

*Government Orders**[Translation]*NOTICE OF ALLOCATION OF TIME FOR CONSIDERATION
AT THE SECOND READING STAGE OF BILL C-69

Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of State (Youth), Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, I have two notices to give to you and to the House.

I stress that it was not possible to reach an agreement pursuant to Standing Orders 78(1) and 78(2) regarding allocation of time for second reading of Bill C-69, the Government Expenditures Restraint Act.

Pursuant to Standing Order 78(3), I give notice of my intention to move a motion at the next sitting of the House for the purpose of allotting a specified number of days, or one day, for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at the second reading stage of the above-mentioned bill.

NOTICE OF MOTION PURSUANT TO S. O. 57

Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of State (Youth), Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Also, Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 57, I give notice that at the next sitting of the House, immediately before the Order of the Day for resuming the debate on the motion by the Minister of Finance for second reading and referral to a legislative committee of Bill C-69, the Government Expenditures Restraint Act, and any amendments thereon, I shall move a motion that the debate not be further adjourned.

Of course, Madam Speaker, if agreement is reached with the opposition parties, we will review the procedure.

[English]

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) that Bill C-69, an act to amend certain statutes to enable restraint of government expenditures, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

Mrs. Diane Marleau (Sudbury): Madam Speaker, I am here to speak today to Bill C-69, a bill implementing four measures for budget restrictions announced in the February, 1990, Budget. I am going to repeat them so

that we can be very clear on exactly what we are debating here today.

The first one freezes federal transfer payments to the provinces under Established Programs Financing. It freezes transfer payments for post-secondary education and health care.

The second one limits the increase of federal transfer payments to Ontario, British Columbia and Alberta under the Canada Assistance Plan, which affects social programs.

The third one eliminates the Canada Exploration Incentive Program, which affects mining, gas and oil industries.

The fourth one freezes public utilities income tax transfers over the next two years.

At first glance this might seem to be innocuous language and taxpayers might say that since they are not getting an increase in taxes it may not be so bad. But the people of Canada are very well informed and they are very much aware that a cutback in transfers will probably translate into increased taxes.

I was reading the March 1990 issue of *Policy Options*. In an article in that publication Grattan Gray says:

The government camouflages regressive changes to trick Canadians into believing that tax increases are tax cuts and that benefit cuts are increases.

This is another example of this kind of subterfuge. Not only is the government about to impose the GST, the greatest tax grab and most regressive tax in Canadian history, through this budget and with this bill it will impose cuts of over \$7.5 billion to the provinces over the next five years. Never before have so many been taken for so much and been left with so little.

I will start with the Established Programs Financing. This program provides equal per capita financial assistance to all provinces to assist in the funding of health care and education.

In 1982, the Minister of Finance was opposed to cuts in the Established Programs Financing. This is 1990 and, obviously, he has changed his tune. He stated that cuts to EPF:

—could have disastrous effects on the universities and on the colleges, on the hospital funding and on the operation of the hospitals. Let us not make hospitals, universities and colleges a battleground between the federal government and the provincial governments. Let us solve those problems not on the backs of the hospitals and universities; let us solve those problems outside of that arena.