

would be today—35 million Americans did not benefit from any kind of health or hospital services. At least we in Canada extend coverage to one and all, rich or poor. And still the universality of the system and the way it is managed are such that it costs less in terms of our economy, 2 per cent less in 1980. I would not be surprised if I heard that the gap has since grown wider.

In the area of postsecondary education, one can very well refer to high costs, but those who have tried to gain admission to an American university, either Harvard, Columbia or those in California, realize what the fees mean for a student, while in Canada we have established a public and universal system which allows in fact any person with the necessary qualifications and the desire for education, access to university. However, governments should not be so restricted in their awareness of present necessities to believe that we could keep up the quality of those services by shifting the tax burden to the provinces and reducing the rate of growth of transfer payments by up to \$8 billion.

Mr. Speaker, if we analyze the decisions taken by this Government with respect to taxation since it came to power, we find that this concern about the deficit did not bear too hard on them when they granted a tax rebate to taxpayers who made huge profits on the sale of shares and real estate, or what we call capital gains.

Mr. Speaker, there was money for that, and for about the same period it involved nearly \$5 billion.

How is it that the federal Government had money to spend on such a large tax benefit to a very small number of people who are affluent enough to make investments that yield capital gains? How is it that the minister of Finance had money for that while, in the same breath, he was suggesting they have no money to maintain the contract that was in a way signed with the provinces?

They have money for tax benefits to the rich, but they have no money for hospital care, no money for medicare, no money for post-secondary education. But they have money for tax benefits to the most affluent in our society.

In that context, it is my view that Bill C-96 is absolutely unfair. It seems to me this Government has lopsided priorities. If at least they were consistent. Very often they have talked about the deficit, but if they were consistent, it seems to me they would follow one line and refrain from fiscal provisions that extend tax benefits to the most affluent in our society. If they have no money for universities and hospitals, then they should have none for the others either, since their deficit theology should apply in both cases.

Mr. Speaker, Bill C-96 will create havoc in the financial structure and balance of the Provinces. Bill C-96 will create havoc in the financial planning of universities, colleges and hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, certainly Bill C-96 also will have a negative impact either on consumers, users of health services or those

Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act

who avail themselves of university services. The impact of Bill C-96 will hit those people through increased tuition fees, increased costs for semi-private rooms, and perhaps certain provinces will have to introduce extra-billing.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, there are enough reasons for the Government to withdraw Bill C-96 and immediately undertake serious negotiations with the provinces in order that, if indeed financial circumstances are tight, they find ways to ensure that this tightening and the amendments can be agreed upon in consultation rather than by forging ahead unilaterally as they are doing, forcing provinces to find ways of funding by themselves post-secondary education.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the Government to put an end immediately to the discussion of this legislation and enter into negotiations with the Provinces in order that, as soon as the fiscal arrangements come to an end on March 31st, 1987, negotiations are under way on an alternative that would be more equitable, not only in terms of balanced provincial finance but also for universities, community colleges, hospitals and users of health services and post-secondary education.

• (1710)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Speaker: Before I recognize the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Orlikow) it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 66, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for London East (Mr. Jepson)—Abortion—Therapeutic abortion committee procedures—Death of Ottawa woman; the Hon. Member for Vancouver Kingsway (Mr. Waddell)—Atomic Energy Control Board—Appointment inquiry. b) Request for reconsideration; and the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier)—Public Service—Pensions—Government Position b) Inquiry if pensioners were represented during negotiations.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL FISCAL ARRANGEMENTS AND FEDERAL POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION AND HEALTH CONTRIBUTIONS ACT, 1977

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) that Bill C-96, an Act to amend the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Federal-Post