

Adjournment Debate

Some Hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member but the period for questions and comments is over.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Carlo Rossi (Bourassa): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to take part in the debate on Bill C-96, because the federal Government claims that under the provisions of this Bill, it is protecting the provinces against inflation. However, as the Nielsen Report pointed out, the cost of health care and post-secondary education is expected to rise faster than inflation and our economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to rise at this stage in the debate to explain to Quebecers that the cutbacks resulting from this Bill will most certainly affect Quebec. Over the next five years, Quebec will lose \$2.83 billion. In 1986-87, \$82 million; in 1987-88, \$174 million for the province of Quebec alone; in 1988-89, \$277 million; in 1989-90, \$389 million;

In 1990-91, Quebec will lose \$512 million and in 1991-92, \$647 million. This adds up to a total of \$2.83 billion for the province of Quebec and Quebecers.

When the federal Government claims that Bill C-96 protects the provinces, I wonder whether cutbacks totalling more than \$2 billion afford any particular kind of protection to the province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, that is why as a Quebecer and as the Member for Bourassa, I strenuously object to cutbacks of this kind.

Mr. Speaker, if we go back to what was said by the Quebec Minister of Finance when he brought down his Budget for 1986-87, he said the following: Transfer payments to the provinces do not lie at the root of the federal deficit, because these transfers have remained constant in relation to the Gross National Product for several years, while other federal expenditures represented a growing percentage of GNP. And the Minister of Finance went on to say: "That the federal Government is transferring its deficit to the provinces."

Mr. Speaker, indirectly, that is certainly quite true, because the federal Government is cutting more than \$2 billion in transfer payments to the provinces over a period of five years.

The Minister went on to say: "The federal Government has again decided to sidestep real negotiations with the provinces."

Mr. Speaker, this Government has always claimed it wanted to negotiate with the provinces and has always claimed it was listening to the provinces. Well, they certainly did not listen to the Province of Quebec when they decided to make a drastic cut of \$2 billion without consulting anybody. I am not the one who is saying this, Mr. Speaker, those are the words of the provincial Minister of Finance.

He went on to say: "The federal Government is making incoherent budgetary decisions by reducing its participation in health care and post-secondary education while allowing a

gradual exemption on capital gains and gradually withdrawing from the oil and gas taxation field in the producing provinces."

Mr. Speaker, the federal cut-backs will make interprovincial disparities even worse since a \$1 per capita cut in a rich province does not have the same impact as a similar cut in a poorer province.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Quebec was forced to introduce a surtax on corporate income. Why? Again because the Province of Quebec did not get the more than \$2 billion it was entitled to. It had to raise the employer's contribution to the health care fund and increase the tax on capital so as to offset the federal cut-backs in established programs financing.

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about \$82 million. Yes, \$82 million for this year alone.

With respect to equalization, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the federal Government's failure to provide at least 95 per cent of the funds due for 1984-85, the Province of Quebec lost \$66 million. They talk about negotiations, Mr. Speaker, but if they had negotiated they would surely have found a solution.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Government . . . Members opposite are signalling that I should stop. True enough, Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would be better to stop, for we have a lot to tell them about negotiations—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member has 13 minutes left.

● (2200)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 66 deemed to have been moved.

HEALTH—PRESENCE OF DIOXIN IN VEGETABLES, FRUIT AND MILK

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, last month a member of the City of Toronto Department of Health, Katherine Davies, with the assistance of funding from the International Joint Commission, prepared and published a report dealing with the chemical content of a typical basket of fresh produce from southern Ontario. In that study she found that typical food basket contained dozens and dozens of toxic chemicals, including DDT, PCBs, and dioxins.

She found as well that pesticides which had been banned in Canada by the federal Government some 10 or 15 years ago were identified in those fresh fruits and vegetables in such a way as to indicate that either they were still present in our environment after 10 to 15 years, or, alternatively, somehow or other they were coming through the atmosphere and there was a fall out in our countryside which was causing this chemical