

That is the crux of the issue. We have no doubt that this legislation will render our universities into second-class institutions because of its insensitive nature. Universities need money to operate and the increases should be more than simply the rate of inflation. Universities conduct research and are continually striving to increase the quality of education. One cannot simply say that as long as financing keeps up with the rate of inflation it will suffice. It is not good enough. They need more, and it has been shown that universities suffer more when their funding increases are pegged to the inflation rate.

Students and professors, indeed all those involved with universities, have roundly condemned this legislation. I need not quote all those individuals and groups who appeared before the committee. Suffice it to say that there was a very strong message delivered to the Conservative Government, but it has fallen upon deaf ears. In pressing for this legislation the Government is once again showing that it is not listening to Canadians, notwithstanding the lofty pronouncements it made over a year ago.

Mr. Hopkins: Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the Hon. Member for—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hopkins:—York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata) for a clear and succinct description of the evidence that here again is another example of a total failure by the Government to carry out its promises. The Hon. Member quoted the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) saying the exact opposite to what he is doing in this Bill.

The Hon. Member has been talking about medicare and post-secondary education. Does he not think that in Ontario, which pays the largest amount of taxes of any province and therefore shares more with other provinces, will now not only be paying more as its share but also will be losing something like \$2.9 billion by 1992? Will the Hon. Member give the House an idea of how Ontario is going to find this money? Will it raise taxes to make up the \$2.9 billion loss despite the fact we will still be paying a larger share to the other provinces because the federal Government has failed to keep its promises of the last election, particularly those made by the Minister of Finance? What effect will this have on other things under the provincial Government in Ontario? What about the municipalities? Is it going to mean less money from the Province of Ontario to the municipalities and, hence, more taxes on local taxpayers? What is the drain effect of what this Tory Government is doing to every Canadian right down to their individual homes today?

● (1150)

Mr. Nunziata: I would like to thank my hon. colleague for his question. His points are extremely well taken in terms of what impact there will be in the Province of Ontario. I would submit, thank goodness, in the Province of Ontario we have a Liberal Government headed by Premier David Peterson who is very sensitive to the needs of the universities, and to the needs

Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act

of hospitals and the health care system in Ontario. He will be faced with a very difficult decision, together with his Treasurer, Mr. Nixon. The Government of the Province of Ontario will have, in some way, to make up the shortfall of \$3 billion. I have every confidence in the Liberal Government of Ontario that before they in any way diminish the level of health care and post-secondary education that they will look to other measures first. I very strongly and sincerely believe that the Government of the Province of Ontario has its priorities straight and is fair in terms of its deliberations.

If there have to be cuts, and we hope that there will not have to be cuts—it is almost inevitable given this legislation—then the Government of Ontario will no doubt look to other areas before it looks to health care and post-secondary education, if at all. Of course the other option is to raise taxes, but that is not really an option in the Province of Ontario, which already pays a tremendous amount of taxes. My hon. colleague is quite right, municipalities will no doubt bear the brunt of Bill C-96.

I note you have indicated that my time is up, but I would simply in closing ask the Government to reconsider the legislation in view of the almost universal condemnation of Bill C-96.

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I consider it a welcome part of the responsibilities of a Member of this House to bring to bear some comments on Bill C-96. I have to confess that my stomach is feeling a little uncomfortable today. I am experiencing some nausea, and, therefore, I want to express my appreciation to the House in denying an extension of time to the Member for York South—Weston (Mr. Nunziata) because had he continued I doubt that I would have been able to continue my presence here without having to exit for a serious medical purpose.

We just heard a Member of the Liberal Party, which only a very short time ago held the Government of this country, the Government that was responsible in 1982 for the first shot at decreasing the rate of increase in funding to post-secondary education, stand in this House and attribute exclusive culpability to the present Government. I note too that he was lauding the progress made in the Province of Ontario, and of course there has been some, but it is worth noting that even after the slightly progressive changes in financing of post-secondary education which have been implemented by the provincial Government of Ontario, Ontario still stands very low on the totem pole with respect to post-secondary education, a position which has to be an embarrassment when we are compared to other poorer provinces in this country much more strapped than Ontario with higher rates of unemployment and less advanced industrial development. Many of the provinces are making more progress with respect to post-secondary education than the Province of Ontario even now.

Of course the Tory Government, which is responsible for introducing this Bill, is guilty. It is guilty of failing to meet the promises it made during the course of the election. One need only to refer to the Progressive Conservative policy statement