

think the reality is that if you move in that direction you abandon the kind of leadership that is necessary to insure certain basic standards in the country and what happens is that there are more and more inequalities throughout the country, because there are different priorities from one province to another.

If you only use cost sharing as your instrument to try and reduce regional inequalities you would then have a situation that would perpetuate the existing inequalities. But there are other instruments for dealing with those kinds of inequalities, in terms of equalization payments, and in terms of serious kinds of region economic development strategies that ought to begin to alter the capacities of different regions. With cost sharing at least there was some kind of guarantee that money that was allocated was used for the intended purpose while now there really isn't any guarantee.

REGAN

I think there is an argument that can be made on either side of that case. I think what it comes down to is that the whole system of share-cost funding needs to be renegotiated. I tend to believe that shared costs is the best formula rather than block financing. It hasn't worked in the past well and it can only work as long as both governments have some input into the efficiency with which the money is expended. If the shared cost program is operated in such a way that there is no incentive for the provincial government to achieve efficiency, then obviously the federal representatives in the House of Commons become disenchanted and that basically is what happened in relation to M.S.I. The caution taken by the federal government in then moving into block funding is a pretty drastic act—reaction if you like. I think now that the problem has persisted and that we see the danger of the erosion of the benefits of M.S.I. in some areas of Canada.

What we need is a conference of health ministers and for Ottawa and the provinces to renegotiate something that will provide that both levels of government will share fairly in the escalation of costs, but they both will have an opportunity to be satisfied in relation to the efficiency of the expenditures.

SPURR

The difference between the pre- and post-1976 federal-provincial financing programmes is an example of how the rich and their state are shifting money out of education into more profitable areas for the rich. I cannot support either scheme because each was just designed to serve the interests of the rich minority at different times. We are opposed to cutbacks in social services, but for us the issue is that the rich should be made to pay.

The federal and provincial governments are governments

of the rich, and all their schemes amount to using the money stolen from the working people to finance schemes that increase corporate profits. Besides, we favor a centralist unitary republican system whereby the social services of the entire state would be centralized. This would ensure equality of services right across the country.

In terms of what would be the best policy for this area, do you think PetroCan should be expanded or dismantled?

COOPER

The Conservative policy on PetroCan is to expand PetroCan and make it stronger so that Canadians can own and control a greater percentage of this natural resource than we already have. This we propose to do by privatizing PetroCan

The NDP policy on PetroCan is that it should be involved in wholesaling and retailing gasoline, coast to coast. Canadians could then fill up at a PetroCan gas station and every nickel of the profits would stay in Canada. That way, as well, independent retailers would have secure supplies of gasoline guaranteed.

PetroCan should also act as a counterweight to protect Canadian interests in the oil industry which is dominated by foreign controlled multinationals. An expanded PetroCan should guarantee that oil and gas development take place under public control at a fair price. This is especially important in the tar sands, where the multinationals want guaranteed world prices and tax subsidies before they will get involved in producing oil. As well, I think it should become the sole importer of

good for their shareholders. If they see that they have a better prospect all over in the water off Thailand than they have off Canada, then they'll let the waters off Canada wait for another year or another decade. That's not in the Canadian interests.

It's vital to Canada that we become self-sufficient in energy. I think that if we have Petrocan, then in many areas where multinationals don't move ahead when they should, then there is a role for Petrocan to play.

SPURR

Petrocan is a state monopoly corporation that exists only to serve the oil barons, and renders them immeasurable service in the plundering of our energy resources. There is nothing socialistic about it. The parties of the rich are united around trying to con-

MCDONOUGH

Differential fees for foreign students are not only discriminating, but violate the spirit of Canada's commitment to Third World development. Students from foreign countries contribute to the local economy through the consumer dollars they spend in meeting their basic needs for food, clothing, shelter, etc. The savings effected by the imposition of differential fees are relatively insignificant in dollar terms, and do not begin to outweigh the loss in terms of cultural diversity and international exchange contributed by the presence of foreign students. Surely the most valuable contribution Canadians can make to developing nations is to make post-secondary educational opportunities accessible so that political, economic and technological leadership can be provided through indigenous human resources.

REGAN

I'm against it, first, last and always. Differential fees are a lot of crap as far as I'm concerned.

I think that differential fees achieve nothing. Moreover, at a time when we don't have enough students to fill our universities, they discourage more people from coming. I think that the richness of university is in the diversity of backgrounds and the geographic locations or origins of the students who attend it.

I've always thought that if at UPEI everyone came from Prince Edward Island you'd have a pretty sterile academic atmosphere. I believe that you learn as much at university, if not more, through osmosis outside the classroom by mixing with people with a variety of backgrounds than you ever do through lectures. We have excellent universities that have traditionally attracted students from around the world and they should continue to do that. I think that it is a redneck approach to suggest that we should be charging students coming from developing countries to study in our country a richer tuition fee.

SPURR

By their very definition, differential fees for foreign students are discriminatory, and, furthermore, they are racist and chauvinist. They represent blatant attacks by the state, not just on foreign students but on all students, and are part of the shifting of the crisis onto our backs. The foreign students are singled out by the rich for these attacks because they are supposed to be the most defenceless, being subjected to all the fascist rules and regulations of the Immigration Department.

The rich by all manner of means, such as the TV programme **W5**, try to create the impression that foreign students are a "drain", that they "take away jobs", and that Canadian students resent foreign students, especially "visible minorities". The rich do this so as to create a split

continued on next page

CAMPAIGN CLOSE-UP

and distributing the shares that are now held by the state to the citizens of Canada. This will give the company a commercial base and it will then be able to tackle the big boys like Exxon and Shell and be able to reverse the ridiculous situation we have now where most of our oil and natural gas is owned by corporations outside the country. The socialists and the Liberals have been deliberately distorting the Conservative policy on this as it has always been to privatize PetroCan and thereby to make it stronger. What they're suggesting, quite inaccurately, is that we propose to dismantle and throw it away. We propose exactly the reverse of that. There is state function in PetroCan. Thirty per cent will remain owned by the government of Canada so that certain aspects of national policy that all parties recognize must prevail in the development of this resource will be able to be directed by the national government. State to state purchases of oil will be dealt by contract between the government and PetroCan. The exploration for non-commercial kinds of gas and oil will be carried out by PetroCan by contract with the government of Canada and in general the government will be able to direct through these means the future of PetroCan, but not in a way that will destroy its commercial base. The present PetroCan is bankrupt, the present PetroCan is costing the Canadian taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars a year, it's wrong, this company can't work, and has to be changed for the good of Canada, particularly Atlantic Canada.

MCDONOUGH

I feel that PetroCan should be retained as a 100 per cent owned crown company and expanded to all phases of the industry.

oil. The Liberals and the Tories say 'no' to this even when multinationals have been cutting back supplies of oil destined for Canada.

A limited PetroCan would not be able to undertake high risk projects such as frontier and offshore exploration to ensure energy security. State to state agreements for energy would be an important role of PetroCan so that Canada gets the spinoff industrial and technical benefits offered by energy resource development.

REGAN

I think that Petrocan is perhaps the best thing that the former Liberal government ever did.

I think that Petrocan came into existence at the time when there was a need for it, but not nearly as much need as there is today. I think we have seen that the multinational oil companies are prepared to divert supplies intended for Canada to the United States when it suits their convenience and that they play games in pricing by having dummy companies in Bermuda, as I was able to show in the Imperial Oil versus the Nova Scotia Power Corporation case when I was premier. I think that if Canadians are to be secure in relation to their oil position and not have to pay unnecessarily high costs, that there is a very important role for Petrocan to play. I think Petrocan not only provides the stimulus to bring about the development of Canadian resources more quickly than the multinationals would, but I think also the fact that it is there with the potential to expand tends to keep them honest. I think that you have to keep in mind that the multinational companies are looking at the bottom line of profits and they have to decide each year where they are going to spend their money on the basis of what's

vince the people that aspirations for a solution to the energy crisis and an end to foreign domination on the energy front can be won by relying on the government and its crown corporation, Petrocan.

This is a pernicious social-democratic illusion, that state monopoly capitalism is somehow akin to socialism. In contrast to this flagrant illusion mongering, our Party's programme calls for the expropriation of the oil barons, as well as the rest of the rich minority, their property and wealth, without any compensation, and the transformation of this into common property. The NDP has, right from the beginning, sown the illusion that Petrocan, being a crown corporation, had something "socialistic" about it, that it was an example of public ownership, almost the nationalization of a key sector of the economy.

Do you think differential fees for foreign students are discriminatory? Are the economic benefits of differential fees misrepresented?

COOPER

I don't think that differential fees are discriminatory because a government-funded university is allowed to say that the taxes of the people that live in the particular province or country should go toward educating the children of that country and not students from other countries. But I oppose differential fees for foreign students. I think it's unwise from our own point of view to exclude them as we inevitably would if we increased the fees. I think it is healthy for us to have in our midst students from overseas and for that reason I oppose fee differentials.