

highest proficiency with respect to its ability to get a patient transferred from a high-cost hospital bed to one which will serve his purpose? Are patients being held too long in hospital areas which lack the necessary facilities or manpower?

Has there been sufficient investigation of surgical procedures? Is a physical condition found, for example gallstones, in a patient who complains of gastric distress, and is it found upon removal of the gallbladder and gallstones that the patient continues to suffer gastric distress caused by a hiatus hernia or other malfunction? Patients in older age groups often suffer from two or three diseases, one or all of which could be responsible for their discomfort, all of which makes for longer procedures after the patient has been actively and successfully treated.

When patients are ready to be moved, how quickly are we able to get them into extended care beds where costs are one-quarter of the costs of an active treatment bed? If the patient has his own home, is adequate home care being provided for at least seven days per week? One nurse should be able to call on five patients a day. If this scheme is to be made more useful, it must be on a seven days a week basis because sickness never occurs on the basis of a five-day week. Health care costs have increased by leaps and bounds. Medicare was forced on Ontario and now the federal government wants to run away from its share. Hon. members will recall what happened in the province of Ontario. They had a good health care scheme there covering 25 per cent of the people who were having trouble meeting costs. Sixty-five per cent were covered by their own plans through their own insurance taken out either in groups or as individuals.

I wonder what is being done in the field of alcoholism, tobacco addiction and the limitation of preventable accidents, especially car accidents occurring on suicide strips. Seat-belt legislation and speed traps are only band-aid remedies. Some four-lane highways are a permanent danger to motorists because they are not marked with barriers or dividing lines: they just have painted signs on them which are useless, especially in winter when they are often invisible. This is the case on trans-Canada highways.

Then we must reckon with the careless spending of money on bilingualism, an issue which has been blown out of all proportion by politicians. The former minister of finance, John Turner, speaking to the Canadian Club in Toronto put this in perspective when he said the Official Languages Act established the right of every Canadian to deal with the federal government and its agencies in either the French or the English language. The brunt of the responsibility falls, of course, on the national capital region and other areas where there are French or English minorities. The legislation in no way imposes bilingualism on the country, nor does it oblige any Canadian to speak the other official language. But it does allow an individual to approach the government in the language he knows and relieves him of the necessity of learning the other official language, thus allowing more people to remain unilingual.

### *Restraint of Government Expenditures*

What did the government do? It decided to change the federal civil service and make it bilingual overnight. Far fewer positions need bilingual occupants than the politicians decided was necessary. In other words, positions were created which were not needed as far as dealing with the public is concerned. Older civil servants with just five or six years to go before retirement were sent to Quebec for one-year immersion courses in the second language, only to find on their return to the job that they rarely used the second language. This cost \$80,000 per year per person. What a tremendous waste of money when people are trying to struggle along to buy a home, raise a family or save a little money. In simple words, the government just wasted money like a drunken sailor. It failed to explain the legislation. Instead, the Official Languages Act was taken for granted as the law of the land. Surely any politician should know that you cannot legislate language or morality. It takes more; it takes a lot of facts to prove to and to persuade people that this would give people a better country and in the long run would help the people and their families.

• (1640)

The government should find out that all those not concerned with bilingualism are not bigots. I am sure that both English Canadians and French Canadians are equally as proud of their country and proud to be Canadians. They are mad and upset that the government has spent millions of their dollars and accomplished little except to upset everyone in the country as a whole as well as adding to the tax burden of every Canadian.

The same thing applies to industry. Government taxation to meet some of the things which have proven to be so foolish and so futile has helped price the manufactured article out of competition in the world markets. Not only has this occurred, but the working-man must also pay more for the articles he buys. He is taxed more than he should be, and he finds that he needs more money, which in turn increases the cost of a manufactured article. Just recently I toured a local factory where they produce articles from start to finish. I then looked at its financial records and found out why it was having trouble selling its products. Other firms in competition with them were buying parts from Hong Kong, Japan, Taiwan, and so on, and assembling them in factories in Canada, thus discharging many employees and adding to the high unemployment rolls.

Today, governments in Canada at all levels are taking approximately 50 per cent of the gross national product. Have we got into the position that state control is now nearly a fact? Would the government please get off our backs, lower its take of the gross national product and allow people to use their incentives and skills so that they may progress in a satisfactory manner? Do we really want a society where priorities, policies and operating methods of all our institutions and organizations will be subject to a political process? Free societies, surely, must control and decentralize the use of power. Potential for disaster is always a result of too much power. It becomes concentrated in one sector of society—the government.