

universities to meet the demand for research and development, or even to provide adequate basic instruction for students.

• (1920)

[*Translation*]

As we can see, Mr. Speaker, there were such protests against Bill C-96 that I sincerely believe that the Tory Government would be well advised to amend it.

I also heard a while ago one of my Conservative colleagues tell us how the Liberal Government had been inconsistent and had burdened Canada with a terrible financial problem. On the other hand, the Conservative Government is supposed to solve all the problems. Let it be so, but on the other hand they always compare with what is being done in the United States. I hope that we will not become the second United States and do everything they have done because now their poverty rate has really gone up.

It has also been stated that over 40 per cent of Americans cannot get medical care because they do not have the required funds. The same thing should not happen in Canada.

I would like to say once again that I am against this Bill. I think that it is an altogether unacceptable measure following which postsecondary institutions as well as health care institutions in Canada will lose \$8 billion. In Quebec alone, \$2 billion are wiped out. I am convinced that Canadians will remember this at the next election.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ricard):** Questions or comments. The Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria).

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for my honourable colleague. As she knows, over the past year, the Government has made several expenditures which some of us have very seriously and rightfully questioned, and I am sure you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker. For instance, Canadian taxpayers, through their taxes, had to sink approximately \$2 billion in what is commonly referred to as the banking bail out fiasco. We have learned also these past few days that nearly \$1 million has been spent in travelling expenses for three little trips made by our Prime Minister. We have even learned today that nearly \$40,000 was spent on a few minute long television program, so that Americans can have the great privilege to see our Prime Minister's mug on their TV screen. Could she tell us if, in her opinion—

**Mr. Lanthier:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ricard):** The Hon. Member for LaSalle (Mr. Lanthier) rises on a point of order.

**Mr. Lanthier:** Mr. Speaker, do you really feel that it is proper for a Member of the House to use such an expression when dealing with the Prime Minister of Canada. Whatever its political stripe I think the Prime Minister of Canada deserves to be shown a certain amount of respect. In this connection, I

*Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act*

think that we should follow the example of the Americans who, whatever their party affiliation, always address their head of state as "Mr. President". I therefore rise on a point of order to ask the Hon. Member to show a little more respect to the Prime Minister of Canada.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ricard):** The Hon. Member's point is well taken. I therefore ask the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) to mind his words when he refers to the Prime Minister. The Hon. Member has the floor.

**Mr. Boudria:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Following my honourable colleague's admonition, I will refer from now on to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), as he has just suggested, as the President of Canada. I have noted his parallel with the President of the United States.

We can therefore assume, from what we have just heard, that the Prime Minister of Canada is not only the head of the Government, but that he should be recognized from now on as a head of state.

The Hon. Member for LaSalle—Ville Emard seems to think that he is a head of state. In my book, Mr. Speaker, he is only the Government leader, and it is my Queen who is my head of state and nobody else.

However, I will drop this matter to ask my colleague the Hon. Member for Outremont (Mrs. Pépin), who has just made an excellent speech in the House, whether she feels these expenditures—wasted, in my opinion—which the Government can make are sensible and reasonable, considering that we no longer have any money, as evidenced by the bill we are dealing with tonight in the House, that we are lacking the necessary funds, because of these extravagant expenditures, to do the job. I should like her comments on this.

**Mrs. Pépin:** Mr. Speaker, looking back on the 1984 election campaign, I recall clearly well that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) who was the Leader of the Opposition at the time, railed against Liberal patronage throughout his campaign. The lesson must be twice as hard to swallow today as the Conservative Party appears to be twice as bad as we were. In fact, when they talk about budget cuts and they say that we should listen with very great care, when we know that women's programs . . . When we know that funds for the shelters for battered women have been cut, when we know that groups of women are still waiting to know if their program is going to be continued and we read in the papers about the rather shameful Government spendings, we are left with some serious questions.

If the Government wants to be believed and indeed trusted, I think it is time that they start putting their action where their mouth is, that they start doing what they say because people are now trusting this Government less and less. They tell us to do something while the Government act in a different way.

Therefore I think that there must be ways of increasing the Government's credibility.