

Economic control is present whenever any agency, government or private, becomes the sole buyer and seller of medical services or any other service in the community. Government control which must exist over any "free" service carries with it a real danger to the freedom of those providing the service. For example, if the legal profession were socialized—God forbid—who would represent the individual against the state? Or if citizens enamoured of the slogan "Cleanliness is next to Godliness" advocated "free" plumbing as a right, would the guilds and unions agree to the principle of economic control by the state, to the principle of compulsory arbitration, or to the principle of the state having power to legislate its own idea of a fair wage? Are not the advocates of "free" services with government control and compulsory arbitration only advocates of such measures when control and compulsory arbitration are applied to others?

Free men and institutions have the right to place a value on their labour and services. These freedoms are endangered when the state promises to the people the "free" services of others in the face of the expressed opposition of those who would provide the services.

There is general agreement that free essential services should be provided for the deserving needy, and it would seem more reasonable to grant more generous benefits to those in need than to grant equal benefits to all regardless of need. Everyone is concerned for those with real needs—that is a doctor's life—but there is a growing feeling we are acting unwisely to the extent that we are actually using the federal treasury to encourage and reward laziness and malingering.

The concept of medical care as a right, and the relationship of this concept to basic rights and freedoms, desire careful analysis. The advocates of the welfare state, and socialized medicine in particular, have recently adopted the slogan "Medical Care as a Right," and are already demanding this new "right."

What are the implications and possible consequences if this demand is accepted as an established right? This concept of "medical care as a right" must be examined in the light of the postulates of right and duty arising from the philosophy and laws of western democracy.

A curious paradox of some contemporary social philosophy is the idea that a man should spend what he earns for his pleasures rather than for what he needs. It is appropriate, so this reasoning goes, that he should buy a television set, a vacation in Florida, or an

outboard motor boat, because these are cardinal rights. But, for something that he really needs, such as his life or his health, or the life of his child, someone else should pay. This may be the government, his employer, his union, his great aunt, or anyone else who can be cajoled or coerced into paying the price for him. If no one else will pay for it, then the doctor should serve him for nothing. This is the philosophy of the child whose needs should be met by his parents, but whose Christmas money or earnings for sweeping the front porch should be spent for his personal pleasures. This may be acceptable for the child of an indulgent parent, but it is not appropriate for a free man in a free society.

It is fairly obvious that the government believes that the payment for the provision of medical care should be a tax-supported right for every Canadian. It would also appear that they hold that when one purchases a medical care insurance policy they should not be provided with a copy of that policy unless they purchase it from the Queen's Printer, and employ a lawyer to interpret it for them. The benefits provided in the policy should not be dictated by sound insurance or economic principles, but should be subject to the whims of political expediency.

If one holds to the foregoing, then this is good legislation. If, however, one holds as I do that the Government's interest in medicine is not, and never has been, medical but was, and is, political, designed to extend a greater degree of control over the individual and to extend socialism by taxation, then it is bad legislation.

As the Canadian public has accepted the above-mentioned principles as applied to the hospitalization plans for some years, it is doubtful if they will object to this act until after it is passed and the necessary taxes levied.

Numerous supposed rights are based more on imagination and emotion than on fact. In general, those who contribute nothing to the values and freedoms of society have very small rights to its protection.

The Canadian Bill of Rights defines the rights of the citizen against those of the State in accordance with democratic philosophy. I hasten to bring to your attention, and emphasize some basic economic truths—not theories or fanciful crudities. In evaluating the socialistic welfare state it might be timely to reflect on a few basic economic truths which have been proved many times in the course of history. The first is: Governments cannot give to the people what they do not first take