

"Raise the money and pay your own bills. Don't be looking for hand-outs from the federal government."

Surely that ought to be the aegis of how we operate the finances of this country in the 1990s. We cannot go back to old history and say: "At one time the federal government had the wherewithal to make massive transfers." Therefore, ever and ever and ever it should make these massive transfers. That cannot be the case. Surely there is a time when some sense of fiscal responsibility ought to be heard. These people claim they want to be government. The Liberal party claims it has the whim of public opinion behind it, that it has massive public support.

If they are going to be government, how do they propose to pay the bills? Do they propose to invent new trees behind Parliament Hill where they can pluck the \$100 bills. Or, do they propose to rearrange the financing of the country in a more sensible fashion, the kind of rearranging set out in Bill C-69.

We have, unfortunately, the haves and the have nots this country, but surely the haves can carry their own freight. Surely a reasonable way of doing things is the kind of suggestions made by the Minister of Finance in his budget as set out in this bill. To say for one moment that welfare moms are not going to be looked after in rich provinces is to say that the treasurers and health officials of rich provinces are mean spirited, because the very fact of the act itself is a cost sharing act except the federal government has said: "Look, for the time being, we can't cover our full cost share without limit. We are limiting our cost share to 5 per cent. If you want to go further, go further."

Wealthy provinces ought to go a lot further because that is their responsibility. They have a balanced budget. They are, in many cases, in surplus or could easily be in surplus.

In my province, a Liberal government has increased the public service by 9,000 persons in four and a half years. Isn't that awful? Isn't that something else again? They clearly are well off. They are floating in public servants. They could tighten their belts. They could go a lot further on behalf of welfare moms. To blame the federal government because we put a cap on the CAP even though they have a balanced budget is pretty mean spirited, and certainly not within the concepts of the kind of Canada we ought to be building.

Government Orders

Make no mistake about it. No one on this side of the House likes to see cut-backs in social expenditures, but members on this side of the House have to be responsible. It is easy to call for more and more and more. Let's see some responsibility. Let's see some sense of leadership. Let's see if they can justify their role in the poll, or is it only because we are unpopular? Put your vote and park it with them, because it must be just a park. They do not show any leadership and they do not have any policies. This bill is a sensible bill because it comes to grips with the EPF, the CAP, the growth of expenditures and the transfers made from the federal government to the provinces.

Is it conceivably fair that the federal government should limit the growth of its departments to less than 3.5 per cent, year after year, back to back, from 1984 forward and these transfer programs increase at 6 per cent to 7 per cent per annum? Is it fair that those transfer payments should exceed the growth of federal departments year after year just because of an old agreement? That is how we got in the hole in the first place. We have to get this country out of the hole. We have to get this country standing on its own feet again. We have to get this country so it can pay its bills. We cannot pay our bills by encouraging profligacy in the hands of the provinces. It is time that the opposition understood that and opposition speakers spoke sensibly, asked themselves in their own conscience where the money is supposed to come from, paid attention to the deficit and did not say more, more, more, Ma'am, ever more, even though their plates are full.

Mr. Dennis Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Mississauga South is someone for whom I have a lot of respect.

I want to tell you that today he was quoting selectively. We only have two provinces in this country that have a balanced budget. I am not here today to defend the provinces. I tend to think that in some respects the provinces should be carrying more of the burden in this country.

What we on this side of the House are trying to say is that if you have some productivity in the country and all of a sudden it will produce some goods and services that will cost a lot less, that in turn will promote foreign investment and bring interest rates down which will affect everything from mortgage payments to the cost of servicing the national debt. When you ask what we over here will do to pay the bills, one thing we will do is listen to people because this government is not listening to what people are saying. You ask how we are going to get