

There are two points that I wanted to address to my hon. colleague and they refer to the EPF financing, especially with respect to the implications for post-secondary education, hospitalization and medical facilities available to Canadians throughout Canada.

I know that the hon. member focused on the negative implications for British Columbia, Alberta, and Ontario. These are the three provinces which have been targeted by the government for cuts. I want to draw to her attention two points and perhaps she could comment. I am asking for only a very brief response, if possible.

Over the course of the last couple of days, a Noble Prize winner, a Canadian—I dare say almost a former Canadian—Mr. Polanyi, indicated that research and development in Canada is at an abysmal level. I think he indicated that he was ashamed even to refer to the kinds of programs that emanated from Canada as being thought of as participating in research and development.

Given our Constitution and the federal government's inability, constitutionally speaking, to be involved in the education of all Canadians on one level, except at the post-secondary level, and given that the federal government can use post-secondary education as a great leveller and as a great stimulus for research and development and for providing a national scope, a vision of where funds would be used in order to develop not only an erudite society, not only a well prepared society, but also to stimulate research and development that can be applied to the new technological necessities of tomorrow, and given as well that the government has chosen not to act on what is in its purview under the Constitution to do, and instead has decided to withdraw funds from the three provinces that appear to be in a position of leadership by virtue of the health of their economies, can my colleague indicate to us if she has been given an indication by the government or the Minister of Finance, if there is a government alternative that will replace the funds that the Minister of Finance will no longer put at the disposal of Canadians who want to establish a standard for all Canadians in technology, research and post-secondary education?

• (1720)

Is there a government alternative to cutting back those funds from those provinces? Is there, in fact, something

### *Government Orders*

the government is proposing to give to the other seven provinces that do not share those kinds of possibilities.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** The hon. member for Sudbury will be happy to know that she still has a few minutes to answer.

**Mrs. Marleau:** Madam Speaker, I must be very honest and cut all the sham. I must answer no to my colleague. There is no other plan by the government.

I am always surprised at the kind of rhetoric that the government is capable of putting forth. At a Conservative general meeting on August 25, 1989, the hon. Prime Minister stated, in a nice deep voice: "This government will carry its fair share of the burden to ensure that all young Canadians receive a first-class education as they confront a world-class challenge". It is a simple case of saying one thing and doing another, as the government has consistently done over the five years that it has been in power.

**Mr. Dennis Mills (Broadview—Greenwood):** Madam Speaker, first, I want to compliment the hon. member on her address.

I have been listening to many people in my riding and other ridings across Canada in the last few months. What I am hearing from many people, especially labour, is that there is a tremendous sense of hopelessness and the morale is bad.

In order to develop a competitive mood, a sense of national productivity or global competitiveness, the first thing we must have is a happy, productive workforce. If, suddenly, in the middle of a period when morale is bad in our labour force, the government comes along and adds a further complication by giving us a complicated and unnecessary goods and services tax, the GST, is this further disincentive and pressure not going to put further stress on our health care systems and municipal services?

Would the government would be further ahead in trying to increase its revenue base and productivity if, instead of looking at the need for taxes in a technocratic way, it went back to the root of the problem and realized that no matter how much tax we were given, before we are really going get productivity—which ultimately will generate the revenue and even take pressure off our social services and health care? Should the government