

gy, and I have not talked about the reductions of the National Research Council and those that are anticipated. In looking at those dollars that are going to be reduced, one must remember that it is not only for health and education, but that there are large components of those that were in fact directed to research and development. It is not just research and development per se.

The government is proud in saying that research and development should be part of a societal initiative and that government should be involved and so should the provinces and the private sector. Yes, so let us look at the negative impact that those reductions and transfer payments will have on research and development specifically.

The government has also cut training and retraining. Of course, the Prime Minister and his minister said that we would have the best training programs of the world. They are now on the shoulders of the worker and the employer. How has it helped the poor students? This is the logic of the Conservative government. It has tacked on a 3 per cent administrative fee to student aid.

[Translation]

Only poor people borrow money. You do not need to borrow if you already have money. What did the government do? It said: "Since you are poor and need to borrow money, we will ask you to pay an extra 3 per cent", even though it knew that the students' already heavy debt load is growing, that their tuition fees are going up every year.

[English]

That is quite apart from the goods and services tax's negative impact on education. We will talk about that in the next few weeks. It is quite apart from the postal subsidies that were supposed to have been absorbed. That was a promise made by a former government in the last administration that was not honoured. These have to be absorbed.

This is how the government goes about helping education, science and technology, and research and development. Well, it often brags about \$240 million for the centres of excellence. We have acknowledged that it is a noble program. However, when almost \$10 billion is cut, or when it is slated between 1985 and 1986, it is not very

Supply

difficult to give \$250 million or \$500 million. I have got to tell you, it is really, really quite easy.

The government is never really willing to say that in the \$240 million for centres of excellence—quite apart from the \$10 billion that it will cut unless it changes its ways—that there is not one humanities or social science project. There is no project that seeks to look at Canadian society and how you and I and the workers out there will change as a result of a changing technological society. I find that deplorable and I think it says a whole lot about the government's orientation in this area.

[Translation]

—if we want to become more competitive, to be leaders instead of followers, we have no choice but to review what the government is doing. We must make sure that our policy is very strong and sensitive to Canadian needs.

I am asking you to urge the government to examine its conscience and see what it can change to respond with honesty and accuracy to the needs of Canadians from all parts of the country.

[English]

Mr. Winegard: Madam Speaker, I have just a couple of comments about the transfers from the government of Canada to the provinces.

As my hon. colleague knows, the transfers that he is talking about represent, in this year, about one-half of 1 per cent of the provincial budgets, and next year, something like 1 per cent of the provincial budgets. We are asking the provinces to spend at the same rate that we are. I would think that is a pretty responsible thing to do.

Let me take it further in terms of Established Program Financing. My colleague knows very well that these are unconditional transfers to the provinces and that there is no guarantee whatsoever that they are going to go, nor have they gone, to health care and particularly to post-secondary education. That has been one of the troubles. It is one of the difficulties with simple transfer without any strings attached.

It was not our government that did that. It was 1977 when the Liberal government made those transfers absolutely unconditional. Now the Liberals want to come back to try somehow to say: "Well, we would like to have those transfers hooked in in some way". One cannot do