want the story that they have to prove their good faith to the business community. The business community knows where this government stands and is not worried about that at all. We are entitled to a proper explanation why this great social change has been denied to the people of this country.

• (8:10 p.m.)

In a sense, Mr. Speaker, it is symptomatic of the Liberal party which always has posed as a party of great reform; yet, what kind of a Liberal party is it, what kind of a reform party is it when, whenever it thinks something has to be done about its so-called inflation, the two things that are affected are the national medical health scheme, and research and education aid? What a travesty of a reform party that is. But where business is concerned, that is a different matter. When they want to cut down the amount of money in the economy they let business prepay some \$350 million into the treasury. And then what do they do? They do not keep it; they are only going to hold it for 18 months and give it back to business with 5 per cent interest. That is a real progressive reform-minded party.

We saw again the great Liberal party in our discussions about the automobile trade parts agreement, where dislocation was brought about by government action, and where the people who paid for that were the workers. You bled their futures to pay for dislocation brought about by government trade policies. We are seeing this in the research field, where Canada is starving for research money. It is not just money these people want in the form of salary. Our country is starved for research in almost every conceivable field, and the great reformers are urging a cut-back in the name of inflation.

I think about hospital beds. When I came here in 1962 I, and most of the population, had been pleading that the government wake up to its responsibility in the field of hospital beds. We have been pointing out that it costs approximately \$30,000 to furnish a bed in our metropolitan centres, and we get \$5,500 from