

Established Programs Financing

however, will restrict increases in federal contributions to 6 per cent.

To their credit, the Maritime provincial governments are coughing up an increase of approximately 7.3 per cent in the current fiscal year to help pick up the slack. But those governments, as I said before, are badly strapped. They are not in the position to make up the total difference following restraint imposed on higher education spending under this Bill.

In any event, an entirely new approach to university funding is required. First, we need to realize that money spent wisely but generously on education is not a waste of taxpayers' money but rather an essential investment in the education and training of a new generation of Canadians. Seen in that light, undue restraint is not frugality; it is waste. In this case it is a waste of opportunity, including opportunity for job creation, increased productivity, and enhanced research, in fact, enhanced wealth for the country as a whole.

● (1620)

Second, there remains an urgent need for a long-term agreement between federal and provincial governments on the funding of post-secondary education. The current on-again-off-again restraint approach to funding makes it nearly impossible, certainly very difficult, for the institutions to plan ahead with any degree of certainty or effectiveness. Needed especially are: a clarification of all relevant issues, a clear national education policy to override if need be the hodge podge of provincial policies, and imaginative planning by the institutions themselves. As much as anything, Mr. Speaker, the Government must stop using universities as scapegoats for their own waste of taxpayers' money and for their own unplanned and uncoordinated and profligate ways. For their part universities should stop crying foul every time an institution does not get all it needs or thinks it needs from government, though doubtless most universities, including the one in my own riding, have genuine cause to cry foul.

Finally, the public is going to have to get used to the idea that educational institutions require adequate expenditures of money in order to produce the kinds of dividends, social and economic of which they are capable and without which our country will continue to fall further and further behind our competitors. Only then will our universities be a total credit to themselves, to their government benefactors and, indeed, to the country as a whole.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): There follows a ten-minute period for questions or comments. The Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo).

Mr. Hovdebo: Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. Member for Hillsborough (Mr. McMillan) give us some insight into what he considers the long-term effects of the cuts that are being made now in his province? What kind of effects can we look forward to five or ten years down the road.

Mr. McMillan: Mr. Speaker, that is a first-class question and I hope I can do justice to it. Very recently the Association

of Universities and Colleges of Canada published a sterling document called *Some Question of Balance*. It was the third volume of the report of the Commission on Canadian Studies sponsored by the AUCC. The Commissioners for the third volume just released were Dr. T. H. B. Symons, the founding president of Trent University, and James Page, who was a teacher at Seneca College until recently and now is in the employ of the Government of Canada in the Department of the Secretary of State.

To address the question in particular, I refer to that superb study, *Some Question of Balance*. The Commissioners argued that it may well have been true in the 1950s and 1960s that we needed to go outside Canada to recruit highly qualified manpower to teach our students, to conduct research and to help build up our own incipient graduate schools which at the time were not strong enough to produce the faculty required. Nevertheless, though we have strong graduate schools now, well capable of producing the highly qualified manpower we need for teaching and research, we are still going outside Canada to recruit in large numbers faculty, often in the very fields where we ourselves have a surplus of qualified manpower. There are all kinds of Canadian PhD holders who are being passed over in favour of faculty from outside the country who are being actively recruited with the acquiescence of the federal Government.

To get to the long-term implications to which the Hon. Member refers, Dr. Symons and Mr. Page have documented in great detail that because of restraint and budgetary cutbacks and the retrenchment being forced upon universities there is a danger that we may in Canada have a shortage of qualified manpower before long. As a result we may have to go outside Canada again, just as we did in the 1950s and 1960s, to recruit faculty. But this time it will be with justification because we will have starved our own universities and our graduate schools in particular. The Commissioners predict, and they have documented in some detail, that we could have another manpower crisis by 1990. We could have a shortage of qualified manpower in various fields that will require us to go outside the country to recruit personnel.

To address the question more specifically, and to bring it to a point, I want to say that in the Maritime Provinces, for example, we have seen growing evidence—

An Hon. Member: The Symons-Page study is an excellent report.

Mr. McMillan: Yes, it is an excellent report. In the Maritime Provinces we have all kinds of areas—environmental studies, regional studies, and ethnic studies, for example—that go begging for qualified manpower. We should be pumping a great deal of money into those fields rather than being stingy and preoccupied with a false sense of restraint so that our post-secondary educational institutions can meet the manpower and the employment needs and opportunities of the 1980s and the 1990s.

Those are some of the long-term implications. Restraint is being heavy-handed. It is ill-conceived. It is not real frugality,