

Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act

1984 when he talked about what the Liberals were doing and what the present Government is now doing.

By the end of 1991, just to illustrate the total impact this measure will have on the provinces, Newfoundland is to lose \$128 million; Prince Edward Island is to lose \$27.5 million; Nova Scotia \$195 million; New Brunswick is to lose \$156.8 million; Quebec is to lose \$1,435.4 million; Ontario, my own province, is to lose \$2,014 million.

Mr. Redway: \$400 million more than last year.

Mr. Young: I am glad to hear my friend, the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway) mention that because in the Newspeak of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) and Conservative Members of the Government, they have tried to defend what the Government is doing. They said all they are trying to do is to moderate the transfer of money from the federal treasury to the provincial treasury.

They can use all the moderation they want in the language they use to describe what they are trying to do, but the fact is there will be a reduction of \$5 billion from the federal Treasury to the provincial governments over the next five years for health care delivery and post-secondary education purposes.

The Minister of Finance, when he was the Finance critic for the Official Opposition, called them cuts when the Liberals attempted to use the same type of *newspeak* terminology to excuse themselves from what they were doing. A \$5 billion cut over five years is a cut. By any other name it is a cut, a cut of \$5 billion—

Mr. Redway: It is \$90 billion more.

Mr. Young:—that will not be used for educational purposes for the young people, and it will not be used to provide good medical services to all Canadians on an equal basis, regardless of where they live. If you happen to live in Newfoundland and Labrador, you will be entitled to a lesser degree of medical services than you would be in a better off province. That is what the measure means. It is a cut of \$5 billion.

Mr. Redway: It is \$90 billion more.

Mr. Young: As I said before, the Minister of Finance properly described this when he was in Opposition as sheer hypocrisy. I see that my time is up. I thank Hon. Members for listening.

[Translation]

Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, I have prepared a few notes for another speech on Bill C-96, but considering the little time I have left and especially the outrageous comments we heard by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Crosbie), I would prefer to raise some of the points he made in his speech.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, you may have noticed, as all other Members of this House may have done, that when the

Minister of Justice rose to speak just now, he happened to be the very first Government Member and the first Minister to speak to this subject before the House.

The Bill was introduced in the House by the Parliamentary Secretary. I was there. I remember clearly it was the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Communications, the Hon. Member for Hamilton—Wentworth (Mr. Scott). There wasn't a single Minister who had the guts to rise in the House and introduce a Bill as sordid as this one. And now, after several days of debate, we see the Minister of Justice rise in the House and take ten minutes or so to make an outrageous speech, livened up with jokes that would be more appropriate in a zoo than in the serious debate we are having today.

The Minister started by explaining why the Bill was proposed in the House in the first place. According to him, it was to make up for the mistakes of the previous Government which had accumulated deficit after deficit. Well, my opinion is slightly different, and I would say that the Government has added to the deficit by introducing measures to suit its friends.

Mr. Speaker, the Government's decision to give people in a position to make capital gains in this country a lifetime exemption of up to \$500,000 will cost Canadian taxpayers, both rich and poor, something like \$4.5 billion between now and 1990. And I don't want to hear the excuse that payments to the provinces are only being cut back in an attempt to reduce a deficit that was accumulated by the previous Government, because I would say to the Government: Today, you give handouts to your friends, and you ask the little man, the average taxpayer and low-income Canadians to foot the bill.

Let us talk about the rescue operations for the two banks that went belly up in western Canada. When the Government came to the House begging for billions, it was to bail out people with deposits in excess of \$60,000, not ordinary people who were already covered under deposit insurance.

An Hon. Member: Ordinary Canadians.

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, the debt is shifted over to the provinces for payment, and this is one way of compensating for the gifts given by the Government to its friends, high income people. I could go on and on about this. I do not have much time left but before resuming my seat, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that the changes to the national energy policy — we all know this — will bring billions of dollars in profits to the multinationals whose first consideration is not to look after the needs of Canadians. Such are the real objectives of the Government across the aisle. It expects the provinces and individual Canadians who can hardly make ends meet to pay for its lavish gifts to its friends. That is the truth! When he spoke that is the truth the Minister of Justice should have told instead of clowning around.