

Health Resources Fund Act

to make a tax comparison between the average people in the provinces.

An hon. Member: What is the net per capita income after tax?

Mr. Nystrom: I am talking here about families with the same income. Maybe I will go over it again because I am sure the hon. member, being a Tory, finds it hard to understand.

Here is a taxpayer who is over the age of 25, who has a spouse and two children under the age of 16. He earns some \$15,000, owns a home with a property tax assessment of \$9,200 a year, insures a 1975 Impala with \$200,000 public liability and \$100 deductible, and which consumes 600 gallons of gasoline a year. So I am comparing identical families in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario. The ordinary person is getting along a lot better in Saskatchewan under NDP policies than the same person in the province of Ontario. He is even getting off slightly better in Saskatchewan than in Alberta, even when you take into account the tremendous wealth which Alberta has at its disposal.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order. I suggest we all talk about Bill C-2.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nystrom: I am very happy you interrupted, Mr. Speaker, because I never intended talking about taxes. It was only after our Tory friends asked me a couple of questions about tax levels in Ontario and Saskatchewan that I did so. Another hon. member asked me about Alberta, and then they wanted me to repeat it because they could not quite understand it. I am even happier, Mr. Speaker, to talk about health. Again, you can look at a comparison between the provinces when it comes to health care. You have to know which party has a philosophy which looks after ordinary people. It is one thing in the House to talk, but you have to look at political parties and judge politicians by what they do when they are in government.

We know what the government across the way has done. We have said many times we do not like a lot of the things it is doing. It should not be cutting back in this bill. But we have difficulty, sometimes, in knowing where the Tory party stand because they will speak out of both sides of their mouth depending upon which audience they are addressing. So I believe it is very important to look at their record in the provinces, and that is what I was doing in terms of per capita debt, the size of the bureaucracy, and the tax load. Now they ask me to talk about their hospital care record.

Let us have a look at Saskatchewan. Premiums on medicare in that province are zero, but the premiums in Ontario for a family of four are some \$456 a year.

An hon. Member: What about New Brunswick?

Mr. Nystrom: New Brunswick as well. I do not have the figures. I assume they are high. They must be because it is a Tory province.

[Mr. Nystrom.]

An hon. Member: No, they are zero.

Mr. Nystrom: Look at the additional charges for patients. Saskatchewan does not have any additional charges, at least not now, but if we have tremendous cutbacks by the federal government then the province will have to get some money from elsewhere, and I assume they will not charge but that they will get it from resource revenue and the like. We do not have any additional charges to the people in the province, but in the province of Ontario there is an \$8.60 deterrent fee for extended care in a hospital. In other words, there is a tax on the sick. I know the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Crombie) as a good Progressive Conservative, is violently opposed to such a tax—I remember his speech on the haves and the have-nots.

Look at the children's dental plan. There is one in Saskatchewan; there isn't one in Ontario. There is a hearing aid plan in Saskatchewan, there isn't one in Conservative Ontario. There is a drug prescription plan in Saskatchewan; there isn't one in Conservative Ontario. There is a plan to help people who are handicapped in the province of Saskatchewan; there isn't one in Ontario. Indeed, in Ontario they collect more money from hospitalization and medicare fees than they collect from resource revenue. I think this is a commentary on the Conservative party that every Canadian should know. Mr. Speaker, it is an utter and absolute disgrace.

One can go over all the statistics and see what the record of the Conservative party is. When they talk about restraints and cutbacks they do not mean to cut back on services to the wealthy, they are not going to cut back on their fancy tax gifts and being Santa Claus to the corporations. What they cut back, Mr. Speaker, are services to the ordinary people. They do it in areas such as the one we are discussing today, namely, medical care and hospitalization. What makes me angry is why the federal Liberal party, when they are desperate because of the results in the Gallup poll, adopt some of the policies of the nineteenth century party which sits here to my right.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Benjamin: There are two Tory parties. Two too many!

Mr. Nystrom: There are many things that can be said about restraint, about how it affects ordinary people. Another thing that is very interesting is the unemployment statistics which have been published recently. We find that the biggest increase in unemployment in the last year has been in the province which has been beating the drum the loudest about restraint and cutback, namely, the province of Manitoba. The average increase in unemployment in that province year over year, according to the statistics for November at least, was about 30 per cent.

If the hon. member for Lisgar has figures to refute what I say, he should get up and document them. If you look at the report from Statistics Canada you will find there has been roughly a 30 per cent increase, year over year. Of the economists I have read, most of them say that a large part of that