

*Supply*

Let me just give a couple of figures and then I would like him to comment. In 1979-80 transfer payments to the province of Ontario accounted for 47 per cent of the health care expenditures. By the time the Liberals left office in 1984, this had been reduced to 41 per cent. It was further eroded to 34 per cent and now today there are figures showing it is 31 per cent. The reality was that the erosion started with the Liberals in 1980 and by 1984 when they left, it was down to 41 per cent.

In my own province of British Columbia, by 1994-95, we will have lost \$6.8 billion in cutbacks in transfer payments and EPF. Out of those, \$2.6 billion or 40 per cent nearly are the direct result of actions taken by the Liberal government in 1982 and 1983.

Those are the actions of the Liberal government. It was the one that started the erosion of the health care system and the erosion of the provinces' ability to pay. I would like him to comment on those two figures. Are those not the actions of the federal Liberal government? Did it not start cutbacks to the provinces for health care?

**Mr. Volpe:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question. I would have hoped that in the calculation of the numerical and financial impact of the decisions by Liberal governments of the day with respect to health care that he would not have used the actuarial type of figures that are currently bandied about with respect to all kinds of potentials that emanate from pension plans.

I would have hoped that he would have stuck with the absolute figures as they related in 1983 and 1984 dollars. He has not chosen to do that and I choose not to answer hypothetical questions from the past.

On the second item, it might be appropriate for my hon. colleague to remember that those agreements were precisely that. They were negotiated agreements between the federal and provincial governments of the day that determined what would be the proportion of federal contribution and what would be the proportion of provincial contribution. That is not the case right now.

I think the fact that three provinces took the federal government to court on its unilateral actions would indicate that initially when those cuts were made they were done in the spirit of negotiations and they were accepted according to the conditions of the day.

**Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls):** Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House put forward by the NDP is in itself a false motion. It does not tell the truth.

In other words, the mover of the motion from the NDP has been day dreaming or perhaps he had a dream last night in which he claims now that the premier of Newfoundland wants to forgo universality and embrace user and deterrent fees for health services. That is not true.

Why can somebody not now move in this House an amendment saying that the leader of the NDP is opposed to universality? Why not? This is a fib here. This is not true. It is a downright fabrication of the truth. I cannot say it is a lie, I cannot call anybody a liar. I know that, but it is a fabrication of the truth. It is not true.

Perhaps the member moving the motion does not know that it is not true. I do not know, but I am telling him now that it is absolutely untrue. How do you vote on a motion that contains false information, that has dug up something that says the premier of Newfoundland made a statement and has put forward a position which is not true? When the motion is put, how do you vote on it? Can you vote for it or can you vote against it when you know what is contained in the motion is false, completely and utterly untrue, never said by the premier of Newfoundland, never, not in writing. He has never said it in his speech, he has never said it on the radio, he has never said it on television. It is a fabrication, an outright untruth by the NDP, spreading rumours about what a premier of a provincial government said.

If the NDP had shown the honesty that they should be showing, they would have gone back and found out what the premier of the province of Newfoundland said and they would have discovered—

**Mr. Karpoff:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I am requesting clarification of your ruling that the Liberal amendment was in order. The way I interpreted what you had said is that you agreed the motion would stop at the area where it says health care system, that the other parts of the motion that had been moved by the New Democratic Party were no longer permissible for debate.