

Supply

Mr. Mills: The people of Canada—

An hon. member: Will you or won't you?

Mr. Mills: Yes. I will tell you one thing, for the Liberal Party of Canada—

Mr. Samson: You are attacking the federal NDP.

Mr. Mills: Yes, I am attacking the federal NDP.

Mr. Samson: You are attacking the provincial NDP.

Mr. Mills: I am giving you direct quotes from the province of Ontario. I can only speak for the Liberal Party of Canada and the Liberal Party of Canada has always maintained that in no way, shape or form should we tamper with the health care system of this country. When it comes to universal health care, my leader has said that, my former leader has said that, and all of our leaders will say that, and Clyde Wells—

Mr. Samson: The provincial Liberals, do you support them or not?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I would appreciate very much if you would allow the hon. member to answer. I still have another questioner.

Mr. Mills: As the member for Gander—Grand Falls said earlier, there is no stronger person in this country committed to national standards and national programs and not just in health care. We all know that in this country.

I think he cited the premier of New Brunswick. I cannot speak for the premier of New Brunswick. I do not speak for the city of Toronto, any more than he speaks for Premier Romanow.

When I was responding, I was giving direct quotes from the position of the NDP in the province of Ontario. I was only giving those direct quotes to point out the fact that even in the province of Ontario, which is a fairly wealthy province, they too as NDPers are finding it very difficult to deal with this complex issue.

In the process of debate, in the process of looking at options and alternatives and ways of maintaining the health care system, some of their own members, including their treasurer and their health minister and their deputy minister of health have put forward ideas that suggest they are not endorsing national standards.

I will put it right on the record now. I for one moment do not believe that the remarks of Frances Lankin or

Michael Decter are carved in stone, that they are against treating people with lung cancer. He is throwing out hypotheses here, not very bright, for advancing debate.

My point is in the process of advancing debate, do not grab some little clip that somebody makes and try to make it a national story.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The hon. member for Calgary Northeast on a very short question or comment.

Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary Northeast): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the hon. member. As I do not have much time I would like to ask him a short question. He was mentioning St. Michael's Hospital in Toronto.

As we know, the budget for hospitals has been increased by 1 per cent. St. Michael's was obliged to close 100 beds, so naturally the service cannot be as good. They have discovered at St. Michael's that they have a debt of \$63 million that apparently was lost somewhere in the accounting, but now they are aware of it.

Naturally there is a question of debt for some of the hospitals and if there is no increase in funding, I wonder how he sees them managing to provide good services.

Mr. Mills: Mr. Speaker, as I have been saying all afternoon, this is a very tough, complex issue. In order to handle the deficit, the debt of this nation, we have to expand wealth. We have to create more wealth. I make no secret, I am a single tax person. We have to reform the tax system. That gets more productivity going in this country, which will generate more wealth. That will ultimately give us the resources we need to look after the deficits of these hospitals.

This is a long, complex equation we are involved with here. I certainly am not trying to simplify the difficulty of it. If we are going to expand wealth creation in this country, we are going to have to start treating people more fairly through the tax designs. I think that is our only shot and the current system we have in place is a disincentive to that wealth creation.

Mr. Karpoff: Mr. Speaker, this is a supply day debate. I would like to read what it says about this: "It is a fundamental element of the principle underlying financial procedures of Parliament, the idea that Parliament does not grant supply until the opposition has had the opportunity to demonstrate why it should be refused. This opportunity takes the form of debate on designated supply days".