

to 5 per cent from 7.5 per cent seems to be a very short view of saving. What will be saved in the long run? It will be neither education nor health for those in need.

"In my opinion", said the Chief Justice, "money spent on minds will never be money misspent". He also added: "Like the courts, universities require a high degree of independence if they are to search for knowledge and educate students in the best fashion possible". This Chief Justice is a gentleman of 70 years of age who has had time to learn, to regard, and to respect the world in which he lives from the advantage of both his position and his years of experience. We ought to take the time now to stop, ponder, and vote against this kind of action by the Government.

As the House knows, Mr. Dickson was also the Chairman of the University of Manitoba Board of Governors. He also said: "Business and industry have a moral obligation to contribute to the financial well-being of Canada's universities". He gave a message to the private sector which should gladden the hearts of my confreres and colleagues in this room. He said: "My message to the private sector is to give to universities all the assistance that you can". However, that will only do part of the job. Universities would still need the firm knowledge, foundation, and money to do the planning. Perhaps the rest will enable the additions, but we need the fundamentals.

The mission of the universities is a trust which they exercise on our behalf. Universities train students for their future, but it is also for our future. "I would like to suggest", he added, "that the concept of equality, especially equality of opportunity, lies at the heart of Canadian values".

As they cut back on education, they thereby make it more expensive and less accessible to the larger number of young people who need to attend university. If they cut back on post-secondary scholarships, they cut back on the kinds of professors which remain here and end up with a very serious brain drain. We can ill afford the loss of our best educated and those who can pilot us through to the future. It will impact upon research and development. It will have very negative effects upon the well-being of society.

I could read chapter and verse and refer to many other clippings. If the Government is not prepared to listen to the views of the opposition Parties, then it should listen to the views of its constituents and the people who are very distressed by this undertaking on the Government's part. It has been said as well that the federal Government should not cut its contribution to health care, since the Canadian population is aging and since new and sophisticated medical equipment is very costly. I do not have to tell the House that that is a reality.

● (2010)

It would not hurt if we went back and refreshed our memories about a very important comment made as well by a member of our high court. I refer now to comments that were made by Mr. Justice Hall in his review of the health care

Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act

system in Canada, Canada's national and provincial health care program for the 1980s. Justice Hall provided us with a simple but eloquent reminder of the reasons that Canadians supported the concept of medicare in the first place. He said that almost all Canadians were agreed:

—that the trauma of illness, the pain of surgery, the slow decline to death, are burdens enough for the human being to bear without the added burden of medical or hospital bills penalizing the patient at the moment of vulnerability. The Canadian people determined that they should band together to pay medical bills and hospital bills when they were well and income earning. Health services were no longer items to be bought off the shelf and paid for at the checkout stand. Nor was their price to be bargained for at the time they were sought. They were a fundamental need like education, which Canadians could meet collectively and pay through taxes.

That is a fundamental value. That is the social contract that is Canada. It is the social responsibility and, yes, the moral obligation of the Government in power to see that those high values are maintained.

With the kind of action taken by the EPF cuts, we are not meeting the goals and aspirations for which this Government was elected. You cannot say that where you have obligations toward medicare you will be providing adequately for institutions, for health care centres, for homes for the elderly, for homes for the physically and mentally handicapped. What is the Government going to do about those people who need ongoing care that is costly? Some day, Mr. Speaker, you and I, everybody in this House—and certainly the Government in undertaking these actions—will suffer. The day will come, it is an unfortunate one, when we will become sick and we will have to go to a hospital. We hope that we would get the best of high-tech service, the finest in medical equipment and the finest of support mechanisms in a staff that is educated and trained.

The kind of action being taken today does not even allow us to dream in those terms. The Government is diminishing the kinds of structures we have put in place and it is lowering the quality offered to every citizen.

As far as planning is concerned, whether you are planning in the hospital sector or in the educational sector, you plan for the long term. You must plan not for tomorrow morning. It is not as if you were a Member of the House of Commons where your long-term agenda is for maybe 12 hours. A minimum of five years is needed to do proper planning. The cut which the Government has made was done without consultation.

I recall that when I spoke on this Bill before there were laughs and nasty interventions. I wondered at the lack of sensitivity of certain Members across the way. I am embarrassed to mention them although I might in the course of my remarks. They had the nerve to think that a 25 year veteran in the National Assembly, who was then and still is the Minister of Finance, brought down a Budget and accounted for the cuts in his Budget by saying that Quebec will have to tax firms to make up for the federal short-fall. Two Members across the way had the nerve to say to me that the Quebec Minister of Finance did not understand what was going on. I hope that