

Business of the House

12 minutes, beginning at ten o'clock this evening. Therefore, the adjournment proceedings will begin at 10.12 p.m.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Lewis: As you know, Mr. Speaker, we have been working for some time to try to finalize Private Members' Business so that Private Members will get their allotted time and Private Members' Hour will go ahead.

I have for presentation to the House a draft Order, upon which representatives of all three Parties worked. Your Honour may find unanimous consent to pass the following draft Order:

That, notwithstanding any Standing or Special Order of this House, the Order for the consideration of Private Members' Business during the period commencing this day until Thursday, June 19, 1986 shall be as follows:

1. Motions (papers) No. 16—Mr. Boudria (Monday, June 16, 1986)
2. Motion No. 119—Mr. Manly (Tuesday, June 17, 1986)
3. Bill C-270—Mr. Fulton (Wednesday, June 18, 1986)
4. Bill C-208—Mr. Isabelle (Thursday, June 19, 1986)

Provided that the provisions of the Special Order adopted on Wednesday, June 11, 1986 and Standing Orders 42 and 72 shall be deemed to be in force for the purposes of this Order and that during the hour that would otherwise be used for the consideration of Private Members' Business on Friday, June 20, 1986, the House shall consider government business.

● (1120)

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the motion which requires unanimous consent to be introduced. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Motion agreed to and so ordered.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We had a Minister's statement today which took up 12 minutes of House time. I think there would be a disposition in the House to agree that that 12 minutes will not be added on to the end of today's standard sitting. If that meets the unanimous consent of the House, I am prepared to make that proposal, and I hope it will pass without debate.

Mr. Speaker: Do I take it there is a unanimous desire in the House not to apply the rule with regard to the application of extension of time.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Therefore, the adjournment proceedings will begin at 10 p.m. tonight.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

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

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Friday, June 13, 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-Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act, 1977, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to Bill C-96. In my view Bill C-96 is one of the most important pieces of legislation with which the House has dealt since it started sitting in late 1984. This piece of legislation affects in a very dramatic way the level of funding to the provincial Governments for post-secondary education and health care in Canada. In fact, the Bill has the effect of reducing the level of federal transfer payments from 7.5 per cent to 5 per cent.

I think it is important at the outset to try to determine first what the motivation was behind the introduction of this Bill and, second, what impact Bill C-96 will have on post-secondary education and health care.

First, concerning motivation, it is obvious that the Conservative Government is extremely concerned about the deficit. We share that concern. Where we do not agree with the Conservative Government is the method by which the federal deficit should be reduced or managed. It is obvious that the Conservative Government is prepared to do almost anything to balance the books. The Government tried unsuccessfully to reduce the indexation of senior citizens pensions in its first budget. That particular measure was universally condemned by the people of Canada and the Government of Canada was forced to back down.

The motivation behind that measure I submit is the same motivation that prompted the Conservative Government, through the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson), to introduce Bill C-96, that is, deficit reduction. The people of Canada spoke very forcefully and vigorously when the Government tried to deindex senior citizens pensions. Canadians said it was unfair and unjust for the Government of Canada to try to reduce the deficit on the backs of senior citizens. They said it was wrong to attempt to reduce the deficit on the backs of any disadvantaged group in society, be they the disabled, the elderly, the young or the unemployed. It is not fair to pick on disadvantaged people and ask them to bear the brunt of deficit reduction.

In the first budget not only did the Government intend to reduce the indexation for senior citizen pensions, but it also proposed there be a capital gains deduction, a \$125,000 cash bonanza for the wealthy in society. Canadians asked where was the justice and the fairness in that. They said if you want