Adjournment Debate

POINT OF ORDER

BUDGET STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There have been discussions among the parties and I think you would find consent to approve the motion with respect to the budget which was read into the record immediately prior to Routine Proceedings today.

I understand that my hon. friend for Kamloops has a point of order with respect to questions and answers $vis-\dot{a}-vis$ the minister's budget address which he wishes to raise at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

In the event that Mr. Speaker agrees with my hon. friend for Kamloops, we would agree to the order being amended to take into account any such ruling.

Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with respect to the government's request earlier today to present the budget tomorrow at 4.30 p.m.

Given that this budget will be predicated on the revenues expected from the goods and services tax, given that 80 per cent of Canadians have expressed their concern about this tax and rejected this tax, and given that the government has decided to ignore the voice of Canadians, my party had to seriously consider the legitimacy of introducing such a budget.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. leader of the New Democratic Party has the floor.

Ms. McLaughlin: Mr. Speaker, I understand that my comments could give the government some anxiety but I would say to the government that people of Canso, Nova Scotia, know about anxiety and what is happening to them. People on fixed incomes and the farmers of this country know about anxiety.

Given the high inflation, the increasing unemployment and the high interest rates, we are prepared to give the Minister of Finance the opportunity to show some economic leadership in the country. Should the government introduce a motion to introduce the budget at 4.30 p.m. tomorrow, we are willing to give our consent. Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion proposed by the Minister of Justice and government house leader. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

EDUCATION

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, members will recall that on November 9, 1989, the Canadian Federation of Students visited Ottawa to protest against the government's handling of post-secondary education in this country.

They had identified the massive slash in transfer payments to the provinces, roughly \$24 billion fewer dollars for health and education over an eight or nine fiscal year period. They understood, as well, that there would be less funding for training and retraining. They knew that the government had removed almost \$700 million and then had added another \$800 million without making any adjustments for student growth, without making any adjustments for inflation, and without making any adjustments whatsoever either for new programs that were needed.

They were alarmed at the government reneging on its commitment to double its investments in research and development. We had been at roughly 1.4 per cent of gross domestic product, that is in terms of investments, which is roughly one half of what is expended in the United States, Japan, Sweden, France and West Germany, and that has slipped. In fact the Prime Minister had asked the provinces and the private sector to contribute more. The provinces have contributed 21 per cent more during the last five years. The private sector has contributed 19 per cent more, while the federal government has contributed 9 per cent more. Its contribution has not even kept up with inflation.