

poor, I might not be so offended by the title. We must keep in mind, as we discuss Bill C-69, which is an omnibus bill, that it shows expenditures and restraint will take place only on the backs of the poor, students and the sick.

This bill is not designed to cut spending of the government in ways that are meaningful. This act is designed to take back commitments given to the people of Canada, commitments which this government has made for years to these people.

If we look at Clause 2 of the bill we see it refers to amendments to the Canada Assistance Plan. Let us talk about definitions. "Assistance" under the Canada Assistance Plan is defined this way:

—aid in any form to or in respect of persons in need for the purpose of providing or providing for all or any of the following:

- (a) food, shelter, clothing, fuel, utilities, household supplies and personal requirements ("hereinafter referred to as "basic requirements"),
- (b) prescribed items incidental to carrying on a trade or other employment and other prescribed special needs of any kind,
- (c) care in a home for special care,
- (d) travel and transportation,
- (e) funerals and burials,
- (f) health care services,
- (g) prescribed welfare services purchased by or at the request of a provincially approved agency, and
- (h) comfort allowances and other prescribed needs of residents or patients in hospitals or other prescribed institutions;

"Welfare services" is defined as:

—services having as their object the lessening, removal or prevention of the causes and effects of poverty, child neglect or dependence on public assistance, and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, includes:

- (a) rehabilitation services,
- (b) case work, counselling, assessment and referral services,
- (c) adoption services,
- (d) homemaker, day-care and similar services,
- (e) community development services,
- (f) consulting, research and evaluation services with respect to welfare programs, and

Government Orders

(g) administrative, secretarial and clerical services, including staff training, relating to the provision of any of the foregoing services or to the provision of assistance,

but does not include any service relating wholly or mainly to education, correction or any other matter prescribed by regulation or, except for the purposes of the definition "assistance", any service provided by way of assistance;

That is a long explanation of what those three words "assistance" and "welfare services" mean. In fact, if one looks at what is contained in Bill C-69, one will see a total departure from what the spirit, the intent, and, indeed, the definition of assistance and welfare services is.

If we look under the Canada Assistance Plan at the content of the budget and therefore the content of Bill C-69, we see that the federal government has provided funds to the provinces and the territories on a 50-50 basis, cost-shared for social assistance and social service programs. Social assistance, as I said in basic terms, is income assistance such as welfare. Social services include counselling services, rehabilitation services, homemaker services and child care.

Until this budget, the program had been an open-ended one. There were no ceilings on the amount of shared dollars the federal government was willing to match. Indeed, the measure was need. It was hoped that the provinces with the incentive of 50-50 funding would in fact make sure that those people in each province who required these services would receive them. For every dollar spent by the provincial governments, the federal government would pony-up a dollar in kind.

With the exception of Saskatchewan, all provinces have increased their spending on Canada Assistance Plan cost-shared programs in 1988-89. A 5 per cent growth ceiling for the next two years has been imposed by Bill C-69 on the three wealthiest provinces—British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario. All the other provinces and territories are exempt. A saving of \$155 million is projected over the two-year period, but is dependent on the actual spending of the three provinces affected.

We have to think a little about what we mean when we say that we are capping the three wealthiest provinces. In fact, British Columbia, the province from which I come, is a wealthy province because, first, it has over taxed its