

Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act

transfers and what have been the percentages of increases to the universities. My riding is in the heart of southern Ontario.

Mr. Prud'homme: It is rich.

Mr. Winegard: Rich is right. It is rich in spirit, rich in morality, and rich because the people work hard. Let me look at Ontario because that is what interests me first. In 1985-86 federal transfers were \$5.636 billion. In 1986-87 federal transfers will be \$6 billion. That is an approximate \$400 million increase in one year; \$364 million to be precise. That is not too bad. I do not think that amount is too low, considering where the CPI is now. There is no doubt at all that it was not what they expected. I am not sure any of us will have our expectations fulfilled for the next several years. That is what is wrong. Alice must come out of the Wonderland sometime, Sir. It is time. What is the reality that all Canadians must face? They have to face an operating budget in Canada of over \$100 billion, one-third of which each year we cannot pay.

• (2110)

There was no sign of change in sight when we came here two years ago. The answer to everything was: "Increase your spending and increase the deficit". A philosophy: "If it has to be done, let government do it." There was disdain for private enterprise; no plans to reduce interest rates; no plans to increase the number of jobs except, of course, through government action and government spending. There was no thought for the long-term future of Canada, only thought for short term political gain. There was no thought for the economic health of our country, for the future of our young and for the future of the aged. That is the legacy of the past. Someone had to say "enough" and thank goodness the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) with the full backing of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) has had the courage to ignore short-term politics, to look ahead to see the horizon and to say Canada needs and wants a fiscal plan, a plan for all Canadians. We do not need to drift forever aimlessly in a sea of Liberal mortgages on our future. Every program must be examined. None are sacrosanct.

Statutory programs will grow at the rate of at the most 3.8 per cent a year for the remainder of this decade. Non-statutory programs will grow at the rate of 2.7 per cent a year, if that, all in a period of 4 per cent inflation. If we look at the EPF, it will increase 5 per cent a year. That is what the hullabaloo is about here today. Surely that indicates a desire to help the provinces.

We have heard from some of our opposition colleagues during this debate, a debate which I remind you, Sir, has had well over 130 speakers. That is hardly muzzling Parliament. They have said that unless one continues to spend at the same rate as in the past, that everything will collapse. They have joked about our attempt to find national consensus, a national purpose again. They have said the opportunity for the young will be lost, that students will stay out of post-secondary institutions and that health care will suffer. I understand these

comments. I understand the well meaning but in my opinion it is a misguided mentality that promotes such concepts. I do not agree one bit because I have more faith in Canadians.

I have more faith in our post-secondary educational institutions than some of my colleagues apparently. The institutions will find new and better ways to do things. They are finding ways to do things differently even now. They will rationize. They are saying to the provinces: "Give us our share of the funds that you are receiving from the federal Government. You have not been doing this for years. Do it now". They are saying to the provinces: "Tell us now what you will give us over the next five years. The federal Government has told you. You now tell us, please." If the provinces would do so, the institutions would know how to respond.

Managers can manage if they know what their income is going to be. They can be innovative, and the post-secondary institutions have proven that time and time again. The health care system can manage. It will find priorities if the system knows what the future is.

There are ways of delivering health care that are different from those we have now. There are many experiments going on in the world. Some of those experiments are proving that good health care can be provided at less cost than we have now. We have said that we can afford, and I agree with my hon. colleague who said that we can afford, the best health care system. I think we can. However, my concern is that that does not mean the existing health care system, nor does it mean the existing post-secondary educational system. You do not obtain the best by extrapolating the past. The old ways required enormous sums of money. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because this country, like many others, has relied on tertiary health care for years. In other words, you do not do anything until it is time to put people in the hospital.

It is the hospitals, the technology and the testing that is costing us so much. It is not the doctors—and I say that to my colleagues on the far left—who cost the system so much money, it is the other end of the health care spectrum. We all know that. We all know too that even the professionals know. They know that you cannot extrapolate the health care costs of this country. There have to be some changes. Those changes will be found. It is the financial pressure which they are going to feel. There is no question about that, but some of that financial pressure can be turned to useful and innovative purposes.

I am not one who believes that you follow slavelessly the past to find the future. I believe you look for something different, ways to challenge the system, ways to make it better. You do not make it better by building more. You make it better by change. I have no hesitation in telling my colleagues in the health care system, and I know some of them well, or my colleagues in the post-secondary institutions that I know they can do it. It will be their contribution in getting this country out of the morass that we are now in. I know they will respond to the challenge as they have always responded because they are Canadians.