

in the provinces. These cuts will amount to approximately \$8.2 billion once the Bill is passed between now and 1992, some six years. As a result of this Bill, the provinces will receive \$8.2 billion less than they would have received for health care and education.

We in the Liberal Party have opposed this Bill at second reading stage, in committee and at report stage and now we are opposing it at third reading stage. We have moved a motion that this Bill be not read a third time until six months hence, a way of trying to postpone the implementation of this Bill at least until that time.

The Hon. Member from the Conservative Party who just asked a question stated that this Bill has been debated for 13 days and consequently that should be enough. We all know that in a Parliament such as this in which the Government has 211 Members and the Opposition only 70, we cannot win any votes but we can, through debate in the House, bring issues to the attention of the public in an attempt to formulate public opinion on these issues.

I must say that with so many issues before the country and with the Government creating new issues that did not even exist before, it is sometimes difficult to penetrate the public consciousness, and for that reason we must continue this debate. We must continue this debate so that Canadians will know what is happening with respect to education and health care services. We know that the Government does not respect Parliament. It would just as soon see that we did not debate these issues at all but closed down. However, government Members do respect public opinion polls.

I am not afraid to state very clearly in the House that I do not expect to convince government Members through debate but I do hope that through debate, my colleagues and other members of the Opposition will make members of the public aware of what is happening so that they will react by sending letters and making phone calls and responding to the many polls that are taking place. In this way, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and the Cabinet will finally start to listen.

When the Government introduced this Bill, government Members did speak at that time. They said that the Bill was required in order to deal with the terrible deficit. Of course action should be taken to deal with the deficit, but there is no way that that action should fall on our health care and education systems. The deficit became a serious problem many years after we implemented programs to assist post-secondary education and health care.

● (2130)

We had our hospitalization system and programs for assisting provinces in post-secondary education for many years, and there was no problem with the deficit. The programs which are being cut in Bill C-96 are not the cause of the deficit. More than that, during the election campaign, the Prime Minister and the Conservative Party pledged that social

and health programs were a sacred trust which would not be cut back by them. However, what do we see?

While they are cutting back on education and health care, they are providing \$500,000 capital gains exemptions to their friends, the big investors. The Prime Minister is also providing for posterity by having a Hercules aircraft tailing him across the country with cameras to take photos and videos of him at \$40,000 per crack. That was not done before; it is an additional expenditure.

Over the weekend we read in the newspapers about increases in the staff of Ministers as a result of the Freedom of Information Act. The figures released by the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. de Cotret) show that the over-all cost of Ministers' staff is \$42.9 million in the 1985-86 fiscal year. That is up 17 per cent from 1983-84. However, they spent 53 per cent more on their personal political staff last year than did the Liberals in their last full year in office. Of course, that sort of thing is going on at all levels. While they are cutting back on education and health care, Ministers' offices are becoming bigger. Instead of executive assistants, they have chiefs of staff earning up to \$70,000 per year. Also, offices are being opened up in Vancouver, Montreal, and other cities so that Ministers can put up their feet and make their telephone calls. That was never done before. I understand that the Government is about to rent space in one of the most expensive buildings in Montreal. It only has one Minister in Montreal, the second largest city in the country, and he is not very visible. The Government is opening a large office down there like the one in Vancouver so that other Tory Ministers can come to Montreal and carry on their business in that way. That was not necessary in the past; it was not necessary under the former Liberal Government nor under the former Conservative Government of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark).

We have had \$1 billion bail-outs for depositors in banks and the \$56 million for new uniforms for members of the Armed Forces. While those sorts of things are going on, the Government cuts the rate of growth of moneys for education and health care.

Of course the deficit has to be dealt with, as I said. The negative approach of the Government in cutting health care and education will not really reduce the deficit. What will reduce the deficit is a growing and vibrant economy. Essential to a growing and vibrant economy is a dynamic post-secondary education system. The strength of a growing economy is in the ability of our citizens to deal with the problems of a modern technological age, in the ability of our citizens to produce research and development and new products, and in the ability of our citizens to deal with entrepreneurial problems in a new and dynamic way.

Education is paramount if we are to have a growing productive economy. It is a growing productive economy which will return more moneys to the Treasury and bring down the deficit, even without raising taxes and without cutting programs. It could be that certain programs should be cut, but