

[Translation]

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

FORUM IN SASKATOON, OCTOBER 25-28, 1987—DEBATE
CONCLUDED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Hicks calling the attention of the Senate to the Forum on Post-secondary Education held in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, from October 25—October 28, 1987.—*(Honourable Senator Leblanc (Saurel))*.

Hon. Fernand-E. Leblanc: Honourable senators, Senator Hicks was so kind as to adjourn the debate on my behalf, and as Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance, I want to thank him and congratulate him on his comments after attending the Forum on Post-secondary Education as an active participant.

I also want to thank him for his invaluable contribution to the committee's report on a question of vital importance to the social, cultural and economic future of our country.

I was anxious to take part in this debate since the question of the need for a national forum was discussed at length by the Committee on National Finance during preparations for its Report on Federal Policy on Post-secondary Education. In the report we concluded that post-secondary education will continue to be, as it always has been, the responsibility of the provinces. We also concluded that the federal government clearly had a role to play in certain areas of post-secondary education such as research, and that it shared responsibility for accessibility, and more specifically for student assistance.

I noted that forum participants had determined that governments and the provinces should co-operate in five specific areas of post-secondary education: foreign students, student assistance, research, upgrading data and providing a better program for research on education. I also noted the absence of any discussion of EPF, in other words, the federal government's transfer payments to the provinces for post-secondary education. However, that was predictable, especially since one can hardly discuss this question without the active participation of the finance ministers, whose concerns would, of course, extend to many other aspects, including equalization.

What worried me most, however, was the absence of any final statement on specific follow-up mechanisms by the Secretary of State or by the Honourable Roland Penner, Manitoba's Minister of Education and President of the Council of Ministers of Education.

It is true that although there was no statement about a new structure that would support this kind of national responsibility, the Council of Ministers agreed to meet with the Secretary of State in 1988 to discuss measures emanating from the conclusions of the forum.

I hope it will be a positive statement, although sometimes I have my doubts. In the National Finance Committee's report on this question, we pointed out that in his annual report to Parliament last year, the Secretary of State included a section

[Senator Frith.]

on federal-provincial consultations. This is what we said in our report:

The . . . annual report . . . included a section of federal-provincial consultations. This section makes extensive reference to the number of meetings which took place, but conspicuously omits mentioning any conclusions or results emanating from these meetings.

This quote is taken from page 30 of our report.

I hope the meeting in February will be a confirmation of the kind of co-operation without which the Saskatoon forum could not have been organized, and that it will not perpetuate the lack of communication that has long been characteristic of federal-provincial relations in this field. The good intentions of Mr. Crombie and Mr. Penner alone will not do the trick. All provincial Ministers of Education will have to make their contribution as well.

I may be raising this question again later this year, after the meeting scheduled with the Secretary of State and the Council of Ministers of Education, depending on what transpires from the meeting.

The Hon. the Acting Speaker: Honourable senators, if no other senator wishes to participate, this inquiry is considered as having been debated.

[English]

NATIONAL FILM BOARD

FILM ENTITLED "THE KID WHO COULDN'T MISS"—PUBLIC
RESPONSE TO PETITION—ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Marshall calling the attention of the Senate to the response of Canadians to a petition mailed out, calling upon Parliament to urge the government to act on the motion dealing with the production of the NFB film "The Kid Who Couldn't Miss".—*(Honourable Senator Marshall)*.

Hon. Jack Marshall: Honourable senators, I would like to say a word on this order. In view of the circumstances, namely, the fact that the National Film Board has decided to produce another documentary on Billy Bishop, the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs will be meeting tomorrow in order to obtain a consensus on how we should deal with Order No. 13.

Order stands.

FISHERIES

INTERIM COMMITTEE REPORT ON FRESHWATER FISHERIES—
RESPONSE OF MANITOBA MINISTER—INQUIRY WITHDRAWN

Hon. Jack Marshall rose, pursuant to notice of Thursday, November 19, 1987:

That he will call the attention of the Senate to a response from the Minister of Natural Resources of the Government of Manitoba relating to the recommendations made by the Standing Senate Committee on Fisher-