Time soon showed the irritation and problems caused by the EPF legislation. One irritant was — and still is — that some provinces allegedly have used the discretion given to them under EPF excessively, with the result that the growth in their transfers to their post-secondary institutions has been substantially below the growth in EPF.

In his 1985 report to the Secretary of State, entitled Giving Greater Point and Purpose to the Federal Financing of Post-Secondary Education and Research in Canada, Mr. A.W. Johnson provides a table which shows the EPF portion of the federal transfers as a percentage of provincial operating grants to universities and colleges. This table, from page vi of the Johnson Report, is reproduced below as Table 2.3. It indicates that in 1984-85, five provinces received more money from the federal government for PSE than they transferred to their institutions in that year; in other words, they made no contribution from other

Table 2.3

EPF/PSE Fiscal Transfers as a Percentage of Provincial Operating Grants to Universities and Colleges

| | EPF/PSE Transfers as a % of Provincial Operating Grants | | Increase in EPF/PSE Fiscal Transfer "Share" or |
|----------------------|---|---------|--|
| | 1977-78 | 1984-85 | Reduction in "Purely Provincial Share" |
| Newfoundland | 83.3% | 106.9% | 23.6% |
| Prince Edward Island | 101.5% | 106.9% | 5.3% |
| Nova Scotia | 87.5% | 91.6% | 4.1% |
| New Brunswick | 98.1% | 101.8% | 3.7% |
| Quebec | 56.1% | 59.6% | 3.5% |
| Ontario | 73.7% | 88.7% | 15.0% |
| Manitoba | 80.3% | 102.9% | 22.5% |
| Saskatchewan | 81.6% | 90.3% | 8.7% |
| Alberta | 63.9% | 73.1% | 9.2% |
| British Columbia | 78.9% | 104.3% | 25.4% |
| Average | 68.9% | 79.6% | 10.7% |

Source: A.W. Johnson, Giving Greater Point and Purpose to the Federal Financing of Post-Secondary Education and Research in Canada, p. vi.