

Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act

Several weeks ago, before the parliamentary Committee on Research, Science and Technology, representatives of the University of Waterloo told us that they were losing an increasing number of teachers. For example, the Dean of the Faculty of Mathematics, which is the largest faculty of mathematics of any university in the world, left last fall for the University of Tennessee, not even Harvard, Yale or Princeton. He blamed his departure on the deplorable research climate in Canada. He said that he had had enough of undertaking a monumental battle every time he needed a new piece of equipment, no matter how small.

[Translation]

Just recently, Mr. Speaker, a distinguished chemist from the University of Waterloo, Professor Giacinto Scoles, for one, announced he was going to Princeton University. While looking forward to a change in his career, Professor Scoles would have preferred staying in Canada. But no Canadian institution would offer him even a tenth of the grants he will be receiving at Princeton for purchasing the laser equipment he needs for his work.

Last winter, Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from a mother who was concerned with her son's future. I am quoting from that letter:

My son will be terminating post-graduate studies in physical chemistry in November 1986, and then there is a big question mark. He has been looking for a job for next November, but wherever he goes he gets the same answer: "No job, because we have no funding."

Since he went to University in November 1985, three young chemistry researchers whom he met there have left Canada for the United States.

If my son does not find work in Ontario or Quebec, or anywhere else in Canada, he will have no choice. And this would mean that both my sons will have to live in the United States because Canada is not looking after its young scientists.

That mother's case is not the only one—there are so many others, Mr. Speaker.

[English]

In other countries there is an understanding that one must invest in education. I use the word "invest" advisedly because we hear members of the Government talk about the deficit and the need to cut spending, and I sometimes wonder whether there is anyone in the Government who understands the difference between investing and spending money. What is a more logical investment than that in education and in the youth of our country?

I have an advertisement from the State of California which appeared in a recent issue of *The Economist* magazine. It highlights the fact that the Californians put more money into their public education system, including grammar schools, high schools, universities and post-graduate schools, than any other state. The advertisement reads: "We will spend \$21.6 billion this year. That is a 35 per cent increase over three years ago".

There is an article in a recent edition of *Time* magazine on the State of Massachusetts, pointing to the low rate of 4 per cent unemployment in that state, and demonstrating clearly

the importance of the universities in the Boston area to the economic development of that state and its low rate of unemployment.

I have other examples from other countries. There is an advertisement from Northern Ireland in a recent issue of *The Economist* magazine. It states: "Industry can benefit from Northern Ireland's outstanding R & D support." It states that Queen's University, Belfast, and the University of Ulster turn out many highly qualified graduates and work closely with industry in fields like robotics, industrial automation, computer-assisted design, and computer-assisted manufacturing, among others. We know Belfast for other reasons, but its prominence in the area of education and high quality graduate students is perhaps less well known.

East Kilbride in Scotland placed an advertisement in the magazine which points out that Scotland's five most prestigious universities are within an hour's drive, providing an enviable pool of graduate labour and research and development facilities.

[Translation]

To return to Canada, Mr. Speaker, let us look at what is happening under this Progressive Conservative Government. What does the Government do to address the situation in Canada? Indeed, it has done everything to make the situation more disastrous. This Progressive Conservative Government, as we very well know, wants to slash \$8 billion from health and post-secondary education funding over the next five years. This is a lot of money for our universities and colleges, already facing serious financial problems.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, university and college funding increased by only 2.5 per cent in actual terms since 1977-78, while the number of students has sky rocketed, with increases of 27 per cent in universities, and 36 per cent in colleges.

Because of the national interest in post-secondary education, the Liberal Government had created a commission to study this issue.

The Johnson Commission recommended that federal transfers for post-secondary education increase at the same rate as the operational grants paid by the provinces to the universities and colleges. The commission wanted to encourage the provinces to increase their contributions to education at the same rate as the federal Government, but the Conservative Government has rejected the conclusions of the commission. It has decided to reduce federal expenditures and to cut back provincial transfers. That is all.

Let us see what the Secretary of State (Mr. Bouchard) said in February:

The provinces receive money from the federal Government, but it is up to them—
—up to the provinces—

—to allocate this money according to their priorities.

The federal Government has no say. The provinces must decide how to allocate the money they receive for education.