

Medical Care Act

tion here, as in so many other cases, they have followed the course they plotted for themselves before even proposing consultation.

What about motivation; I have wondered about that. I have wondered a lot about the motivation of the government which seems determined, even motivated, to pit one part of Canada—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member again, but the hon. member is definitely not speaking on the bill.

An hon. Member: Oh, but he is.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Madam Speaker, I find it difficult to follow this ruling as I am merely citing examples in which the government claims to be doing one thing yet is doing another.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): With all due respect, it claims to have consulted with the provinces on medicare and then it just tears up the consultation and acts. It is quite obvious to us now that the government knew beforehand how it was going to act. Why bother going through the charade of consultation?

I should have thought in this country of ours which has such variety the government in all sincerity would have consulted and obtained a consensus, but not this government. What is the great problem? If I appear to be wandering into other fields, Madam Speaker, it is merely to show that this is not just in the area of medicare, but in all other areas where the government follows this same practice.

An hon. Member: It is a course of conduct.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I should like with your permission to go back to Edmund Burke, and again the Edmund Burke that so few people quote. Government and legislation, he said to the people of Bristol 200 years ago, and his words are still true, are matters of reason and judgment and not of inclination, but what sort of reason is that in which determination precedes discussion and in which one set of men deliberate while another decides? While ministers are talking, the Prime Minister is deciding exactly what he is going to do, and that is consultation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: That's a leader for you.

Mrs. Holt: Your leader hasn't been here for a couple of days.

An hon. Member: You want to be thankful about that, Simma.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Here we are by pre-determination and farcical consultation under which the government acts. Why has the government decided to act divisively in this case and in so many instances, even on the matter of the death penalty which will come before us? The government does not consult the Canadian people, otherwise there would be no Bill C-83 or C-84. The government decides to act counter to what it ought to know the

[Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich).]

Canadian people need and want. This is a case in point today.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Trudeau times are tough times.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: You were raised in a tobacco patch.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I am almost afraid to guess why the government acts in this way. I leave it open because to look too carefully into that grinning maw could produce nightmarish results.

Motives there must be, but for what purpose does the federal government want to antagonize all provincial governments, as it is clearly doing by introducing this measure and by announcing its withdrawal from the scheme in a budget statement, even after certain assurances had been given to provincial ministers that further consultations on the matter could be expected? Then came the bombshell of June 23, 1975, and the bill now before us. Is this an application of the divide and rule principle? If it is, it is strange now because I cannot imagine one single provincial government that is not allied in the assault with every other provincial government to oppose the federal government on its present plans. It may be dividing the federal government from the provincial governments, but is it certainly not dividing the provincial governments among themselves. This then seems to be confrontation, confusion, and antagonism leading to chaos. The government seems to thrive on this procedure.

Why would it not be better to have honest discussion, an open exchange of views, a search for concession, co-operation, and emergent order arising from consensus? The Canadian people have reason to ask themselves these questions. Surely in a country like Canada this is what we need, and it is to an opportunity to attain that blissful state that the present amendment is directed. I therefore support it and urge the government to reassess its stand during the six months' period which acceptance of this particular amendment would provide.

● (1550)

There are several other questions which can be asked. I have dealt only with the basic elements of the matter. Where are the provinces to find the funds to supply the services for which high expectations have been built? Are they to find them through provincial taxation? In the present circumstances of inflation the provinces have only limited taxation capabilities. Can we ensure, given provincial inequalities in respect of fiscal capacities, that even if they could raise the funds that we would have equal medical service for all Canadians which this plan originally was intended to provide. We cannot give this assurance. One of these days soon hon. members opposite perhaps will move to another province where they will require medical care and where they may find that they will not receive as much care as they did.

An hon. Member: Let us hope it will be very soon.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I fear that there will be a deterioration in the quality of health services and in the uniformity of health services across the country with