

Justice of the Supreme Court, because they are the same concerns which we have heard from the witnesses who have appeared before our legislative committee. And the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who is certainly impartial, who does not have to toe the line of any political party, has confirmed the findings of other observers, namely, that excessive cuts in post-secondary education financing would have major economic effects and will also impact negatively on the quality of teaching in our specialized schools.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that these many testimonies should convince the Government to pause and review its position, because contrary to what that small propaganda booklet published by the Department of Finance wanted us to believe, for instance, that transfer payments would continue to increase . . . Mr. Speaker, we have never argued that transfer payments would not increase. What we have said, and rightfully so, and which have been confirmed right and left is that the rate of growth of the transfers have been decreased, to such an extent that it will represent to the Federal Government, for fiscal year 1990-91 alone, \$2 billion. There are people somewhere who will have to pay for that! Who are these people?

Mr. Speaker, I should like to share with you what this will mean for each of the Canadian provinces.

Newfoundland is not a province with an extensive fiscal capacity. From fiscal years 1986-87 up to 1991-92, the cumulative effect of Bill C-96 will amount a loss of \$180 million.

Mr. Speaker, to Ontario and Quebec, \$180 million is a lot of money. But to Newfoundland, it is a huge sum. Some people with whom I was discussing this matter told me that teachers in St. John's University in Newfoundland may be lost simply because the University may no longer compete with other universities in Canada or in the United States in terms of the salaries offered. God knows if the province of Newfoundland needs—like all the rest of Canada, but that province particularly because of the developments to come in a hopefully near future in the oil area—a highly qualified manpower coming straight from those universities; but those developments will of course be affected by the cuts in the transfers from the federal Government to the provinces; \$180 million for Newfoundland.

For the province of Prince Edward Island, which is a very small province, but with a rather limited fiscal capacity—

● (1650)

[English]

For the Province of Prince Edward Island, the cumulative effect of Bill C-96 from 1986-87 to 1991-92 will be \$40 million. That is a lot of money to the Province of Prince Edward Island.

For the Province of Nova Scotia, the cumulative effect of Bill C-96 from 1986-87 to 1991-92 represents \$271 million. That is a lot of money to the Province of Nova Scotia.

Federal-Provincial fiscal arrangements

I cannot understand why the brochure of the Department of Finance indicates that Bill C-96 will not have a great deal of effect on of post-secondary education or health services. I can say that for the Minister of Finance for Nova Scotia, \$271 million is a lot of money. Someone will have to pay that money. If we cannot find anyone who will replace those dollars, the quality of services will be affected and nurses and teachers will lose their jobs.

For the Province of New Brunswick, in the same period of time Bill C-96 will have a cumulative effect of \$220 million. As is the case with Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, that is a lot of money to the Minister of Finance of New Brunswick. I wonder why Hon. Members from New Brunswick have voted for the Bill. Their constituents will have to pay \$220 million, and that is a lot of money. We are not even sure if the only solution the Government will find will be to cut the services. If the Government has to do that, it will be a disaster for post-secondary education and health services.

[Translation]

For the province of Quebec, the cumulative effect of Bill C-96, based on the larger population—since all the figures I am giving you are on a *per capita* basis and vary according to the number of citizens in each province—amounts for the same period, to \$2 billion. It was indeed with good reason that the Quebec Minister of Finance as well as his Ontario counterpart, with whom I will deal in a few moments, made rather strong statements against Bill C-96.

I recently had the opportunity to meet with the Minister of Finance in Montreal, and he asked me if Bill C-96 had been passed or what the chances were that its implementation might be postponed till a year later to allow for broader consultations. I told him that it was being examined by the Legislative Committee and I did not know what was about to happen, but I can see today that at the Legislative Committee's stage, Government Members defended the *status quo*, in other words the contents of Bill C-96, and today, for technical reasons, Mr. Speaker, you rejected the amendments I had suggested. If the Government had agreed to endorse those amendments, since it was a "money bill" as they say, those amendments could have been tabled and supported. However, the Government majority refused to do so. To the people of Quebec, that would mean a shortfall of \$2 billion for the fiscal years 1986-1987 to 1991-1992. On a yearly basis, the amounts would increase gradually from \$82 million to \$2 billion by the final year.

Mr. Speaker—

[English]

For the Province of Ontario, the cumulative effect of Bill C-96 from 1986-87 to 1991-92 is almost \$3 billion. One could say that the Province of Ontario is the richest province in Canada and can afford to raise taxes. However, if the Government of Ontario is forced to increase taxes, the federal Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) will simply have transferred his problem to his provincial counterpart.