

*Established Programs Financing*

the distance from an institution but because of the cost of getting into those institutions.

We have attempted to establish training in all areas of education. We have done a good job of it across Canada. We have institutions which will give to students almost any kind of training that is needed by any occupation. There are very few students who have to go overseas or across the border to get the kind of training they want. Most training is available in Canada. The moment we start cutting back on the funds available to those institutions, programs that are not well attended will be dropped. We will cease to have the kind of comprehensive education of which we are so proud.

**Mr. Manly:** That is already happening.

**Mr. Hovdebo:** Yes, as my colleague is saying, it is already happening.

The quality of the education is also bound to be affected by cutbacks right now in some institutes in Saskatchewan. I think particularly of the Kelsey Institute in Saskatoon which has 140 students enrolled in some courses instead of the 35 or 40 enrolled a couple of years ago. The reason for this situation is that there are not enough funds to pay for three instructors instead of one. People say it does not affect the quality of education particularly, but I am sure everyone in the House who has gone through a higher learning institution will know that when you have several hundred students in one class you do not get the kind of attention necessary to give you the best quality education. Consequently, this cutback is affecting universality, accessibility, comprehensiveness and the quality of education in the post-secondary field.

People have reasonable expectations. We have accepted those expectations as part of the educational system of Canada. We should continue to do so. We should not at this time cut back on them. In these days when many young people and older people are unable to find work, it seems that we as a Parliament of Canada as well as the Governments across Canada should provide them with alternatives, some alternatives to unemployment insurance or welfare. That is possibly the greatest effect of this cutback. Many people will have to go on welfare or unemployment insurance when they could go into training. That training will not be available for them unless we are willing to pay for it.

● (1540)

**Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak today on a topic which is of great importance to the future of our country. I am referring to Bill C-12, which seeks to limit transfer payments to the provinces, especially in the area of post-secondary education. The Bill itself is a depressing document, and it bears depressing news about the future of our universities and our youth.

The Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) pointed out the completely incomprehensible language of the Bill. Anyone who doubts my affirmation that the Bill is 100 per cent bafflegab should refer to *Hansard* of Friday, January 27, in which the Hon. Member read portions

of it for the record. I will not repeat the actual words of the document, mainly because it is illegible and is not written in either of Canada's official languages. Rather, it can be understood only by bureaucrats specializing in the language of confusion.

However, the consequences of the Bill are simple—the universities of the country which are already suffering will be suffering more. I suppose Hon. Members have read yesterday's edition of *The Citizen*. In it the plight of Carleton University was outlined. The problem is that only a very small portion of the university's budget has been set aside for the maintenance of buildings. The obvious result of this is the deterioration of buildings on campus. We know the old saying: an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Perhaps the expensive deterioration of the buildings can be stopped if more money is infused into the budget for maintenance. How can they set aside more money if less money is being allocated by the federal Government for university expenditures?

It was noted by a high level official at Carleton University only a few days ago that he would like to see improved accessibility to universities. How will this be possible if Bill C-12 is allowed to pass in the House? Perhaps my colleagues across the floor can answer that question better than I can.

I am told that of course the question is really one of restraint. This is an old theme, rather like the one we hear on street corners from organ-grinders with monkeys. Not that I wish to harp on this musical theme, but if the Liberals are to trumpet the issue of restraint, they will look rather foolish when the time comes to pay the piper. The taxpayers of the country are not fools; they can tell the difference between an overture and a swan song. That is what Bill C-12 is. It is the last sound of a dying government as it seeks to show the country that it is capable of restraint. That is all fine and dandy, but why can it not show restraint in spending in other areas?

Let me give a few examples of the wasteful spending perpetrated by the Government. Then, Mr. Speaker, you can judge for yourself if the intent of Bill C-12 is sincere or if it is just a smoke-screen, an attempt to cover up previous fiscal blunders with a move which is designed to sort of smell of restraint but gives off the more evil odour of hypocrisy. Hon. Members will recall, as has already been pointed out, that this is the year of the rat. How well that applies to this particular Bill!

Look at de Havilland. Look at Maislin. Look at the shameful exceptions to the six and five program. There are dozens of examples of "do as I say, not as I do". Look at Mirabel. It is a prime example. How about that one?

What is a few million bucks? Perhaps it does not matter that much. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) was able to come up with \$200 million almost overnight to hide the gaffe of his notorious leak last April. There seems to be plenty of money to bail out Crown corporations. There are many other examples of incredible waste. For example, despite the fact that the Department of External Affairs advised the Minister not to proceed with the multimillion dollar sewage system in