

Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act

billion give-away as a result of new capital gains provisions to our wealthiest citizens.

Mr. Scowen: That's b.s.

Mr. Tobin: If the Hon. Member believes it is b.s. then he should get on his feet. He should not sit and mumble behind his hands.

Mr. Scowen: I'm not mumbling.

Mr. Tobin: Your constituents sent you here to speak on their behalf in order to represent their views and interests, not to say behind your hand in a mumble: "b.s.". It is incredible that it takes a shotgun to wake up some of these people.

The hon. gentleman says that is b.s. The Premier of Ontario does not say it is b.s. He called it a breach of faith—that's b.f., not b.s. He also calls it something else. He says it is breaking a promise. The Minister of Finance for Quebec said that it is unfair to the provinces because they were counting on these amounts of money for the setting up of their programs. The Minister of Finance for New Brunswick, a good Conservative, said:

It is unreasonable for the federal Government to think that provinces which have taken difficult measures to deal with their own financial situation can also be expected to absorb part of the problem at the federal level.

Mr. Keer, another good Conservative and Minister of Finance for the Province of Nova Scotia, another fellow shooting b.s. according to my friend, said:

By cutting health and education spending, the federal Government is running the risk of creating two levels of health care and education in the country.

Mr. Vic Schrooder, the Minister of Finance for the Province of Manitoba, said that Mr. Wilson "made the wrong choices—the choices are basically to look after the people of the country or the corporations". He was referring to the tax breaks the federal Government has given business, and to the capital gains provision that matches precisely the amount of money that is being cut in education and health care.

We are taking money out of the pockets of the people in terms of health care and education and passing it over to the wealthiest individuals through the capital gains provisions instituted by the present administration.

Mr. Roger Hamel, another man shooting b.s., President of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, has urged the Government to spend more, not less, on universities. He said that the business community is increasingly concerned that the squeeze on post-secondary education funding will make it impossible for universities to meet the demand for research and development. The President of the Canadian Association of University Teachers is opposed to this measure, as is the President of the Social Science Federation of Canada, as is the Canadian Medical Society.

That is not b.s. These are not people looking for today's headlines. These are people concerned about the shape the country will have tomorrow. They are saying to Members opposite that any time they attempt to balance the books of the

nation by saying that to the young people—since that is who we attack when we see these Draconian measures imposed—that we have stopped moving forward as a country. They are saying that anytime we say to our young people that the Government has lost the will and, more important, the vision to invest in their future, and therefore the country's future, then we are moving backward. Anytime we say to Canadians, irrespective of where they live, that they are entitled to a first-class medical system which shall be approximately the same in every province, and then say that we can no longer provide that, that we do not believe it, then we have changed the definition of Canadian citizenship.

When the Prime Minister during the course of an election campaign makes a commitment to invest more in our education system and says that he will respect funding levels for health and education he should keep his word. That is the kind of country I want to live in. I want a Prime Minister who will speak to us from his heart and not from a Hollywood script. I want to live in a country that says we can be among the very best of the nations of the world in the evolution of new technologies and that our people will have the basic raw materials to compete with the very best in the world, not a country that says the cost of investing in our young people is a cost too high. I want a country and a Parliament in which Members will occasionally find the courage to stand on their feet and oppose legislation which they know is not in the best interests of their constituents, which does not reflect their views and, more important, which will take this country down the road to mediocrity, both in terms of health care and in education.

Thus I appeal to Members opposite: Let us hear your voices. If you have the courage of your convictions then stand on your feet and we will find out whether or not there is a rational defence to be made of this Bill. If you have not the courage of your convictions, if you have forgotten already amidst the glitter, the chandeliers, the glow of the marble that surrounds you in this place and the cocktail circuit that swept you away from the concerns of your constituents back home, then go away from here. Do not cast a vote to pass this measure which you have not the courage to defend.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there questions or comments? The Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway).

Mr. Redway: Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member and all his colleagues are aware, government Members have spoken many times in the past with respect to this Bill. The process that is going on here today is one of merely trying to filibuster the Bill.

I would like to put one single question to the Hon. Member. Is it more fair that the payments to the provinces from the federal Government for health care and post-secondary education be increased by 7 per cent when inflation is running at 12 per cent? That was the case when the former Liberal Government was in power, and the Hon. Member was a supporter of that Government. Is it fairer that these payments