

*Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act*

enterprise and sound business practices. Perhaps that will convince them. Expenditures by the federal Government on health care and secondary education are not an expense, they are an investment which provides a good return for all levels of Government. It is an investment in our people from which the nation receives a tremendous return.

Keeping people healthy is not only civilized and humane, which may not appeal too strongly to the Conservatives, but, and this should impress my hon. friends opposite, it keeps them working and producing for the benefit of the nation as well as of themselves. There is less absenteeism and the workforce produces efficiently. They are healthy and remain so because of federal and provincial expenditures. If we keep them healthy and working, they pay taxes on their earnings. The more they work, the more income they have, the more taxes they pay to all levels of Government. Therefore, expenditures by the national treasury on health care and post-secondary education are self-liquidating. Governments at all levels recover more than they pay out because of an efficient, healthy, highly productive workforce whose health has been well protected. Those who are better educated and trained through our education system earn higher incomes and pay more taxes. That should satisfy my Conservative friends who rely on sound business principles.

Battles won do not necessarily stay won. It took decades to achieve a high standard of reasonable, equitable and equally distributed health care and secondary education. Yet it is gradually being lost, stifled, whittled away, and in the name of what? In the name of deficit reduction. Let me quote Mr. Justice Emmett Hall again from the same speech:

In the search for services heretofore regarded as essential, some of which may have to be reduced or abandoned, no one in his right mind would see health care as anywhere but at the top of any essential list ranking there with education, national defence, justice, transportation and the like.

So, let us compare what is proposed as between two essential services—health care and national defence.

As of now, the expenditures on health and higher education on the one hand and on defence on the other, are very similar. Health and education cash expenditures were \$8.6 billion in 1984-85, while defence—was \$8.9 billion.

For the coming five-year period, the federal expenditure for health and higher education will grow only 14 per cent while that on defence will expand by a whopping 41 per cent. Why not treat these two essentials alike for they are in a sense twins, two components of one national objective. National defence, as it is known today, is to protect against external invasion or harm to the citizens of Canada.

Health care is the internal protection for the same citizens of Canada.

One is as important and vital as the other. It is why Prime Minister Mulroney has rightly called health care a "sacred trust", so why not treat health and national defence alike. They can both be called "sacred trusts".

He closed by saying:

The defence of medicare requires the same priority as the defence of the nation—as I have said, the two are very alike. Let's treat them that way.

This is the message to carry to Ottawa.

I am only too proud to provide that message from Mr. Justice Emmett Hall for the benefit of my friends sitting opposite. The test of any decent and civilized society is how well and thoroughly it treats its old, sick, and young. Canada

was well on its way to being a world leader in passing that test. We are now well on the way to ranking 12th, 14th or 15th among industrialized nations in how well we treat our old, sick and young. There are nations less well off than we are which are doing it, and we should be ashamed of ourselves for even considering this kind of legislation. I hope my friends opposite will have a change of heart over the next few days.

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Mr. Speaker, it is very unwise for the Government to attempt to choke off this debate on a matter of great importance. We in the Opposition, although so few compared to the vast majority which the Government commands in this House—

**Mr. Berger:** Silent majority.

**Mr. Caccia:**—which is silent, regret very much that the Government would resort to such mean measures to muzzle Parliament. I will put to you graphically why we are so upset about this latest move. I would like to begin with your province, Mr. Speaker. The impact of this Bill on Alberta between now and 1992 will be such as to reduce the revenue of your provincial Government by \$773.1 million. That money would go to Alberta for health and education if this Bill is not passed. The net effect on the Province of Newfoundland is a reduction of \$187.7 million. For Prince Edward Island it is \$40.8 million; Nova Scotia, \$282.6 million; New Brunswick, \$228.8 million; for Quebec, more than \$2 billion. For Ontario the net effect will be a reduction in revenue of \$2.9 billion; for Manitoba, a reduction of \$340.4 million; Saskatchewan, \$332.5 million. There is a total of reduced revenues for universities and health care between now and 1992 of some \$8 billion.

• (1250)

I can understand why the Tory back-benchers are so silent. Surely they feel uneasy about this and they do not want to defend this Bill. Rather than having to be forced to speak on this measure which they should defend, they would rather choke the Bill. This is what is happening here this morning and that is why we are so upset. We are not the only ones to be upset.

In February of this year *The Telegraph Journal* had an article entitled "N. B. Medical Body 'Tried' To Thwart Medicare Cuts". *Le Droit* in March stated that 300 students are denouncing the cuts. *The Toronto Star* had a title in February of this year: "Funding Cuts Seen As Crisis For Our Universities". *The Telegraph Journal* in January of this year had an editorial entitled, "A Danger To Our Health". *The Toronto Star* in January of this year produced an article entitled "Political Leadership Is Needed To Save Canada's Universities". *The Telegraph Journal* in January had an editorial entitled "The Quality Of Our Life". *Le Devoir* in December of 1985 had an article in which the Minister of Finance of Quebec was raising the urgency of the situation flowing from this proposal. *Le Droit* in December of last year discussed the anticipated university crisis as a result of this