

as, for example, where it is going to put a prison. That is extremely unfortunate.

There has been a lot of other shipbuilding in other parts of Canada, for instance in Saint John and on the St. Lawrence River, yet no attention is really being paid by the Government to the shipbuilding needs on the West Coast.

There were items in the Speech from the Throne which I and other Hon. Members, I know, were very encouraged to hear. The recommendations in relation to science, technology and post-secondary education were superficially, at least, encouraging. In the case of scientific research, \$1 billion over five years in funding is promised. That is about the only specific in the Speech from the Throne. That was good to see, although, as we all know, practically all of that is catch-up since scientific research has been so under-funded. Also promised in the Speech from the Throne was a strategy for technology and a variety of other proposals. We will have to see whether or not these will be elaborated upon further in the weeks and months ahead. We can only hope so.

The Government promised that it would call a national forum on post-secondary education early next year to help meet the challenges facing higher education. Again, this is a desirable proposal, one which we have been making for some time. It would, of course, have been more seriously taken by us had we felt that the present Government has a serious commitment to post-secondary education. We find that its commitment is really not a particularly serious one, when as recently as June of this year it pressed through with Bill C-96 which, as we all recall, significantly reduced the rate of increase of federal support for post-secondary education. Nor has the Government made any response to a suggestion made by many people in the field of higher education that there should be a Minister of State for post-secondary education in the federal Government. That is something for which the New Democrats have been calling for some time. I speak of New Democrats in this connection, Mr. Speaker, because both federally and provincially we have been particularly strong proponents of accessibility to post-secondary education as well as fairness and equity, adequate funding, a better loan and grant system and all the other important matters relating to post-secondary education if we want a society where we have genuine equality of opportunity.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that we objected very strenuously in 1977 to the open-ended federal funding proposals which were passed at that time. That meant that provinces could spend the money on any matter they wished rather than spending it strictly on post-secondary education. Provinces have been very remiss in keeping up their full share of the costs of post-secondary education, particularly the Social Credit Government of British Columbia which has been extremely remiss. It has been cutting back very seriously on accessibility to higher education. I am curious to know what would happen, and I hope I never see it, if our current premier, who was a disastrous Minister of Education, should attend the national forum on challenges to higher education because, quite

The Address—Ms. Jewett

frankly, the current Premier of British Columbia, as became quite clear in a television newscip the other night when he appeared at a meeting with students at the University of British Columbia, really has no interest or concern about the issue of equality and accessibility in higher education. Nor, indeed, does his Minister of Education. I was shocked to read a day or two ago that: "B.C. Education Minister, Russell Fraser, says poorer people should examine their priorities and consider putting off post-secondary education if they are unable to afford it".

Post-secondary education is as significant for those of us in British Columbia as the forest and shipbuilding industries. We would like to see a full debate on this in the current provincial election. The New Democrats, as I said before, both federally and provincially, have creative programs for post-secondary education. Our British Columbia leader, Bob Skelly, outlined in detail our post-secondary education policies at the University of Victoria last week. It would be desirable, it seems to me, as it does to him, to have the current premier debate with him—and we have been urging this in our province—issues not only of forestry and other matters of job creation but also the accessibility of education to young people, and we still hope to see that happen.

The Speech from the Throne also addressed another subject in which many of us in this House have a great interest, that is, the equality of women in society. It is rather disappointing, however, that it is difficult to find in the Speech from the Throne any real, strong and genuine commitment to, for example, universal child care. It had some things to say about wage equity in the Public Service but there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne which address the problem of ghettoization of women in low paid jobs in the Public Service, nor anything about the problems of the part-time worker, most of whom are women, the impact of technological change on women, or the enormous problem of women in development in the Third World. I feel that the commitment of the Government to the equality of women at home and abroad is not a very deep one.

• (1200)

I was interested to note that in the listing of the Ministry as reported in last Wednesday's *Hansard* no one is listed as being responsible for the status of women. I thought that the Hon. Member for St. Paul's (Mrs. McDougall) had been given that responsibility—but apparently not. Beside her name in the list there is mentioned only her responsibility as Minister of State for Privatization. Indeed, if one looks at the alphabetical listing of Members set out in last Wednesday's *Hansard* one will see that beside the Minister's name there is no reference to her being Minister Responsible for the Status of Women as well as being the Minister responsible for privatization. So someone who did not know what was going on here, and I suppose from time to time that includes many Canadians, would not know that the Government had anyone responsible for the status of women. Perhaps that shows the Government's priorities. It is difficult to understand, particularly in view of