

recession—and I would like to add just this, that it seemed important, honourable senators, to discuss this problem of federal-provincial fiscal relations in the context of the very definite need for a specific definition by the Government of the principles of equalization and stabilization. This specific definition the Government of Manitoba has apparently not been able to obtain. Why?

Honourable senators, I am unable to resist the temptation of trespassing upon your valuable time by saying something about the national development of our human resources. As I consider the various proposals concerning the Government's intentions which are directed to the accelerated and supposedly more vision-oriented plan of national development, it does appear that the majority of these projects have to do with what one may term the more material and more physical aspects of this development—a railroad, airports, airways, roads, bridges, harbours, houses and the like. Now, it may be that these more physical developmental projects rate an immediate and overriding priority, to which basic contention unfortunately I cannot wholly subscribe. For what is missing in the Speech from the Throne is some definite indication of what more the Government plans to do at the national level—and without infringing upon the constitutional responsibilities and competencies of the provinces—in the field of concerted, national-level action, for the national development of our human resources, and, specifically, for the training and educating of our Canadian youth so that they may more effectively participate in the new vision of Canada's increased economic development and industrialization.

May I quote the words of the honourable senator from Mille Isles (Hon. Mr. Monette):
(*Translation*):

The most imperative duty of governments is to watch over the physical and moral conservation of its human capital.

(*Text*):

With this statement I agree most heartily. Surely we do not need to be persuaded that a co-ordinated, vigorous, and concomitant safeguarding and development of our human resources potential must go hand in hand with the development of our physical and material capital; surely the small changes in the federal-provincial fiscal arrangements have not suddenly solved the problems that harass provincial and local authorities in this regard; and surely there is no need to document the pressing educational needs which do in fact exist and which urgently require further national level assistance, be this assistance direct or indirect.

Perhaps it would not be unfair to ask ourselves these questions concerning projected national level spending for 1958-59:

(1) What are the increases in the main estimates and the first of the supplementary estimates laid before Parliament?

(2) What are the probable increases in the sum total of projected expenditures, with supplementary estimates still to come and including capital or other expenditures involved in the legislation which is to be presented to Parliament?

(3) What is the probable sum total of anticipated deficit financing?

(4) How much more will be included in these startlingly large increases for national interest and responsibility for education?

Senate *Hansard*, at pages 290 and 301, gave us returns of federal Government expenditures to March 31, 1957, that is, for one year, of approximately \$42½ million for general educational purposes.

Unfortunately it is not possible to get the figures for the year ending March 31, 1958, so I went into the estimates and I found that there are changes in the levels of some of these expenditures over and above the normal changes we would expect from the growth of our population and the normal extension of services. There are changes in the estimates for Indian education, for vocational and technical schools, for research grants by the National Research Council and for National Research Council scholarships.

Some of these changes are significant and will be welcomed, and the Government is to be commended for these extensions. However, I venture to say that in the light of the purported all-out effort to further the national development of our physical and social asset resources, an equal and more equitable, because equally necessary, scale of national participation in the education of our invaluable human resources is to be commended to the attention of the present Government, in which area of national endeavour there appear to be no significant or binding commitments.

I would like to refer to the final report of the Gordon Royal Commission, especially to the chapter on the Role of Government, beginning around page 445 to page 455. It discusses the needs of our nation for trained manpower and research, it assesses our potential educational needs, it describes the key role of our colleges and universities, and it makes challenging statements, of which I shall quote three.

Referring to university enrolments, on page 449 the report has this to say:

The increases in numbers we anticipate are at a rate which will double enrolments and graduations in twelve years, and yet there is every reason