

*Medical Care Act*

financing or Bill C-68, all that raises the question of our faith, our belief, our prouddness in our country or again in our regionalism, our chauvinism, all that which will prompt unilateral action, independently from the province. And at the end, Prime Minister Trudeau and his government will be astonished that this country's unity is jeopardized. The main problem is not bringing back the constitution in Canada, but starting to unite the country.

Mr. Speaker, I invite members of this government to review their positions concerning Bill C-68, I urge them, before second reading and referred of the bill to committee, to give us a formal and earnest assurance that the federal government's partners, the provincial governments, fully participate in and are in total agreement with this kind of distribution. If such were the case, if the government could tell us this evening that the provinces accept that kind of fiscal sharing, then as a Canadian I would easily join in passing Bill C-68.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like to move blindly. But this is exactly what the government are trying to make us do this evening with Bill C-68. They are asking us for a blank cheque. "Give us a blank cheque, so they ask, take unilateral action, and then we will complete negotiations with provinces."

Mr. Speaker, I am too Canadian and I believe too much in Canada to accept and take such a gamble.

**Mr. Roy (Laval):** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** The hon. member for Laval on a point of order.

**Mr. Roy (Laval):** Mr. Speaker I want to remind the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) that in the opinion of Liberals sitting here, from the province of Quebec as well as other parts of Canada, we have never called upon members of the Social Credit Party of Canada to express our views and we never needed them, be it about the Olympics or anything else, Mr. Speaker.

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** I recognize the hon. member for Lotbinière, but it is not on a point of order; it is on a point of debate.

[Translation]

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Roy) for whom I have much esteem still has not understood a word of what I said. I simply gave an example of the way in which as Canadians we part on specific subjects. I know full well that I am not a spokesman for the Liberal party, and God save me from ever being one! However, Mr. Speaker, I do know he would very much like to become a spokesman for the Social Credit Party but we do not agree on that either.

Mr. Speaker, had it not been for our friendship, the fact still remains that it is a typical example that I gave not out of malice. He knows I am right, he knows what I say is true. Mr. Speaker, I know he is just teasing me. The fact still remains that the principle which I emphasized is Canadian unity and this is too serious a subject to kid about it.

[English]

**Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, this is the second time I have had some opportunity to dwell on this bill and to discuss it in the House. I am pretty concerned about the attitude of the minister in introducing a bill which, quite frankly, if I were to employ legal terms would indicate that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) probably has some type of disorder best described as a fecalith in the Circle of Willis which is giving him a rather disturbed outlook on life. Having said that I think it is important to ask why the people to my left have asked for a six months' hoist.

Is it some type of legislative trick we see pulled here in the House of Commons on the government from time to time for one reason or another? Of course it is, but I think the very basic reason it has been introduced, the very reason there should be a six months' hoist, is to give an opportunity to the provinces to develop a proper dialogue with the government to sort out what can be reconstructed from the proposal introduced by the minister in this bill.

Certainly there is not a member from the opposition side at least who has spoken on this bill who has not referred to the fact that this is again an example of confrontation with the provinces. We are simply asking that the normal process of dialogue, or arbitration if you like, or debate, be introduced between the federal government and the provinces instead of this continuing confrontation with the provinces. It is no wonder the provinces and the public are becoming increasingly suspicious of the attitudes and actions of the government.

The government promises one thing and gives another. How long can this continue? How long does the government expect to continue this particular program? I think this whole damned process will grind to a halt in 1978 or, hopefully, sooner. I think when we speak about promises and priorities we must reflect for a moment on the examples.

I think it was the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson) who said that they were going to monitor the effect of the introduction of the 5 per cent or 6 per cent tax that was taken off building materials.

**An hon. Member:** What about medical care?

**Mr. Brisco:** Hang on; do not be impatient. I am making a point and I will get to it. The minister indicated that he intended to monitor building supply stores across Canada on a selective basis to make sure that this reduction was being passed on to the consumers. When he was asked a question about this he gave an evasive answer. We have never heard another word from the minister on the subject.

The same situation applies to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde). He took up the case of boots, shoes, and clothing, and when he responded to questions in the House he said that they were monitoring the effect in order to be sure that the consumer would not be ripped off. What has happened? The consumer is being ripped off.

What do we have in Bill C-68? We have the same vague promises which lead to an eventual cost to the consumer, How will that cost be passed along? It has already been