

financial reason that will attract them to the Atlantic provinces. The reverse is true, they will go elsewhere. That is a very serious situation, and a direct result of the cutting of transfer payments for post-secondary education. We found that same situation elsewhere.

Let me give you an idea of the magnitude of the funds that will be cut. Here are the figures for the Province of Newfoundland. Over the next five years we in Newfoundland will receive \$187 million less than we had anticipated. There will be an increase, Mr. Speaker. The Government will say that post-secondary education is getting more money this year than it got the previous year. That is true. But provinces are getting less money than they anticipated. There was a federal-provincial five-year agreement with certain agreed on figures. The provinces were basing their expenditures on those figures and the universities were basing their expenditures on those figures. But now we are seeing the Government saying unilaterally that Newfoundland is going to get \$187 million less than it anticipated, less than was promised, less than was agreed, less than it bargained for. It is somehow going to have to make that up. How is it going to make it up, asks Newfoundland? Is it going to make it up by cutting out health care, cutting down on hospital care, cutting out beds, cutting down the salaries of nurses? How is it going to make up that deficiency of \$187 million?

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, the House and the Government that we are talking about a province with the lowest per capita income in the country, a province which has the highest retail sales taxes anywhere in the country, a province with the highest unemployment rate anywhere in the country, a province with the weakest fiscal capacity anywhere in the country. Yet we are telling this province that it will receive \$187 million less over the next five years than it had anticipated.

What are the young people of Newfoundland supposed to do about that, Mr. Speaker? Let me tell you. In the Province of Newfoundland there is close to a 50 per cent unemployment rate among young people eligible for employment. The unemployment rate is well over 40 per cent and getting close to 50 per cent. That is the unemployment rate of the young people in Newfoundland who are going to be affected by this Bill.

I know my time is short but I want to make a last plea to the Government. Let me say to the Minister of Finance, who is a passionate and thoughtful man and I believe a man of fairness, that I understand his problem with the deficit. But let us not put the burden of that deficit on the group in the country to whom we should be paying most attention and for whom we have the greatest responsibility, our young people. If there is any future for this country it lies in their hands. I remind the Minister of the words of the Chief Justice, that we should not choke off the universities. He said that if we do that it will lead to second-class students and ultimately a second-class nation. That is something I and my Party cannot tolerate. I hope

Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act

Members on that side of the House in the Government of Canada will not tolerate it either.

• (1240)

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order on a different matter. After Question Period a report of the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission was tabled by a Minister on behalf of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Côté) who was not here. My office and that of the Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), our consumer critic, have been trying to get copies of that report. We were unable to get copies until a few minutes ago. There was a lock-up this morning, We could not get in the lock-up. All the oil industry representatives got into that lock-up.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order, please.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I raise that because I think the privileges of an MP are affected.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): I can appreciate the fact that the Member for Vancouver—Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) may have a point which can be brought up at some time in a different context, but not at this time in this debate.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on that point of order. I would like to make a submission with regard to the appropriateness of the raising of a point of order. It is necessary in order for a point to be sustainable that the point be raised at the earliest possible moment. This is the earliest possible moment. We would be in a very difficult position if we did not at least give notice of our intent to raise this point at a subsequent time.

If the Chair is ruling that we should make the argumentation later, of course we will abide by that. However, it is absolutely crucial that a point of order or question of privilege be brought to the Chair's attention immediately when it becomes known. I would, therefore, ask the Chair's indulgence to accept that we have now given notice of our desire to raise a point of order and to allow us to raise it either later this day or on Monday in keeping with the normal practices.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): The Chair will take that as notice. I will simply clarify the point I was attempting to make without going on for very long on this issue. In the context of this debate that is not a point of order. I understand that the Member for Vancouver—Kingsway may have a grievance following a procedure. It is my understanding that the report has been tabled, and also my understanding that it will be distributed today. If the Member and the House Leader for the New Democratic Party feel they have a point, they can put it down in writing and bring it up at the appropriate time. I was going to say that I hope this puts the matter to rest, but I see the Member for Hamilton Mountain on his feet.

Mr. Deans: I am rising on debate.