

*Oral Questions*

[Translation]

**Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is confusing the issue. He should take another look at the Income Tax Act and the provisions of the Act which oblige these people, like all Canadian citizens, to declare their full income, whatever that income may be. Since our basic system is a voluntary one, Canadians who receive income in the form of tips, as in the example given by the Hon. Member, are responsible for declaring and paying tax on such income.

The Hon. Member was asking whether these amounts should be recognized for the purposes of various social measures, but that is an entirely different matter which concerns other departments, and my responsibility is to administer . . . I see the Hon. Member is not really interested. I suppose he is merely interested in asking a question and not necessarily in the answer.

I suggest the Hon. Member take another look at the Income Tax Act. If he wants to blame me for enforcing the Act, that is his business. However, it is my responsibility to apply our voluntary system, and I ask everyone who receives income in this form to declare it on their returns.

\* \* \*

[English]

**EDUCATION**

ENGINEERING AND BIOLOGY—DECLINE IN NUMBER OF GRADUATES

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for Science and Technology who has read the Page Simons report on Canadian Studies and will know that in 1982 we were producing approximately half as many graduate Ph.D. engineers and biological scientists as we were in 1974. Can he tell the House why the Government is not treating that situation as a serious problem which deserves immediate redress? Why do we not see in the Budget, or in the Main Estimates, anything which would correct that problem for the future?

**Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic and Regional Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology):** Mr. Speaker, as I understand the question, the Hon. Member is concerned about the lack of students in certain disciplines, which clearly is a matter of concern to all of us. I would like to assure him that the Government has gone a long way to increase funding for the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council which has those particular disciplines as one of its target areas. The funding for that Council in 1983-84 has been increased to approximately \$282 million. This has been the focus of some very substantial government funding which represents the concern we all have that these particular disciplines be pursued because they are so fundamental to the future of our industrial economic development.

FUNDING OF UNIVERSITIES

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West):** Mr. Speaker, in a pre-election year we can expect an expenditure blitz; the problem has been caused over a decade. This morning in *The Globe and Mail* we saw that major universities are intending to put quotas on enrollment for young people. They cannot get jobs, and now they will not be able to go to school.

Given the Minister's responsibility for science and technology, can he tell us why he has been part of a Cabinet which has cut money for universities and why he thinks that is a good public policy in the present climate?

**An Hon. Member:** That is wrong.

**Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic and Regional Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology):** That is just rubbish, Mr. Speaker. There has been no cut in university spending. If anything, this Government is committed to the view that the future of this country rests with the people.

[Translation]

Brain power or "matière grise" as they say in Quebec.

**An Hon. Member:** He does not have much of that.

**Mr. Johnston:** That is where we are going to put additional funding. That is exactly the policy we have followed, and we will continue to follow. Mr. Speaker, I just mentioned that we increased our Council's budget by an amount that is exceptional compared to past funding. So when the Hon. Member says that we are not interested, that is just not true. In fact, this is probably our main concern: to increase human resources in Canada.

**An Hon. Member:** Hear, hear!

\* \* \*

[English]

**TOURISM**

EFFECT OF GASOLINE PRICES

**Hon. George Hees (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. A government bulletin issued by Tourism Canada, dated February 10, states that "in 1983 Canada had a record travel deficit that will easily top \$2 billion", and it goes on to say "an important cause of this deficit is the much higher price of gasoline in Canada compared to the United States", that difference being 45 cents a gallon. In view of these facts, added to the ones I brought to his attention before, would the Government not now give serious consideration to cancelling the Canadian Ownership Tax of four cents a gallon on gas and oil at the pump, a completely unauthorized tax for the last ten months, and which has brought the total of federal taxes added to the price of gasoline since the last election to 50 cents a gallon?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I know this is a serious and valid question. The Hon. Member