

moments I was given. I thank the House Leader opposite for the opportunity to point out to the House some of the problems which he is experiencing in his stewardship. Anyone who is a House Leader of a group which looks as though it has just broke out of the Montreal zoo has to be commiserated with.

An Hon. Member: That is why you do not do well in Montreal, John.

Mr. Crosbie: Or the Toronto zoo.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On debate, the Hon. Member for Beaches (Mr. Young).

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Crosbie: Shirley Carr.

Mr. Young: Shirley Carr sends her regards.

Mr. Crosbie: On a point of order, I have something here I want to show to the House. It shows the great tit, the blue tit, the coal tit, the marsh tit, and the crested tit. Which are you?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Young: "Mr. Speaker, this is a deplorable piece of legislation because the principle of it is one of betrayal. The Bill betrays the provinces of Canada, the provincial Governments of Canada and betrays the universities of Canada. It betrays post-secondary institutions of Canada. It betrays the young people of Canada and it illustrates rank hypocrisy in the actions of the Government".

Mr. Murphy: Who said that?

Mr. Young: "The House is discussing a Bill to reduce federal contributions to post-secondary education—for the fiscal year ending next March and to reduce the federal contribution to post-secondary education by \$260 million in the next fiscal year starting April 1, 1984. Is that not rank hypocrisy? Is it not an illustration of the rotteness and internal self-contradiction of the people now administering the affairs of Canada? . . . That is the rankest hypocrisy . . . Whom does it affect the most? Whom is this the most crippling blow to? It is the most crippling blow to the Atlantic provinces and, in particular to the Province of Newfoundland. It is a blow to those provinces which are financially strapped, and the four Atlantic provinces are among the most financially strapped of any of the provinces of Canada. This is a vicious blow to those provinces just when they need federal financial assistance, and more of it, to help their post-secondary education system. Just when they have fantastic highs of youth unemployment and unemployment generally, this Government reduces what they are to receive, using the fiction that it has to apply a six and five program to contracts which it entered into with the provinces in 1977. The Government has turned its back on its commitment and asks us to pass this legislation".

Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act

Mr. Redway: You have your back to me.

Mr. Young: I am sorry about that. "What is the effect on Newfoundland? In the year which is ending now, Newfoundland will receive \$2.7 million less than it would have received for post-secondary education. I believe in the year 1984-85, next year, when Newfoundland will be more in need of educational and training services than ever, there will be a reduction, I believe of \$6.1 million. The Province of Newfoundland, already strapped, already with a current account deficit, already with the highest per capita debt in Canada, is not going to be assisted by this Government. This Government is going to grind Newfoundland further down, if it can do it". I could not have said it better. The words I have just repeated were those of the present Minister of Justice, the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), in the House, as reported in the *Debates* for February 7, 1984 when the Liberal gang attempted to do exactly what the Tory gang is attempting to do today. There is not much difference between both of them.

I should like to refer to a letter from the Minister of Finance for the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador who wrote to the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) on April 22, 1986 in which he commented on the legislation presently before the House. He said:

● (1750)

Dear Mr. Murphy,

Premier Peckford has asked me to reply to your letter of April 9th concerning Bill C-96.

As no doubt you are aware, there has been extensive discussions of the matters covered by Bill C-96 at the official and ministerial level between the Federal and all Provincial orders of Government. These discussions included vigorous protests by the latter over the Federal intention to alter current EPF funding arrangements prior to May 1987.

No doubt you are also aware that discussions are continuing concerning an amendment to the Federal/Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Federal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act, 1977 which would put in place a further five-year arrangement for the period 1987 to 1992. These discussions have not yet concluded. The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador regards this larger amendment of very great importance for the continued co-operation between both orders of Government for the joint funding of our Education and Health systems. For this reason we will persist in making presentations to the federal Government detailing the particular problems and needs of our Province in those regards.

I trust I have given you the information which you are seeking.

I thought it was important that the House be made aware of such a letter. The impact this will have on Newfoundland and other Atlantic provinces, as well as other provinces across Canada, will be devastating on the ability of medicare to provide adequate service to the people of Canada. It will be devastating to a lot of young people, one of our greatest natural resources, in being able to afford higher education because of what the Government is doing to the transfer of funds for post-secondary education financing.

It is rank hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Member for St. John's West properly and adequately described this measure in