

You cannot have it both ways, Madam Speaker. The premier of British Columbia cannot have it both ways and he does not know which way he is going to have it. His actions are going to mean more damage to health care and post-secondary education in British Columbia than we have ever had before.

He has tried every party so far. He has been a Liberal.

**Mr. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** He is a Liberal.

**Mr. Gardiner:** He is a Liberal. He has been a Socred. He is now. I do not know how he votes federally. He is suing his friends in the federal government.

**Mr. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** He didn't vote in the last election.

**Mr. Gardiner:** My friend says he did not even vote in the last federal election and who knows what further we can expect. What will the impact be? The impact of this legislation is going to be over \$3 billion worth of cuts to British Columbians. It makes a mockery of the attempts to develop the kind of post-secondary education system we need. We are hoping that legislation will be tabled this week in the provincial legislature to establish a university in Prince George to serve northern British Columbia. What kind of future does that university or other universities have when this government is cutting \$3 billion from post-secondary education and health in this country?

I asked the Secretary of State questions about the block funding formulas that we have, which of course the Liberals support. I asked him to lay to rest the fears that we have had that funds from this government for education and health are spent paving highways in British Columbia. I asked whether he has done any studies on this and whether he can tell me that I am wrong. He did not answer the question. He said we had to trust him.

Canadians have found out what has happened when they place their trust in this government at the ballot box. We have seen an attack on the very programs that we have had to fight to develop in this country. They are being whittled away by the Conservatives, usually with the support of the Liberal party. I think we should make any effort that we can make with regard to Bill C-69 to see that those changes do not come about. All they ask for in the legislation is that the provinces be given notice about implementing changes. That was one particular part of the the previous legislation. It is incredible that we have the same kind of government. The Liberals brought in that measure in the first place. They are encouraged by this legislation. We have got to change it, stop it and ensure that we develop the kind of education

### *Government Orders*

and health programs across this country that the legislation that we have brought in and supported will guarantee.

• (1630)

**Mr. Lee Richardson (Calgary Southeast):** Madam Speaker, we are going to come back to reality for a minute after that speech.

I would like to point out what Bill C-69 is. It was introduced in the House of Commons on March 15, 1990. Its purpose is to implement key aspects of the expenditure control program affecting statutory programs proposed in the February 20, 1990, budget by finance minister Wilson. Combined with the restraint initiatives announced in December, 1989, this plan will reduce government spending by an estimated \$3 billion in 1990-91 and by \$3.8 billion in 1991-92. The federal deficit is projected to decline—

**Mr. Milliken:** Madam Speaker, I know the hon. member is about to make a scintillating contribution to the debate; I just wish some of his cabinet colleagues were here to listen to him. This is—

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order. The hon. member raised the same subject as a point of order earlier and was told that this is not a point of order. I would appreciate that we would continue with debate.

**Mr. Richardson:** Madam Speaker, before I was so rudely interrupted by the lone Liberal in the House—the only one who sits here in the entire House, and he wants to rudely interrupt.

**Mr. Milliken:** I was very polite.

**Mr. Richardson:** As I was saying, the federal deficit is projected to decline from \$30.5 billion in 1990 to \$28.5 billion in 1990-91 and down to \$26.8 billion in 1991-92.

This bill affects four programs: the Canada Assistance Plan, the Canadian Exploration Incentive Program, the Established Programs Financing Arrangement and the Public Utilities Income Tax Transfer. First is a summary of the restraint initiatives.

One, the Canada Assistance Plan: The federal government pays provinces half the cost of eligible social assistance expenditures under the Canada Assistance