

been university decisions because they are autonomous institutions which prepare their own budgets, submit them to provincial governments for approval, and very seldom are they approved in total; they will often be cut back. Under the new proposals of the government pursuant to the philosophy that all roads lead to Ottawa, the universities and colleges will soon have to come to Ottawa to have their programs of instruction approved before money will be paid out to them. Students will have the same philosophy applied to them. One program which is being discussed actively by the government is the voucher system. This will mean that students will come to the national government to receive vouchers with which they can go to universities of their choice. One might think that is great, that it is free choice for people, but we know it has some very severe ramifications.

First, large institutions will be able to destroy the small ones because they have the existing infrastructure, power and programs to offer more attractive packages to students. This will mean the closing of universities in various small towns and cities across the country where universities have added immeasurably to the cultural, intellectual and social life of communities.

Second, with respect to students individually, the voucher system will initially apply to all disciplines. For example, if one wanted to be a philosopher, one would probably be able to obtain a voucher. But it will not take very long before the bureaucracy starts to say, "We need more engineers in the next four or five years. Therefore, if you want to study philosophy, there is no national money for you; but if you want to study engineering or something else, here is your voucher". This will totally disrupt and distort what has heretofore been free choice on the part of students to decide what they want to study in response to their own interests. It goes back to the increasing philosophy of the government that all roads lead to Ottawa.

The next major kick at small business surely must be the budget. We know that the budget tax take is truly enormous. Since the government came back into power in 1980, it presented the budget of April, 1980, the tax increases in the budget of October, 1980, the energy taxes which were placed on the backs of ordinary citizens, and now the enormous tax take of the November, 1981, budget. If we add these together, we realize the tremendous pressure which is being felt by ordinary Canadians. It is very understandable why all hon. members are receiving dozens and dozens of letters from organized groups indicating that every aspect of the budget is wrong. At a time when ordinary Canadians, the men and women who really add something new to the country, are taking home less net pay, government revenues are up 30 per cent and government expenditures are up 22 per cent.

Just to get an idea of the extent of the unhappiness, perhaps I could refer hon. members to the article which appeared in *The Globe and Mail* indicating that some 18 accountants from the city of London, Ontario, sent a letter to the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) pointing out how absolutely devastating are the budget provisions. Those 18 accountants repre-

Small Businesses Loans Act (No. 2)

sent between 85 per cent and 90 per cent of the small business community in London. London, Ontario, is a very significant city, it is a major city in the country. Through their accountants, 90 per cent of the businesses are writing to the Minister of Finance to say, "Look, it is absolutely crushing us and it will not wash". Perhaps Canadians, small-business men and women are waking up to the real danger in the country.

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the hon. member has been using what I would describe as unparliamentary language. Given that increasing percentages of people these days who are entrepreneurs are of the female sex, why does the hon. member continue to refer in an old-fashioned way to businessmen?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Deans): That is an interesting point of view, but it is hardly a point of order.

Mr. Taylor: Is that not a wonderful contribution? It is an NDP contribution.

Mr. Thacker: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member shows his true level of mentality because in fact I heard his speech and he used the word "businessmen" too.

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, I rise on another point of order. The hon. member is correct that in the first instance I used the term "businessmen", but with the interjection of my learned colleague I learned from my experience and talked of business people.

Mr. Thacker: Speaking of learning, it has never ceased to amaze me how hon. members of the ND Party have never been able to learn lessons from history. Their solution to the economic problems of Canada is for more government. Let me look at what happened in other countries where that occurred. Since the Second World War in the United Kingdom there has been a total nationalization of the coal, harbours, electrical and automobile industries. Every aspect of the life of citizens of the United Kingdom has been nationalized. Are they better off with the nationalization of every major industry in Britain? Of course they are not, and they are trying to get out of Britain by the hundreds of thousands. The reason they are trying to get out by the millions is that, as we can tell and chart statistically, for every year the country has a socialist government it will have a year of real pain and anguish. The people of Britain are going through the agony of hell because they have had so many socialist governments which have nationalized all their industries.

Let me refer to another example, that of Poland. Poland has an incredible history in which it was several times a major world power. Also it has a fabulous culture, social life and respect for the family unit, which are hard to beat. It is a very religious country. As a result of government, we find in Poland that all means of distributing food and all industries have been nationalized. Again it is governed by a cabinet of some 30-odd people, with the bureaucracy making decisions as to how