

become hewers of wood that is disappearing, and drawers of water that is polluted. Flunkies in our own home.

I urge the Government to withdraw Bill C-12, or the Members on both sides to vote it down.

● (1600)

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words about Bill C-12. This is the Bill which will cap the expenditures by the federal Government to post-secondary education by 6 per cent and 5 per cent.

Since this is an important Bill I must say at the outset that I am amazed, as a Saskatchewan Member, to see not a single Member in the Conservative Party participating in this debate when half of the ridings in my province are represented by the Conservative Party and half by our Party.

It strikes me as very strange that they represent half of that province yet say nothing in such a crucial debate. It could be that they are very embarrassed because we have a Premier in that province, Grant Devine, who is now slashing, cutting and hammering away at many social programs in our province.

I know that as a New Brunswicker, Mr. Speaker, you would feel very sorry for us that we are saddled with this kind of a government in our province. Indeed, I am sure that is why the federal Members from that province are not saying a word in the House. Their colleague in Regina is doing exactly the same as the Government proposes when he slashes all the social programs and post-secondary educational programs. He is tightening the budget of the University of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon and the University of Regina. We have not even talked about the community colleges and technical institutes in our province. I think it shows where the Conservative Party stands when it comes to dealing with real people's issues and concerns.

Mr. Malone: Real people.

Mr. Nystrom: That is right, real people. I would be very interested if the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) could help persuade some of his colleagues to participate in the debate today.

In the few minutes that I have I want to point out specifically that I think it is very unfair when the six and five program is applied to ordinary people as it is being applied in the Bill today. By and large, the ordinary people we are talking about are the young people of this nation who will be the leaders of the future and who will determine how the country develops in the next few years.

Historically, we have tended to measure the wealth of the nation by all kinds of labour theories, theories of capital and so on. I suggest that the society of tomorrow will be judged on the basis of its knowledge and the ability to think and reason. That is where we are headed in the age of the computer and of advanced technology. Therefore, it is imperative that we train as many young people as possible and that we ensure that the barriers to education are not there but that we have universal accessibility to education across the land. This Bill moves us in

Established Programs Financing

the opposite direction, in a fight that we thought we were winning in Canada back in the 1960s.

When this six and five program is generally applied, it tends to be very unfair to young people and students and to women and pensioners. But it is not unfair to the rich. Recently I looked at some of the very high salaries in this country. I came across a chart which indicated salaries of two years ago. I noticed the salaries of the heads of Crown corporations. For instance, Ian Sinclair, who was chairman of Canadian Pacific Railway, was making a salary of \$556,000 in 1981.

Mr. Blenkarn: He is getting only about \$60,000 now.

Mr. Nystrom: Now, as a reward for helping the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) sell his six and five program and because of the work he did on the special task force on six and five in which he recommended keeping the clamps on ordinary citizens, he has been appointed to the Senate and gets another \$60,000 or \$70,000. I suggest that that is not fair.

A 5 per cent increase on \$100,000 is \$5,000. However, for a young person trying to go to university, receiving a 5 per cent increase does not represent very much money. It also results in an increase in tuition fees and an increase in the expenditures of the ordinary families of this land. If this trend continues, it will eventually mean that university will be accessible only to the more privileged and wealthy in this country. We will have a system in which the right to go to university is not based on one's ambitions or desire for knowledge or betterment but on whether or not one's parents are able to afford financing one's way through university.

Others, such as the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett), have already related many of the statistics on what is happening in the university community. Let us consider tuition fees. There is a great fear in my province that tuition fees will rise rapidly this year because our provincial Government has gone into deficit financing for the first time since the 1930s. It is something that never happened under the NDP premiers of Douglas, Lyon and Blakeney. However, there is a massive deficit of over \$500 million in our province for the first time. In the budget that is likely to be presented in March, there will be another massive deficit, which will be passed on to the ordinary citizens through increases in such things as utility rates, sales taxes and tuition fees for young people. The same is true for other provinces. The University of British Columbia has increased tuition fees, as have other universities across the land.

A great many people have been turned away from universities who wanted to go to school and study.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, in Quebec in the City of Montreal, 30,000 students are now enrolled, while 56,000 had applied to post-secondary institutions in that city. Only 30,000 were admitted, out of the 56,000 who applied.

The same situation prevails in the Province of Ontario. At York University, 1,400 students who had applied were denied