

Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act

promised that they would not just maintain the same level; they would restore the cuts or the money cut out. That was the promise of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and his colleagues during the election campaign. It is shameful that now they are in office they have not only broken that promise and not put back the money the Liberals cut out, but that they have done worse than the Liberals ever did by cutting out six times as much, as they have undertaken to do with this legislation. It will be a black day for Canada when Bill C-96 will be declared law.

Mrs. Finestone: Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to what the Hon. Member had to say. Does he think there is a message or a subliminal intention, or perhaps it is rather direct, in the Conservative perspective—and they have the right to have that political philosophy and ideology, except they also have the responsibility to present it in a courageous way—which suggests that young people who want post-secondary education and professors who want to work toward a doctoral degree or a masters degree have to pay the shot, that society can no longer afford it? It is a fair decision if that is their decision, by the way. Are they also saying that there does not seem to be the opportunity any longer for universal health care at the hospital level, let us say, and therefore they think that the proper option is to remove the National Health Care Act and put in place a user fee? Does the Hon. Member think that those are the subliminal messages which we might be hearing behind the \$8 billion cut in the EPF payments to the provinces?

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, I am asked whether I think the intention of the Government is to privatize higher education by making the student or the professor pay for any education they get by their own individual efforts, and whether I think it is the intention of the Government to privatize health care. I do not know, but I think it is against the rules for us to try to read the Government's mind. However, I would like to compare this with a policy which I witnessed in a country that I visited last summer, namely, Chile. Since 1973, when the military dictatorship took over, Chile has been following a policy very much like this one. It has been cutting back on education so that there are only half as many professors in Chile as there were 13 years ago. It has cut back on health so that 46 per cent of the children under six years old are malnourished and infectious diseases are rapidly increasing. Now, not to speak for the Government but to quote what the Ambassador said to me—by the way, it is the Canadian Ambassador; we paid his wages—he said that this was the correct policy for the Chilean Government in order to promote its competitiveness internationally, and that Canada must do the same thing. That is only one official, but there seem to be signs that it is the opinion that Canada does not need educated people or that Canada does not need healthy people.

• (1610)

There was a time when the Government thought we needed healthy and educated people to do the proceedings work of

production in this country. But it seems there is now a class of people who say: "We will buy what we want offshore from the United States or elsewhere. We do not have to care whether or not Canadians are physically or mentally able to produce." It is a very short road those people would be running if that is their attitude. If it is not their attitude, perhaps it is the attitude of the questioner, but I think they both come down to the same thing. The Government has made a decision not to provide, not to care for the physical and mental needs of the people of Canada.

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, could the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap) describe what happens with the formula that provides post-secondary education and health care to the provinces? He gave some figures. Could he expand on those numbers and perhaps tell us what it would mean in the forthcoming four or five year period as to what sort of losses in revenues will be experienced under this new proposed formula versus the formula that has been in effect since 1977? Could he tell us what sort of losses various provinces might expect as a result of this new conservative approach to federal-provincial financing?

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, it just so happens I have some figures with me that are relevant to the Hon. Member's question. In 1986-87, there will be a loss of \$318 million. The next year there will be a loss of \$680 million, the next year \$1,078 million, the next year \$1,520 million, the next year \$2,009 million making a total of \$5,608.3 million. That is spread among the provinces. Newfoundland in total will lose \$128 million; Prince Edward Island will lose \$27.5 million; Nova Scotia will lose \$195 million; New Brunswick will lose \$156.8 million; Quebec will lose \$1,435.4 million; Ontario will lose \$2,014.1 million; Manitoba will lose \$235.8 million; Saskatchewan will lose \$227.4 million; Alberta will lose \$530 million; British Columbia will lose \$641.8 million; Yukon will lose \$4.8 million; and the Northwest Territories will lose \$11.7 million.

I do not think there is one of those provinces or territories that can afford to lose that much money from education and health services.

Mr. Lesick: Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate this afternoon and I have noticed a tremendous amount of confusion in the minds of opposition Members and particularly with respect to the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap). Opposition Members are always talking about cuts, cuts, cuts in an area in which there has been an increase. That is the problem that I have as I sit here and listen to them.

This is the first responsible Government we have had in 23 years, other than the nine months in 1979. We are trying to balance the budget. There have been cuts, but in this area there are no cuts. The Hon. Member is talking about a supposition, something that may be, and I suggest that the Hon. Member should realize that this is not a cut; it is a lack of an increase. Why not speak the truth, as we know it and as the Member knows it? These increases will be experienced by