

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Monday, June 12, 1989 8:00 p.m.**

Date: 90/06/12

[The Committee of Supply met at 8 p.m.]

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Members, please take your seats; it's now 8 o'clock.

head: **Main Estimates 1989-90****Advanced Education**

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to welcome you to the Committee of Supply. The government has called the Department of Advanced Education to present its estimates tonight, and I think it's particularly fitting that my predecessor in this Chair is now the Minister of Advanced Education, so he will for sure follow all the correct procedures and, I'm sure, will be very helpful to the committee this evening. As you know, a member of Executive Council is the only one who can present money matters to the Chamber, and we're happy to have the hon. Member for Lethbridge-West in his new capacity as Minister of Advanced Education with us this evening.

Standing Orders apply in the committee. A member can speak as often as he or she wishes but no more than 30 minutes at a time. The time can be spent in making a speech or representations, or it can be spent, perhaps sometimes more profitably, in asking questions of the minister as to the performance or the plans of the department that he's here defending the estimates for this evening. Page 24 of the estimates book contains the estimates for the department; the element details are on page 1 of the smaller volume.

With that, hon. members, I would recognize the Minister of Advanced Education for his comments and explanations. Hon. minister.

MR. GOGO: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. First of all, I'm honoured indeed to be the Minister of Advanced Education in this new government. Predecessors before me, I think, have reflected in a very substantive and accurate way the policies of the government with regard to advanced education. Education is this government's first priority and has been said not only in the throne speech, but I would hope in defending my estimates tonight to in fact prove that this government puts education first.

I'm grateful as well, Mr. Chairman — and I suppose I'd have said this whether the Premier was in the House or not. I'm honoured that he has confidence in me as a member of Executive Council to handle this portfolio and to meet the objectives of the government.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as a member of this House for some 14 years, I've always had a great deal of interest in education, which should not be confused with schooling, and particularly in advanced education.

Mr. Chairman, no man or woman or indeed minister of the Crown, I think, is in any way able to do a significant job with a portfolio without some very strong support staff, and I'm

honoured and pleased that my support staff are in the gallery tonight. I'd like to recognize several of them for the benefit of the committee. First of all, I have a deputy minister who has a very strong reputation in government circles, particularly with Treasury, who has given me a great deal of advice and briefing to the extent that it goes on till all hours of the night my hon. deputy, known to many, Lynne Duncan, who has served this government well for a long time and is continuing that tradition tonight. I suppose a deputy can only magnify herself through others, and we have two ADMs with us tonight, again people who, I think, are familiar to members of the committee. I've grown to have a great deal of respect for them. The first one is Mr. Neil Henry, who is the assistant deputy minister of policy and planning, and with him a man who has been around the system for a considerable time, Mr. Bill Workman, who's in charge of policy and planning. Finally, although I have tried to keep this a secret, obviously one can't keep it a secret. They say that a primary factor in any minister's portfolio is the executive assistant he or she can attract to that portfolio. I know and I realize I'm extremely fortunate to have, I won't say the best, but I'll certainly say the finest EA in government, Charlene Blaney, recently the chief of staff of the Conservative caucus.

Mr. Chairman, education's always been something very special in Alberta. If one looks at our history, you find that one of the first tilings the pioneers of this province did was to establish schools, even before hospitals were established. I think Albertans have always had a very high respect for the educational process. When we look at the very high standards of achievement in Alberta today, I think we have the highest number, certainly on a per capita basis, of those with university degrees. My recollection seems to tell me of the very rapid increase in the past 10 years alone, with some 13 per cent of the male population, and that's an increase of about 40 percent. More startling is the number of females; some 10 percent of Alberta females with a degree at the institutions of higher learning, an increase from about 7 to 10.5 percent. I think that clearly spells out the direction of the future in terms of the priorities Albertans put on education.

With that, naturally, Mr. Chairman, I think goes the habit that is rapidly developing, that more and more of our young people in Alberta, the children of these well-educated people, wish to go to postsecondary institutions. I think in some ways, because it's the first priority of government, government has a primary responsibility not just to find the wherewithal but, indeed, to set the proper policies that will encourage people to attend postsecondary institutions. Last year some 650,000 Albertans availed themselves of the opportunity. I think that's very significant if we look at the breakdown within the 29 institutions that come under the department. What excites me — perhaps most members are not aware, but there's some 85 further education councils that report to the minister. Last year some 300,000 Albertans availed themselves of 25,000 courses offered by those further education councils. I think that's very significant, Mr. Chairman, because they are just the noncredit courses run within the system.

We men have the consortium around Alberta that operates in many members' constituencies to bring education opportunities there. We have members of this House, Mr. Chairman, who spent time on those consortia and further education councils. The hon. Member for Chinook is probably the best known to have contributed in a very significant way to further education in rural Alberta. To prove that it paid off, the hon. Member for

Chinook is now the hon. Associate Minister of Agriculture. It's certainly proof the system works.

Within those 29 institutions, Mr. Chairman, we have the well-known universities, the four universities, budgets ranging from some \$225 million, which has got to be, I think, amongst one of the highest in Canada per student, down to the Athabasca U, which is unique in the country as a distant learning institution. The ones in between, of course, are the famous University of Calgary, which is known for a tremendous amount of the business education component, and of course the finest undergraduate liberal arts institution in Canada, and that's the University of Lethbridge, which I think many members will agree has established some new achievements in terms of students who go on to greater things.

However, Mr. Chairman, we tend to think of postsecondary education strictly in the university sense, and except for those who take professional training, I think the other institutions become remarkably more important. We look just to the west of us, for example, to Westerra, one of our college system institutions. It was born not too long ago, and I would hope, along with the Member for Stony Plain, that it has a bright future. But it has to be included along with SAIT and NAIT, two of the technical institutes that Albertans should be very proud of. When one looks at what they've done over the years in terms of postsecondary education, in terms of apprenticeship, in terms of technical training, I think they have remarkable achievement records. We have, of course, the 11 public colleges that I agree are somewhat costly, but one only has to look at the activities carried out from Keyano in the north to Lethbridge in the south, at the enrollment these institutions have, the roles they fill in terms of the technical training within our province, and we've every reason to be proud of them.

As well, Mr. Chairman, Advanced Ed is responsible for six hospital-based nursing programs, and that would include, here in Edmonton the Mis, the University, the Alex, and in Calgary the Foothills, and perhaps two that we don't often hear about or talk about: the mental hospitals of Alberta. Those are Alberta Hospital Ponoka, which does nurses' psych training, and Alberta Hospital Edmonton, just outside the city, which also provides psychiatric nurses training for most nurses in the province.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we have the private colleges. I think the private colleges bring a new dimension to education, degree-granting institutions anyway. Three of the four grant degrees now; the fourth is probably on the verge of achieving its degree-granting status. I think that when one looks at Camrose or Lacombe or Edmonton, we see that these colleges have played a very significant role. I think that for that reason the government has seen fit, as members will see in their budget documents tonight, to contribute in a substantial way -- not always as great as some people would like, but in a substantial way -- to their operational funds. The one drawback, according to some, certainly the colleges, is that no capital funds go into private institutions.

Mr. Chairman, to try and get an understanding or handle on this portfolio, I've been perhaps like other new ministers; I've been traveling around the province. I guess one has to be a member of Executive Council to begin to understand how difficult that is, with the wide range of cabinet committees. But I have been to a variety of institutions, and I'd like to share with the committee members both the reasons I'm doing it and what I'm gaining from it. I've learned very quickly, although as an MLA I've had some knowledge about board-governed institu-

tions. But I'm getting a whole new understanding of the very significant role our boards of governors play in these institutions.

First of all, by law, by our statutes, the Colleges Act, the Universities Act, they have a very high degree of autonomy. Some members sometimes think they have perhaps too much autonomy, but I would point out that under their Acts they're responsible for delivering, within the funding provided by government and the programs authorized by its minister, various programs which serve the needs of the people they attract. For example, I was to the nursing program at the Foothills hospital, a Donna Humphries there in charge of that program. I certainly had my eyes opened, Mr. Chairman. There are some 350 nurses that go through that program, taking what turns out to be a RN designation, a very exciting program. One of the tilings I learned very quickly was that nursing is not nursing is not nursing, but there's a variety of portions to the nursing profession. Members will see in this year's budget that we've included some very special funds for specialties in nursing.

Then, Mr. Chairman, we had the great opportunity of touring and visiting the University of Calgary. I've never had the opportunity, other than being on campus, of meeting the various stakeholders, and I'm very excited about what I hear from the stakeholders. I've mentioned the boards of governors, who have the responsibility. We had the opportunity of meeting with the senate. Senates, of course, are peculiar to universities and unique, but they too are citizens who are prepared to spend a lot of time, a lot of their own personal time, in the best interests of the institution, particularly when you consider that a senate really has no jurisdiction other than an advisory capacity.

I was more than taken, Mr. Chairman, with the attitude of the student council. That's why we exist, I think: for students. Because without them we wouldn't have institutions, we wouldn't have boards of governors, and there'd certainly be no requirement for faculty. I tended to put the question to the various student bodies I met with about tuition fees, and I want to come back to that later as to their attitude about whether paying 8 to 12 percent of the bill of postsecondary education is enough, because some members may be surprised, Mr. Chairman, as to what their answer is.

Also, a group we tend to overlook are either the instructors or the faculty associations. I think for the most part we are extremely well served by the faculties. They're very knowledgeable, well qualified, and as I understand it, in demand.

Then finally we met with the support groups. Any member who thinks you can get along without support staff in any institution begins to realize very quickly that they are a very important part of that whole team that enables an institution to function. Whether it's a janitor, whether it's food services, whether it's security, whether it's maintenance, they're all a very integral part, in my view, of an institution. So the University of Calgary, Mr. Chairman, was very exciting.

We then had the opportunity to visit that one and only college of its kind in Alberta and one of only four in Canada: the ACA or Alberta College of Art. Mr. Dale Simmons is the chairman. I found that a very exciting place, a very exciting place for an institution that has one out of two who comes out of the school system and the other one out of two, or 50 percent, are different age groups. What a marvelous opportunity the Alberta College of Art offers to those Albertans who want to do -- I don't care what it is, they seem to do it. Some may quarrel that they are one of the few that don't have a degree-granting status.

That's something that perhaps we'll deal with at some point, but it's interesting to note that diploma graduates from the ACA are accepted in masters programs in other parts of North America. That should attest in a very significant way to the quality of education that comes out of the College of Art.

Then, Mr. Chairman, to ensure that I had a sense of the college system in terms of demography and geography, we managed to get to one of the Alberta vocational centres, which come directly under our department -- we have four of them -- and that was at Lesser Slave Lake, which has two campuses, one at Slave Lake and the other at Grouard. Many of those, perhaps most of the people in AVCs in Lesser Slave are native people, and how exciting it is to see that native people want to have upgrading. They want to have some skill training because you can't compete in the world today in terms of industry without your having some of those very basic skills. I'll come later to something I feel strong about, and that's the whole question of literacy in the province of Alberta, for those who are functionally illiterate perhaps are equal to the same numbers we have for senior citizens. But how exciting it was to visit that Grouard campus outside of High Prairie. The hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake I know is very proud of that place. And for me as a southerner and as minister to visit this institution, to see what they're doing within their community, it's very exciting. They operate on at least a minimum of some 20 sites outside of the Lesser Slave Lake campus. They're scattered throughout the north in some 20 communities.

Then, Mr. Chairman, there were three other institutions I just want to touch on: the Grande Prairie Regional College, for which this government in this year's budget has authorized some \$34 million in terms of expansion. If that's not commitment, I don't know what is. That's the famous college designed by the architect Cardinal. It's a unique institution, but what's very important is that they deliver such a variety of programs, including the universities transfer program.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I managed to get out to an area very familiar to the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking, Lakeland College, which is a unique institution, one that I thought was really only agriculture. That was its birth, but if you look today at what Lakeland offers on its seven campuses scattered throughout northeastern Alberta, you get, it seems to me, a new understanding of what that college is all about. [an hon. member applauded] Well, that's about the same applause I got, hon. member, when I was there.

The government has just authorized -- and it's well on the way to completion -- the Lloydminster campus. For those who have not had the opportunity of touring the Upgrader site, I can tell you it's just immediately east of the Lloydminster campus, a commitment of some \$22.5 million by this government to see that they have in place an institution as part of Lakeland campus, which will satisfy, hopefully, the needs of the citizens in that area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I've left the best to last, which surely is reasonable and understandable. That's the great college of Lethbridge Community. Lethbridge Community College, the first public college in Alberta, one of the first in Canada in terms of publicly funded institutions, has a very proud record. I don't want to dwell on it other than to say it's interesting to note that of the 145 requests this year for B budget items, Lethbridge College was not one of them. Either you will attest to the fact that the MLA for Lethbridge-East, the hon. Provincial Treasurer, has adequately looked after it in the past and they don't need any

more, or indeed they are cognizant that the new minister doesn't want to show preference and, as a result, didn't ask for any special recognition.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to close with this comment. I view education as the road to the future. I certainly view this portfolio as the opportunity, and perhaps one should even be known as the minister of the future, because we are dealing now with people's futures. We are dealing with young Albertans who want to be well qualified; they want to be well trained. To do that, we've put in place several items, and in my closing comments now I simply want to refer to a couple of them. It's the policy of this government, has been, and will continue to be as far as I know into the future, that any Albertan who has the ability and the desire to pursue postsecondary education will not be hampered in that regard from financial constraints. For that reason we have in place perhaps the finest student loan program in the country. It has provided, as we'll see in the estimates, not only substantial funds but has a very meaningful way of providing those funds. For example, Albertans believe that young people should contribute to their own education, and although we have a generous loan fund, although we have a generous remission program, it's not the desire of this government at all to see any student graduating from a postsecondary institution only to be faced with a tremendous debt that they must repay. Mr. Fred Hemingway, the executive director, has a very exciting staff over there; they get some 85,000 calls a year with regard to student loans. That puts a lot of hoops in the system that these people must jump through, but that's why we have in place appeal committees that say, "If you're not satisfied with the decision, you can then appeal it." It's an understanding -- the Students Finance Board, under Mr. Tims -- that in my view answers all the needs of the students of Alberta who need financial assistance.

Then, Mr. Chairman, before I entertain questions, one should talk about things one's proud of, and I can't think of anything I'm more proud of than the endowment and incentive fund. This was not only the first government in the country but to my knowledge the only government that offered, starting in 1980, the very exciting endowment fund, where government would match contributions, primarily from the private sector, to institutions who wanted to do other things. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it's probably history to most, but that fund that opened in 1980 at \$88 million and that was viewed to take us into the '90s was expended in five years. It showed, I think, the generosity of Albertans who wanted to participate in contributing to postsecondary education. A second fund was started in 1985 and was used up in just a few years. As a matter of fact, it was so successful that if I recollect this House, the previous government had to have a special warrant of some \$48 million to honour its obligations. Well, as you know, Mr. Chairman, in this year's throne speech of February 17 we have another commitment, which was again reiterated the other day in the new throne speech, of another \$80 million. Now, members may have questions and concerns that it's got to last 10 years so the maximum allowable a year is \$8 million. Some members may feel that's not sufficient. Well, I want hon. members who feel that way to feel free to contribute on their own, because the government can use your help, and I'm sure the institution could.

We've also done something, Mr. Chairman, that I as a member of the House felt very strongly about, and that is that no longer is it satisfactory for the two major institutions in Alberta, U of A and U of C, which have the largest alumni, largest access

to business capital, to take all these funds and use them up so that Lethbridge College or Grande Prairie College or Lakeland College can't have access. So this year -- and I'm quite prepared to defend it -- we have a quota system where each college, each postsecondary institution in Alberta, is guaranteed its share of the new endowment fund. And to make sure that they act with some dispatch in attracting those funds, Mr. Chairman, we've put in a three-year period where we're going to review that.

So, in conclusion, again I'd like to say how honoured I am (a) to have the portfolio, (b) the confidence of the leader of this government in asking me to undertake the responsibility, and, finally, Mr. Chairman, I can't think of a more exciting portfolio to be in than one that deals primarily with the future of this province, the young people of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Minister. I'll recognize the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary-McKnight, and then Calgary-Fish Creek, and then we'll go on from there.

MS BARRETT: Do you want to deal with the motion that I proposed earlier? Shall we do that or no?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member suggested to me before we came to order that the committee might give consideration to allowing a party to split the first 30 minutes between the other members of the party. Instead of that particular person speaking for the full 30 minutes, they might accommodate what they want to do in a more expeditious way if it could be split. [interjection] Well, I think that would apply to the government side, too, for the first one.

MR. GETTY: Let's think about it.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Sure.

The hon. Premier mentioned that maybe we should think about it. Maybe it will apply at the next committee and not this committee.

MS BARRETT: Delay tactics; oh. I'm just trying to accommodate the Assembly, Mr. Chairman, to make sure that things flow smoothly. A little innovation now and then doesn't hurt as far as I can see, but what the heck. If you don't want it . . .

MRS. MIROSH: You take 15 minutes anyway . . .

MS BARRETT: Well, I mean, I could do that; that's possible too. But, you know, it just seemed to me that it would be a reasonable way to proceed as an experiment. By this time next year you may be glad to try it that way.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the minister on his appointment to this portfolio. I know that it is a big one and involves a lot of not only money but time and consideration. On the other hand, I'm afraid I must initially beg to differ with the opinions shared with the Chamber by the minister. In the first instance, he has failed to recognize or pay attention to the fact that on page 30 of the Budget Address itself you will see that the transfer payments from Ottawa to Alberta in sponsorship of Advanced Education have fallen by \$21 million compared to the '88-89 forecast. I know that that cannot be explained away by a reduction in enrollment in advanced education facilities in Al-

berta. So I think question number one is: how does he plan to deal with this issue, and how does he plan to deal with the continual cuts that will now occur to his department as a result of the established programs financing cuts that are being imposed by the Wilson budget? I'm sure the minister understands that enrollment is actually increasing in all educational institutions in Alberta, and I can't see that he's made any attempt to accommodate the increasing enrollment with the reduced transfer payments from the federal government.

In the second instance, Mr. Chairman, I look at some of the broad figures and share the dismay that is being felt by institutions, faculty, staff associations, and students across the province. For instance, in the larger estimates book we see under Object of Expenditure, on page 29, vote 3, that Grants are down by a total of 3.6 percent. That surely must be alarming, given that there are more and more people attending postsecondary institutions.

The other problem that I believe compounds this is that with a high unemployment rate wages are relatively depressed. This is a very long-term problem, but I can make a very easy case that overall wages continue to be depressed, which means that those seeking employment or finding employment in the summers, for instance, are able to garner relatively smaller incomes and thereby able to be self-sustaining in a diminishing amount. That surely will hurt and by itself be a deterrent to attending a postsecondary program of any description.

Now, I know the minister talked about his new \$80 million endowment fund. Well, there are concerns -- and they are raised increasingly in the United States -- that systems which invite joint ventures between, say, a government, which is responsible for turning around tax dollars to publicly desired programs, with the interests of certain private groups, who very often are multinational corporations, result in basically the buying of relatively cheap research and implicitly changing the nature of the institution that buys into that. I don't think it has been demonstrated to be a problem here yet, but I can speculate that in the longer run it will be. The minister may want to turn his attention to a notion of an endowment that would refuse to tie itself to special projects, particularly those which are being targeted or run by special interest private-sector groups. Specifically I have a concern in the area of the international arms race, and I wouldn't want to see our university being bought to sponsor research in that regard. But indeed although I acknowledge it is not a problem yet at the universities in Alberta, I caution the minister to pay attention to that.

But then I also caution the minister to be careful in the way he refers to the February 17 throne speech, that special one-day election kickoff event that probably cost Albertans an awful lot of money, Mr. Chairman, money that could have gone into, say, adding to the capital funds for various institutions or the Students Finance Board. Because first of all, the deadline was passed. It was promised for April 1, and it was not effective April 1. I think that's a sorry reflection on the intentions and assumptions the government has with respect to the public at large. In the second place, it was very cleverly worded to not refer to the fact that it would be spread over a 10-year period, therefore having the effect of, on average, \$8 million a year. That said, I think it is important to recognize that when such a program is instituted, it needs to be dispersed fairly. I am intrigued by the notion of the quota system, a subject which I have discussed on prior occasion with the minister, and I look forward to a detailed analysis of that, which I don't expect tonight,

but at some time it would be very good if the minister would provide to members of the Assembly the procedure that he intends to apply to the distribution of those funds.

One of the concerns I have that I know my colleague the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona will raise has to deal with capital budgets and in this case specifically, Capital Construction under Postsecondary Institutions. I wonder if the minister has any plans to intervene to help the crisis that the University of Alberta residences are now facing: needing millions of dollars worth of repair in order to be able to function safely and house students safely and at the same time not having benefited immediately or since from a program such as that which has benefited, for instance, the University of Calgary by way of the Olympics having been held there in the Olympic village and residences being constructed. Now, I say this understanding full well that, for instance, the U of A did benefit, although it had to take out a \$15 million mortgage to get the Garneau housing which came along with the Commonwealth Games held in Edmonton.

Back to specific questions, Mr. Chairman. I wonder, under vote 3.0.4, why the big drop in the Remissions of Loans. That's a 12.5 percent drop in an environment where enrollment is increasing. I didn't see reference to a changed formula. I'm not aware of one, so perhaps the minister would explain this. But I would also be interested in a political explanation as well as a technical one, because quite frankly, as I pointed out before, students are less able to command decent incomes for their work, less able to sustain themselves through the university years or the postsecondary years, and facing more and more staggering debts when they get out of university, which itself can be a deterrent. I speak from the experience of having waited several years before going to university, worked at a dry cleaners as well as borrowed money, and I know that it was a real deterrent I was afraid of the debt. If I had known what my master's degree was going to cost me, I probably wouldn't have done it. In any event, I think that's a real attack on students and needs to be addressed.

From the University of Calgary perspective I would like to recognize that they, too, are very concerned at the shortfall of about \$3 million that the university was expecting for equipment and renovations, as is Mount Royal College with respect to the loss of about half a million dollars for the same purposes. What I note is that reductions in these capital costs, while they may seem easy to do on paper and it may look like, "Well, if I've got to cut somewhere, I'll just go slash-slash and that'll be the end of it," the problem is it's like cutting off your nose to spite your face. We're not just talking about functional plant and, say, environmentally sound or habitable plant, we are talking about keeping up with high-tech, basically, changes in laboratories and their equipment, computer changes, and so forth. The government formula for the university provides only that furniture and equipment replacement would be had on an every 33-year basis.

Given the high-tech nature of our society and economy, I believe that formula really needs to be reconsidered. I believe fundamentally that the issue is no longer that those who invest in education and advanced education will keep pace. The issue is now reversed. Those who do not will be consigned to Third World status, and unfortunately one of the fastest ways to promote that is to not invest in the technology that facilitates research, the dissemination of information, and the transformation of that into knowledge. So I would like to see what the minister proposes to counter the cuts that he is imposing in his own

budget.

I have been to the University of Calgary several times. I noticed the minister referred to the Alberta College of Art, which indeed is a fine institution, but I wonder if he's made any decisions or is looking at any decisions that would assist it in getting degree-granting status. Now, I'm not certain that this is a totally smooth road, but I do know that the different programs operated by the U of C Fine Arts faculty and those offered by the ACA differ enough to warrant looking at that so that people can move on more readily, even though I do understand some of them can get into master's programs with the diploma. But I would also like to point out that both of those facilities are in serious need of an additional capital grant, as, quite frankly, are all of the institutions I've visited. The equipment in the ACA is really dinosauric, and much of it needs replacing. If I were a student at the U of C Fine Arts faculty, I think I might quit under circumstances of hot days. They're located on top of a garage. They have the benefit of breathing in all those fumes, and without adequate air conditioning and ventilation they nearly perish in the heat on warm days, plus the fumes from the products they use make it an almost unbearable environment. Now, I'm sure I could give you details like this from every institution in the province, but I won't do that. I'm sure the minister is aware. I get copies of letters sent to him, so I'm sure he's aware of the overall thrust of the problems I'm raising.

I have two more only at this point. One is that the overall or long-term planning prospective of universities I believe has been derailed, for what reason I'm not sure. I recall being actively interested in the issue in the early 1970s when discussion under way at that point ultimately led to the establishment of Athabasca University, meant to accommodate, first of all, those who prefer to study at home or need to study from home and, secondly, any demographic bulges that universities might need when it comes to tidying up degree programs. It has done a good job. The problem is: now that we have university transfer programs from within the colleges, which is a laudable fact in our system, what are we going to do when the bulges hit? Now, I would like to see if the minister has worked on discussions with the colleges to see how easy it would be, how willing they are to pursue degree-granting status themselves. If he is in those discussions, has he contemplated further down the road, then, that if we do that -- and I recognize that it may be a necessity, Mr. Chairman -- if we do proceed in that direction, is the minister desiring to replace the community college concept with yet the next layer?

The fact of life is that more and more people, not just for the first time but for the second, third, and fourth time, on a part-time and full-time basis, are enrolling in continuing education programs of one description or another. It is an inevitability of the state of the world that we do so. I believe the minister is sincere in his desire to make sure that system continues, but if we go for the degree-granting status for the community colleges, with what will we replace those so that the moms who want to get back into the work force or the computer analysts who need to upgrade according to new tech or indeed the tradesmen, accountants, you name it, who need refresher courses based on new information and systems can get into a community-based program, remembering that one of the most important things about community-based programs is that they do respond very quickly, unlike really large institutions, to local demand? They can be more readily demand driven, which is fairly important not just in moving our economy forward but also our society.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister what he knows about the state of negotiations for the land acquisition for the Grant MacEwan Community College downtown campus. I understand that the land bylaw issue is in front of city council and will be determined later this month, which I do not believe ultimately settles the issue. My concern is that with the campus proceeding at the downtown level and being a fairly large one, meant to hold some 4,500 students if I'm not mistaken, I am worried about the absence of a community college presence in a less intimidating environment, such as in a residential district -- or a much more residential district, at any rate, than is downtown Edmonton. The reason I'm concerned for that is the obvious: what I've stated before about the need for community colleges and all the roles they play.

The other thing I would like to ask the minister if he knows, and I'm not sure he can answer this one, is something that has just come to my ears related to anticipation of laying underground LRT track in Edmonton to that new downtown location -- if the province has yet been approached for the cost-shared funding on this matter and if that proposal mitigates any policy direction the government might take.

This discussion and series of questions could probably go on forever because it's a very large department, so I won't even attempt to do that. I would like to repeat two issues that I think need a political address as well as a financial address. That is, how are you going to handle the increased student load with a reduced commitment to student financing? The second part of really what amounts to the same question is: how do you plan to handle increased enrollment with facilities that are facing decay with a changed, reduced formula in the capital funding program? With that, Mr. Chairman, I'll let the next person get on with it.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. It's my understanding that the minister would like to respond to questions after everybody has had the opportunity of asking them. That will avoid duplication perhaps. I will recognize the hon. Member for Calgary-McKnight.

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also want to congratulate the minister on a very challenging appointment. Having spent four years at the University of Calgary on the senate there, I know that the problems facing the universities and the colleges are many. Many of the problems in a sense are based on the fact that our young people -- and not only our young people but all of our population -- have a very earnest desire for higher education, creating need for more spaces, more resources, and so on. While I was on the senate at the University of Calgary, I chaired the public relations committee, was a member of a task force on the role of the senate, and also was a member of the executive of the senate, so I feel somewhat well prepared to speak tonight in addressing the budget as it pertains to advanced education.

Overall, advanced education is in fairly good shape in this province. Most of the programs outlined in the February throne speech have been provided for in the budget. Assistance to higher and further education has risen by approximately 10 percent. This increase includes the allocation of additional funds towards student housing at the University of Lethbridge and funding for the new Grant MacEwan Community College. On the whole, funding to advanced education has risen by ap-

proximately 8 percent. This is all great, but has one new student space been created, or are these funds, for instance in capital spending, meant to help in the overcrowding and so on that exists?

Accessibility to universities and colleges is a major concern. I recall attending a day-long workshop at the University of Calgary last year which was sponsored by the senate at which Professor Fraser, Mr. Fred Speckeen from AVC, Don Baker from Mount Royal, and Ms Lynne Duncan from the department were all there to address this matter of accessibility, and it is really one that I think we have to pay a great deal of attention to. Quotas based on marks will simply not work. To begin with, in our caucus we do not really believe that we should have quotas, but if we're going to have them, basing them on marks just isn't going to work. If you ask a bright student to get another 10 percent on an advanced diploma exam, they can easily do so; they'll just work a little harder. So basing quotas on marks is certainly not the answer. As I said earlier, having quotas in the first place is somewhat questionable.

There were decreases, as my predecessor just stated, in the funds allotted for Financial Assistance to Students, primarily in the area of Remissions of Loans, which is down 12.5 percent, and the Implementation of Guarantees, which is down 4.8 percent. As well, the budget saw only a minute increase in the allotment for Fellowships and Scholarships. Overall the funding for Financial Assistance to Students dropped by a total of 3.3 percent over last year's estimates. When you tie into this the inflationary factors as well as the federal sales tax and so on which students will face, I do believe that this is a burden on those people who wish to attend universities. There was also a noticeable 6.6 percent drop over last year's estimates for Funding for Hospital-Based Nursing Education at the Alberta Hospital Edmonton. This is of some concern, as it appears to focus cuts in the area of psychiatric nursing while increasing funding to other training program;.

As well, it should be noted, although it is not mentioned in the throne speech, that there is at present a great deal of concern over the condition of residences at the University of Alberta, something which was stated earlier. An architectural evaluation done in the fall of 1988 estimated the cost of necessary repairs to be well over \$50 million. While the government has assisted with \$2.5 million in emergency repairs, there remains a great deal of work to be done. Faculté Saint-Jean, Galbraith House, and the Lister residences are all needing major upgrading. I would challenge the minister to visit these residences. I had a daughter at Faculté Saint-Jean maybe 10 years ago, and it was very archaic then. The building I'm sure is an historical site in the city of Edmonton, probably is at least 80 years old, and I don't think the residences have been upgraded at all since that time. So I would challenge the minister to visit these residences and see for himself that they are neither efficient nor safe for our students, let alone being pleasant places to live in.

Increases in capital spending were announced. Again, my question: does this add one new student space? I note that the University of Alberta will get a new Faculty of Extension building. I applaud this acknowledgment of the desire of many more senior people or, you know, those beyond the leaving high school age for a continuing ed or a part-time education at the university. I do have a question to the minister which I asked earlier last week, and he promised he would answer it this time. Did the University of Calgary get its professional building?

Again I would like to mention the problem with the quotas.

specifically the 70 percent enrollment quota at the University of Alberta, and ask if this government has a policy of capping enrollment at universities. And if it has, why does it have that policy? Have they discussed this kind of policy with the population at large?

My predecessor also mentioned the transfer payments from the federal government, the decrease. I know it's a decrease in the rate of transfers, not so much in the overall, but when you do take it down a few years, it does become a significant amount. I'm wondering how you intend to deal with that or to compensate for that.

There will also be a very significant increase in the financial burden on postsecondary institutions because of changes to the unemployment insurance regulations whereby now the institution, in this case, will have to pick up total contributions. I think that will mean that universities will be facing very tough times in this particular regard.

This afternoon I asked, in an untimely fashion, about transfer programs. A commitment is made to increase funding of transfer programs -- wonderful, if it's part of an overall rationale, if it fits with the university which has to receive the students after the two years at the college. I mentioned two problems: the ability of the university to receive the student and also the matter of recognition for all the credit which the student earned while at the colleges. I believe this is a major concern. It was a concern at that workshop which I attended last fall, where we spoke about the need for rationalizing the entire system and making sure that as we try to push more students to go to the colleges in the first instance, because the universities are overcrowded, we make sure that when they are successful at college, there is a university program for them, a program which will recognize all of their courses.

Recently the University of Alberta general arts program made French 30 mandatory for admittance. I think this is something else to be applauded. However, an awareness campaign was not conducted to inform high school graduates of this change. Many students wanting to attend the U of A found out that they had to have a French 30 course. I do think it's very important that universities make sure that the high schools are well aware of all of the new admittance requirements so that the students do not have surprises when they go to apply for entrance at the university. My question, then, I think the basic question -- well, there are two or three, and I'll end with the basic question. First of all, are you committed to capping enrollments at the universities, and if so, why? In a province where we boast about our high level of education, why would we want to limit somewhat the enrollment at universities? I think the colleges are part of the answer, but again we need a rationale.

I also would like to mention the typical, I guess. Conservative philosophy of going to private sources for funding. We are asking the private sector to co-fund research projects at the universities, specifically I think in the medical schools. How much independence does this leave with the university? If much of the moneys come from the private sector, is that limiting the universities' independence in deciding what kinds of programs it will offer and so on?

AN HON. MEMBER: It's just like political corporate donations.

MRS. GAGNON: Exactly. The same thing is happening in the school systems where we have partnerships in education, and

various companies are becoming partners with a specific school. It's all well and good, but one has to wonder what kind of invisible strings might be attached to that kind of funding. We are, after all, supposed to have public funding of educational institutions in this province, and we should not depend on the private sector, be it the alumni associations, be it individual private companies, to take on some of the funding of the basics, so to speak, in our institutions.

I would like again to end with the question which I asked this afternoon, and that is: would the minister and would this government consider a broadly based commission to look at the entire matter of postsecondary education in this province, whereby the future needs would be addressed, not only the needs, as I said, of young people but of people of all ages who desire further education? We would look at the rationale, the integration of all of the colleges and postsecondary institutions.

Thank you very much for listening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, hon. member.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

MR. PAYNE: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess as the first government member to participate this evening in the debate of the estimates of the Department of Advanced Education, I would like also to congratulate the new minister for his recent appointment. During my three terms as a caucus colleague of his I have come to recognize and appreciate that the minister has a fertile and imaginative approach to program analysis, and I believe he has the unique ability to grasp a principle readily -- no pun intended -- and to illustrate the principle with a succinct, easily visualized, and utterly pertinent example. These are skills that will continue to stand him in good stead, and I certainly wish him well in the portfolio challenges ahead.

Mr. Chairman, my questions and comments this evening relate to the 1989-90 estimates in vote 2 for the University of Calgary's operating funds, in particular to the Centre for New Venture Development. A number of my constituents in Fish Creek and other business acquaintances in the city of Calgary have learned that continued funding for the Centre for New Venture Development is now in doubt or may indeed have been terminated. In asking the minister to clarify tonight the funding status of this excellent centre at the U of C, I want to emphasize to committee members in the House that the centre has helped a great number of enterprises in such areas as the creation of business plans and in funding presentations to private investors. As well, the centre has provided much-needed assistance to new enterprises in arranging financing. Members on both sides of the House are of course conversant with this ever-present problem and challenge for our business enterprises in Alberta.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in a recent letter one Calgary businessman advised me that the centre was directly responsible for assistance in arranging at least \$2 million of financing for a private company that he represented. I'm confident that a great many businessmen and entrepreneurs in Calgary regard this unique facility as an extremely valuable tool, and I'd like to add my voice this evening to those supporting the Centre for New Venture Development. I'll share with the Assembly that in a conversation with a colleague earlier this evening I learned that there may be some uncertainty or doubt as to the departmental responsibility for this centre. Traditionally, or at least in recent years, I believe the Department of Advanced Education has carried at least a share of this funding requirement. I would hope

that perhaps in any comments the minister might make at a later sitting by way of clarification of the funding status of the centre, he might, as well, elaborate or illuminate for us in the House just where that funding responsibility lies, so that we can more accurately direct our questions and further dialogue should the information I've been given earlier today be accurate.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: I'm obliged, Mr. Chairman. It was pleasant to go and ramble with the minister through the advanced education establishments in the province, but it would have been more useful if the minister had spent his time in telling us the principles upon which the figures were based; that is to say, why \$80 million in the capping for the matching funds over 10 years instead of \$180 million or \$40 million or some other figure. Why, within the \$8 million a year, should the portion for the University of Alberta, about which I will principally speak or question this evening, be \$2.5 million instead of \$3 million or some other figure? Indeed, as to the whole philosophy of the figures devoted by the public through its government to advanced education in Alberta, why should it still be less than the amounts of concessions we make annually to the petroleum companies to keep them working for us, and that sort of thing?

Looking at the figures, and dealing with the University of Alberta, which is in my constituency, it is fine that there is an increase of 5 percent in the operating grants for the universities. This is certainly better than minus 3 percent of two years ago, but it must be borne in mind that it is only a partial recovery of what has been taken away and not so much of a recovery, anyway, when you factor in inflation. For some reason which I can't understand, the inflation in operating expenses for the university runs about twice the rate of general inflation. I don't think it's necessary to guess at the reasons why here.

Another thing that it would have been useful for the minister to explain is why there is equality in a number of respects in the Advanced Education budget between the University of Alberta and the University of Calgary. One might think this is simple justice, that the universities -- they aren't quite the same size -- are in two cities, and so on, that are the principal cities in the province, and therefore they should have the same amount of money allotted to their respective universities, as it were, the same as we try and keep equality in grants in the two cities for the parks that are supported to some extent by the province, and in other ways: recreational facilities insofar as they are granted, and so on.

It doesn't work that way with the universities, Mr. Chairman. We in Alberta are trying to have at least one world-class university in the province. We already have the second largest university in Canada in the University of Alberta, behind the University of Toronto. We are desperately trying to keep up with the sort of resources that the University of Toronto can devote to its university and thereby attract the scholars to it, attract the professors to it who will attract the scholars, and we can only do that with the expenditure of a lot of money, so much money that we cannot have two world-class universities, or first-line universities, in this province.

I see the minister is laughing about this. I'd suggest that he doesn't know his job, if he thinks that's not true. It is impossible...

MR. GOGO: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. If the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona interprets that as a laugh, I think he perhaps needs my spectacles or to put his own on.

MR. WRIGHT: I saw the minister grinning. Perhaps he'd like that better.

AN HON. MEMBER: No grinning allowed in the House.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. I'm being serious about this. It's nothing to do with sentiments. It's nothing to do with fairness between two cities. It has everything to do with good education in the province. We do not have enough money to have two equally excellent universities in Alberta and to have them in the very top class. We will end up with two rather second-rate universities if it's equality that we're looking for.

So that brings me to the first main point, which is the capping at \$2.5 million on the matching grants. The minister I think by now knows full well that last year the University of Alberta, through its drive for fund-raising, raised some \$10 million from private donors. Now, does that mean then, assuming that this annual rate can be kept up, that the much touted matching grants become a 25 percent match, or does it mean that it'll have to be spread over four years for the University of Alberta, or what? If it means, really, that we are not looking at matching grants anymore for the University of Alberta, then the incentive to raise the money is considerably reduced. I mean, the incentive for the university to attempt to do it is the same, but the incentive to give is much less, because the donor will know that his or her donation is not going as far as it used to. If I'm not mistaken, we must remember that not so long ago the donations were doubly matched, and then they were equally matched, and now it's much less than that. The University of Calgary has an equal cap on it but much less in the way of obligations to raise large amounts of money, because of the less expensive capital facilities that are there, to keep up the sort of research that is done in the respective universities.

It must be emphasized, Mr. Chairman, that in order to attract the first-class scholars who are teachers and researchers, you need the capital equipment, and that this is extremely expensive. If you don't have it, you don't attract them or else you can't afford to pay them, so you don't have other scholars coming, and in time you slip away from the higher standards of excellence. It's not only in science, although it is principally in science, that the very expensive facilities exist. It is also expensive to have a world-class library for the humane faculties to work in, to attract scholars who need a very complete set of periodicals and, of course, the library itself.

So I'm going to ask the minister why there are these particular numbers, but also why the capping division between the various universities was made by the government instead of being made by the universities themselves. The president of the university at lunchtime today mentioned to me an earlier occasion when the Member for Medicine Hat was the Minister of Advanced Education, and I think the question at issue was library funding. Again the government had decided their own scheme of grants: the University of Lethbridge, the University of Calgary, the University of Alberta, and so on. So Dr. Horowitz said: "Well, look; why don't you leave it up to . . ." -- and I can't remember which; it may have been the Universities Coordinating Council, but one of the co-ordinating organizations between universities -- ". . . to make the decision? Then it's out

of the government's hands and will be agreed by the universities, if they can do it."

They did it within an hour or so. The University of Lethbridge conceded that it had an arrangement with the University of Alberta, whereby its library was complete -- i.e., the University of Alberta's library was much more complete -- so they had a reciprocal arrangement enabling them to borrow books. Instead of having two incomplete libraries, they had one complete, or fairly complete, library and one less complete library, but together they managed very well. So it might be an innovation that the minister could take credit for if some more of these decisions as to the division between the universities was made by the universities themselves through the medium, say, of the Universities Co-ordinating Council, although that might not be entirely apt, rather than the government itself or people in the department.

[Mr. Jonson in the Chair]

The next point I'd like to proceed to, Mr. Chairman, concerns the formula for capital available for equipment and renovation. The proposed allocation in '88-89 was only 46 percent of '85-86, and so the 8 percent increase now means it's only 52 percent of what it was in 1985 to 1986, which, when you factor in inflation, works out to about 40 percent. Now, there may be a reason for this, but we don't know why these particular numbers have been thought appropriate by the government. Is it simply a stab in the dark? I realize that any government, however well-intentioned, has got to reduce its expenditure and raise more money by some means or the other to reduce the deficit. Any government has to, and I recognize that, but it's the priorities between various departments and within the votes that should be explained.

The next point I'd like to make is a plea concerning the plight of libraries. I say that I'm talking about the University of Alberta; I am, but I expect that the same is just as true of the other universities. Perhaps it's truer of the University of Alberta because of the more extensive collections there, so the reductions are fiercer than they are obliged to make. I know I've had a series of pleas from people in my constituency who work in the libraries at the university to see what can be done to restore some of the cuts. One department said they had had an 80 percent cut in their series of periodicals, in the purchase of them, which worked out to a 12 percent cut overall in keeping them up, and that was following a 10 percent cut last year. You can manage, Mr. Chairman, for a year or two with these sorts of economies. There isn't a single undergraduate that will not come because these series have been cut and books like this have been cut out, but gradually the word gets out and the university is reduced in its status. We've seen that with other universities in Canada. It would be invidious to mention names, but I think you can think of a couple, anyway, in the east.

The next point I wish to make -- and I think I'll leave it at that, Mr. Chairman -- concerns section 50 of the Universities Act. This is a quite different point. Section 50, I'm sure the minister will recall, exempts universities in the province from the operation of the usual zoning laws and development laws. You don't have to get development permits to make developments within a university. Now, there has been a request from the council of the city of Edmonton to repeal that clause. With the greatest of respect to the council [inaudible], I don't agree with that. But before putting that on record, Mr. Chairman, I

took the trouble to check round with people in my constituency who are affected by decisions made within the university in terms of change of traffic flow and that sort of thing which has been bothering them. Their point is a reasonable one, that if the university is going to build a parkade next to a residential street which will increase the amount of traffic going down that street by 400 percent, then the least they can expect is to be notified, and the most they can expect is to have some kind of input in that decision and some control over it.

Now, to try and achieve that by repealing section 50 is an overreaction. My request to the minister is to consider an amendment to that section which would require the university to notify the surrounding residents, in much the same way as occurs under the Planning Act now, of proposed changes in the university that could reasonably be expected to affect the neighbours. I suppose that's almost entirely traffic, but it could conceivably be if a large chimney is being built or something like that. It could be something other than traffic. Then the university should be obliged -- and this could be done by a change of its own bylaws, I guess -- to notify the residents, and the university and the residents' committee could attempt to work out a solution. If by chance they couldn't agree, then an appeal, let us say, to the development appeal board as a sort of umpire of such disputes. I suggest, with respect, Mr. Chairman, that that is a reasonable compromise between the present situation and just throwing all developments at the university into the ordinary planning process.

In fact, the University of Alberta has been good about notifying residents in the last seven or eight years, after some difficulties before. The thing that brought it to a head this time was that the Cross cancer clinic had a development in which there was a parkade being built on university land, and the university thought that the Cross cancer clinic was doing all this notifying and it wasn't. They fumbled the ball between them, and it caused a lot of heartache in my constituency. It's something for the minister to think about.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Red Deer-North.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman -- and also for the thunderous applause.

I'd like to congratulate the minister . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Perhaps, hon. member, I could just remind the Assembly that we need to keep the noise level down a little bit, please.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to congratulate the minister, and also his staff, and to just let the minister know, as I'm sure he already does, that he's got a significant challenge ahead, which is to live up to the tremendous record which the Department of Advanced Education under the leadership of this government has had in the past when you consider just a few very major areas: things like the lowest tuition rates in Canada outside of the province of Quebec, the most generous finance packages in Canada, and other areas like most research dollars per faculty member of any other province in Canada being provided to our faculty members in the various institutions. Challenges for you, Mr. Minister, and I know that you'll be able to rise to those significant chal-

lenges in terms of the standard of excellence which this department has set for its students and institutions in the province.

I do appreciate your exuberance about the institution in your own constituency. I would like to say that Red Deer College also has a story to tell. I have a preamble for a question which I'd like to put to the minister. Dr. Ed Luterbach and the board and staff and students at Red Deer College indeed have an incredible story to tell. I'd like to tell that in about two minutes and then give you the question itself, because the question is going to ultimately involve the expenditure of dollars.

Anytime you're looking at dollar expenditure, it's important to consider can you look to the institution in question with confidence that the dollars are going to be well spent, well handled, and well managed? I would suggest three areas that I'm sure the minister takes into consideration in this area when looking at an institution. Academic excellence, of course, would have to be one of those areas. Financial competence obviously would have to be another, and organizational ability of the institution itself would be a factor to be considered in looking at an expenditure request of any kind. I know the minister takes that responsible kind of approach.

So before asking the actual question, in terms of academic excellence, extensive comparisons at Red Deer College with their transfer students going into third- and fourth-year programs at, say, the U of C or U of A in comparison with students from other programs show very encouraging results. I don't want to get any of my colleagues upset if I'm to compare their institutions and their students with those coming from Red Deer College, but in fact the students out of Red Deer College perform exceptionally well as they move into the third- and fourth-year programs. Therefore, Red Deer College's academic excellence is something that's a thoroughly established fact.

Then moving to financial competence, comparisons which we have sent to the good minister's office, both under this present minister and under the former minister, of costs per full-time equivalent -- again very encouraging figures. Mr. Minister, as you sit down and look at those, and I won't go over them in detail for you to allow time for other members, in comparison, again, with other institutions, the financial competence of Red Deer College is something that is established in fact and not just in theory.

Then in the third area you'd want, of course, to be concerned about the organizational ability of the institution itself, in terms of if they're asking for a considerable, or any kind of, increased expenditure. I'm sure the minister is aware of an award won last year by Red Deer College, the North American winner of the award for outstanding staff, program, and organizational development. That award was only given to two institutions in North America out of 1,600 that were under consideration; a significant accomplishment, I might suggest to the minister.

Having then stated that preamble, the question, of course, is: how significantly and aggressively is the minister considering the request by Red Deer College for degree-granting status at some time in the future? The present size of the college could certainly justify and rationalize such a request being granted. The benefits to the students are obvious. Being able to stay more or less in their home area in central Alberta, that would require less in terms of student loans and less of an impact on the student finance package overall. We've already experienced some problems at the college in terms of, for instance, the social work program not being able to continue, coming out of another university. The benefits, I submit, would be significant, Mr.

Minister, in giving due consideration to that request. I don't know if you can answer that for us tonight. Certainly I would like an answer in the affirmative and would heartily thump the desk here in front of me. I recognize your constraints as your department gazes down upon you and as my colleagues do, but I would like some reflection as to your consideration of that request.

Just moving quickly to another area on a totally different level, I guess. As you are aware, under the School Act we have what is called in this province registered independent schools. These are schools which don't use the government curriculum per se, but they do have to demonstrate that they meet the goals of education as laid out by the government. Most of these schools subject their students to an annual battery of extensive and external testing; for instance, ACT, SATs, Canadian Test of Basic Skills, and so on. The difficulty arises when these students graduate from their own grade 12 program and apply to get into a government institution without the actual government credits per se, even though they can demonstrate through producing records of their own scope and sequence of their various curricula that they have accomplished the comparable amount of high school learning, and in all cases are willing to write entrance exams and also to go on probation.

Some of the institutions in the province accept the students on that basis, and some seem to have extreme difficulty in accepting students. All these registered schools are asking for is that the same consideration be given to their students as would be given to students from another jurisdiction, coming from, let's say, another province, maybe from a foreign country where they don't have the actual exact credits. They're coming from a different system, and yet they are able to enter our secondary institutions after they've demonstrated certain proficiencies. So would the minister investigate this problem and possibly even comment on it, as it is distressing to many of our Alberta citizens?

Another area -- actually a word of thanks to the minister and to someone in particular in his department, and that's Mr. Bill Workman, who's a member of the Alberta Tourism Education Council. One of the functions of that council is to determine and prioritize education and training needs of the tourism and hospitality industry in the province. We specifically have a position on that council from Advanced Education and also from the college of presidents. The purpose of that, of course, is that as the council attempts to work with industry to prioritize their education needs, we want to avoid duplication and to promote efficiency in the education training system. So your department, Mr. Minister, is represented by Mr. Bill Workman, and he advises whether a certain program that might come forward as a request from the industry would be feasible or even necessary. I just alert the minister to that and also to the fact that with Mr. Workman's considerable expertise, he would be able to give good advice to you in terms of programs that indeed are required to go on stream and possibly through the existing infrastructure of postsecondary institutions.

My last question deals with the federal budget. The established program funding, as the minister I'm sure is aware, won't be affected this year, but in the future, we've been told, there's going to be a decrease in the increase, if that makes sense. If you think about it, it probably will. Some have established that figure at around the \$20 million mark two years from now, in terms of some \$20 million less coming to your department from the federal government. Has the minister any plans to make up

that shortfall?

I appreciate your time and consideration of these questions, and wish you and your department all the best in the exciting opportunities that lie ahead for us in Alberta.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, want to congratulate the minister on his appointment. I know as a rookie MLA here last session that we felt increasingly in high regard for the Member for Lethbridge-West, and we really want to wish him well in his portfolio. I hope, though, that being at the reins of power and all that funding possibility, he doesn't become too much of a Tory. It seems that often when they get in the cabinet room, they take on a whole different face and orientation.

I had to in fact agree with my colleague from Edmonton-Strathcona saying how we're a bit disappointed that the minister did not outline more clearly or more articulately what his own orientation, his own philosophy, is with respect to the role of advanced education in our society and in our province. Certainly dollar figures and estimate details are going to flow from a clear understanding of what the basic orientation, direction, approach is of a particular government or minister.

I'll always think back to a great debate at Memorial Chapel in Harvard Yard where Derek Bok, the new president of Harvard University, had begun his core curriculum that he wanted to institute back in the late '70s. And yet the dean of the Divinity school, Krister Stendahl, who was a great hero of mine, got into this debate about what the real role of advanced education is anyway, Krister Stendahl taking the philosophy or approach that education is to help one learn how to learn, to help one learn critical thinking and critical faculty so they could make their way in whatever circumstance or changing environment they might find themselves in, whereas there are many others that we know within the department or in the faculties or even in government who think that education is merely to help train one for a particular job or a particular slot in society. Yet they're very profound, different directions that need to be debated, need always to be put in the forefront of government philosophy, in government approach, and particularly as dollars flow and follow the orientation.

So I'd like to hear more from the minister as to where his particular approach is, where his biases are, what his view is of the role, as I say, of advanced education in our society generally. I would hope that he might be closer to my bias, which is that one needs to learn how to learn, that the role of advanced education is to help people to think critically and creatively for themselves in co-operation with others to make for a better world and a better society for all.

Well, not having gotten that, I have a number of questions just in general, and then I'd like to address some remarks to vote 2.7 with respect to hospital-based nursing education in particular. But in terms again in a general sense, I would like to know again from the minister, in his travels around and his experience to date, where he sees the real power of decision-making taking place. Is it in the board of governors? Is it among the faculty associations? Is it by the students, as we have seen such a demonstration of students in China; certainly, the students in our schools of advanced education here are a very powerful voice as well. Or is it in his own department, with of-

ficials who try to develop policy and help make decisions in terms of how things should unfold? Now, I forget about that other deputy who left, who had, I think, some very pure views about the role of advanced education in the department that weren't very popular, and I think he ended up leaving, or something. But I know that within the whole range of whether it's in the universities or the student body or the department, a lot of different people have different biases, different axes to grind. Would the minister please give some indication where he really is going to help enable or empower certain decisions to take precedence over others and where the authority is going to be lying?

My colleague from Edmonton-Strathcona talked about the library system. I would argue strongly that any deterioration of the library system is a deterioration of the system as a whole. The undergraduate university I went to, Trent University, was a very strong university in terms of tutorially based learning in very small groups, so we could sit and discuss with faculty certain issues of the day and certain academic issues of concern, but we found that the library, even after three or four years, was getting pretty short. And as the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona says, we have a chance here at the University of Alberta to have a first-rate, internationally recognized university, and the library system there needs to be developed in the best of all possible worlds, as well as the libraries in the other institutions as well. It's not just a frill or a passing fancy.

The Member for Red Deer-North mentioned about the lowest tuition rates, and certainly students need to have low tuition rates. We don't have them as low as they are in Sweden, where I don't think they have any tuition rate. It seems to me that if we are going to make education as our number one priority and invest, as the minister did say, in the future and in our students, then I don't think there need to be tuition rates at all, and that really should be looked at far more carefully.

What about the whole issue of tenure? Now, I know tenure among faculty is a sacred cow, but I know there are many others who are still raising the question. I mean, here we are as MLAs who have to go to the public every four years to see if our tenure will be at all lengthened. There needs, of course, to be some evaluation, some faculty review, at least in the process in whether or not tenure is automatically going to keep one in the system forever -- or if the minister's going to make any moves in that direction or maybe comments on compulsory retirement. Certainly the situation in the University of Alberta in terms of that whole issue is a very central one, both in terms of policy as well as in terms of funding. It would be useful tonight if the minister could make some comments in that regard.

As well, as I think the Member for Edmonton-Highlands and others touched on, more and more universities and centres of advanced education are used by private groups with private interests. Particularly in the area of research we get an increasingly difficult area of what to do with patents once they're developed. Is it the property of the university in the public good? Is it the property of the private investor, Chembiod, or whoever put the money into the research, who obviously wants to patent so they can continue to make lots of money from whatever research or discovery that happens to take place? And if the university and the minister are going to go more and more in the direction of having private investment in our universities, what's he going to do with that thorny issue, as well as just issues about ethics in the universities in terms of university research? I think an ethical reflection upon what kind of research

we want to do and for what end is often left out of the picture, whether it has to do with genetic engineering, nuclear engineering, or whatever kinds of research. So these are all very thorny, and I know perhaps not pertaining directly to the estimates, but I think they're part of this overarching need to give more articulation to what advanced education needs to be about.

I know in Edmonton-Centre, Mr. Chairman, my own constituency, I'm well blessed with a number of advanced education institutions including -- well, at least NAIT borders on it. But I certainly have Alberta Vocational Centre and the Grant MacEwan downtown campus. Athabasca University's moved in, Alberta College is not far, and we certainly have a number of University of Alberta students who live downtown, a number of students who are studying English as a Second Language, and the whole literacy program that is, I believe, funded through the Department of Advanced Education. All directly impact on my constituents, and I want to make sure that we have some real sense of direction and sense of support from this minister and the government that their needs are going to be met.

I'd like to turn more specifically, though, to the education of health care professionals. Certainly, and again in a general sense, there are increasing numbers of people who are taking increasing numbers of different fields in the whole area of health care, and a growing number of health care professions and expertise are developing. Certainly they're trained in almost every different institution in the province, from universities down to the colleges and throughout the whole system. But I think again we need some specifics with respect to the kind of training they're receiving in the area of care and quality. Certainly one can't learn to be a health care professional only in a laboratory or in a classroom. The need to be out and interacting with people and having reflections upon that interaction in terms of the quality of the care that's provided or being learned about needs to be underscored as well.

Training in the team setting. There's no way in which a doctor can work separately from a nurse or a nurse separately from a nutritionist or a nutritionist separately from a physiotherapist: the whole training in teamwork. And I'm a bit concerned about a fragmented approach to the training of health care workers. In fact then they get out into the system and have to begin to learn how to work together, and I think that's unfortunate.

Training in ethical decision-making. Again I put in a plug for the bioethics faculty at the university, which I think for the first time is taking seriously medical ethics and health care ethics and the training of doctors and nurses in very, very difficult ethical dilemmas that they confront almost on a day-to-day basis. And yet they're struggling to get some funding, struggling to get by. I think it's a growing and an important field of learning and needs the appropriate sort of funding to help not only the ethicist develop different ethical modes of thinking but to help people in health care professions to learn about that and be able to implement it in their day-to-day life and work.

Let me get then, to the most specific concern I have, which has to do with the hospital-based nursing program, particularly as it's outlined in vote 2.7 and following, because it has a whole separate area of budget estimates in there. The minister must surely know that there's a great and growing concern about nursing, the training of nurses, and the supply of nurses in this province, throughout Canada, and throughout North America. Hardly a day or a week goes by when there isn't some mention by some quarter and some media or other about the shortage of nurses and what that's going to do to our health care system.

You can build all the hospitals you want, you can fund all the programs you want but if you don't have the nurses at the bedside performing the hands-on health care, then hospital beds will just be of no consequence. So concerns have been raised from the United Nurses of Alberta to patients waiting on waiting lists to the Hyndman report of about a year ago, all trying to address in one way or other the issue of supply and training of nurses.

If I might, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to turn to the Hyndman interim report of last June, a year ago now, where the Hyndman commission made very strong recommendations about what needs to be done in terms of nursing and the training of nurses. I was trying to listen carefully to the minister's opening remarks. He said something about 350 nurses going through somewhere. I wasn't quite sure what he was referring to, but I was hopeful for a much fuller statement of what he and his department are doing to address this very critical area of concern, particularly following up from the recommendations of the Hyndman report just last June. I'd like to hear from the minister. I don't see it in the budget detailed elements in front of me, and I haven't heard from any news release or other, but what has actually happened with respect to recommendation A.1, where it's recommended

That the Department of Advanced Education provide increased funding to the Universities of Alberta, Calgary and Lethbridge to enable them to increase enrollment quotas in the basic and post-basic degree programs.

Now, I haven't heard. I haven't perhaps done all my homework to find out from the deans over there whether in fact they are able to increase their enrollment quotas. But it seems to me that they're still, through this kind of budgeting for the universities at least not going to develop or increase the enrollment quotas that much.

Then, recommendation A.4 from Hyndman says

That the Department of Advanced Education, through such bodies as the Alberta Council on Admissions and Transfer, collaborate [on the transfers between] one type of nursing program to the next.

This is with respect to registered nursing, registered psychiatric nurses, public care, nursing aides, and the rest. There needs to be far more ability for them to transfer from one program to another, so that they can learn skills in one area and then transfer them and develop them in other areas, and that kind of more consistent approach for nursing education needs to go on right away.

Recommendation A.5, Mr. Chairman, says that funding for continuing nursing education programs needs to be drastically increased by the year 1990, and that the Minister of Advanced Education should take the lead role in the increased funding for nurses' continuing education. Again, I'm sorry; maybe I've missing something, but tonight's the night for the minister to show us and tell us how he has, in fact taken the lead role with respect to increased funding for continuing education for nurses. If I were to prioritize it I think this would be the top one, because certainly we have a lot of nurses who are in the field and what they need is the time and the money to be able to get off the units, get off the wards, put their children in day care, have their husbands do what they're doing, and then be able to get on to some continuing education. But there are so many obstacles, whether it's family or salary or whatever, obstacles that do not allow for nurses to be able to develop their continuing education. Hence they're not up to speed on a number of care needs, and hence a greater frustration accrues. So I'd like to see the minister take the lead role in this respect and really fund con-

tinuing nursing education programs by the year 1990. He hasn't got much time.

Well, there are other nursing issues, as we know. I don't want to get into a debate. I think it's perhaps a fruitless one, as we tried with the former minister about whether in fact he supports the Canadian Nurses Association's hope that all nurses would have a bachelor of science degree by the year 2000. I still think there's some merit in further discussing that and debating that, and I know the minister has had discussions with some very fine nurses at the University of Lethbridge with respect to their need to develop their degree program in BSc nursing, and yet nurses have left there. I'm just not sure how strong that program is there. It's in the minister's own backyard, and I'd like to see at least some fair core funding for the BSc level nursing, not to mention nursing research in the master's program and even PhD nursing.

I'm still amazed that we put \$100 million into medical research in this province and only \$1 million into nursing research. It seems that we have 100 to 1 odds against nurses with respect to doctors in terms of research. A lot of issues about patient care in hospitals and in the community have come from nurses, and yet we give them such a paltry amount to do the kind of research and training that they can and should be doing on behalf of Albertans.

Then of course the issue that's brewing right now -- and again the minister either hasn't addressed it or isn't aware of it, but it has to do with what this department is doing with registered psychiatric nurses, particularly at Alberta Hospital Ponoka and Alberta Hospital Edmonton. I still again would firmly believe that training in mental health nursing is crucially important, that the whole field of mental health is neglected, and that the area of nursing in mental health is one that needs a lot of incentive and a lot of support and a lot of people to enter it. I'm told that over the past the whole training for psychiatric nurses, mental health nurses, or mental deficiency nurses as it's sometimes called, has grown up because of the need for mental hospitals, or mental asylums as it used to be, to get some pool of labour to come in and take care of the patients. So they developed their own programs. That day is certainly long gone, and there's a push to have nurses at a basic level take a specialization in mental health nursing. If that's the direction in which we're going, what does that do to the registered psychiatric nursing program at Alberta Hospital Edmonton or Ponoka?

I'm told that the Alberta Hospital Edmonton program is not long for this world; in fact, it's being phased out. And I'm surprised again. Maybe the minister could explain. You can see by the 6.6 percent reduction that maybe it is, but Ponoka is going up 19.4. I've heard they've got some capital amount that maybe -- and since they need this larger operating. But what's to be the future? I don't care, in fact, what direction they take. I mean, I might have some concerns about that, but the basic concern that we have obviously is that we need very well-qualified, well-trained mental health nurses or nurses with specialty in mental health, and we just don't have them. So if you're going to be phasing out programs, you'd better not do it at the expense of not having anybody there to take of people with mental illness.

Again it gets back to the whole shortage of nursing issue. I would find it to be a most regrettable situation if, in whatever shuffle of programs and funding, we were to get the registered psychiatric nurses upset and others upset or not provide the kind of incentive and support that's needed to help people get into the

field not only of nursing but of mental health nursing, where there is such a great need for care in the province of Alberta.

As I started in the beginning, and I'd just come back to it, Mr. Chairman: all of these points, whether they're specific or general, rest upon the fact that we need a far clearer articulation of what the government and this minister's actual philosophy of education, advanced education in particular, is about, what orientation he has, and what his biases are. Only when we have that more clearly can we as the opposition members call them more into account and then be able to move on for the better good of students today and the future of all Albertans.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Cardston.

MR. ADY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have some questions that relate to the operating budget and specifically to the University of Lethbridge.

[Mr. Schumacher in the Chair]

Prior to getting into the specific questions that I have, I would just like to compliment the new minister on his appointment and also on the fine work he has done in promoting the University of Lethbridge as well as the Lethbridge Community College. I know that the people who operate those institutions know the minister to be a real ally and advocate for the things they have needed. I notice the minister was able to get that university a large increase in operating budget, and I presume that's because of the fact that the institution is young and that they're still in the building process of getting all their programs in place and things arranged such as they should be.

The one question I had specifically that I wanted to ask him has to do with the degree program for education. There is an initiative to have that extended from four to five years, and I just wanted to know what the minister could tell me for the reasoning behind that. There are some negatives to it. Of course, there is the extra cost to the student and his family to go the extra year, and in addition to that, there's the lost revenue that he would make if he were out in the fourth year and working in the fifth year, as opposed to having to take another year of university.

So if he could just give me some insight as to the motivation for that and the department's position in supporting that initiative. Is it widespread to the other institutions in the province, or is it isolated to just the University of Lethbridge? It would seem to me that a better approach than another year of university would be to reinstate the intern program, which was very positive when it was here and would give the student the benefit of some in-class experience.

The question also that comes to my mind is: what does the university really intend to teach in that fifth year? What is it that they haven't been teaching previously that they now see the need to be taught? What was missing? I've not been able to determine that. I've talked to some people and they indicated that they were sure it was going to be in the field of psychology, because teachers were called upon to be experienced in psychology in the classroom today. Others felt that, no, it was going to be more in the line of economics. It doesn't seem that anyone knows. So that is the main question that I wanted, Mr. Minister, having to do with that fifth year for the degree program in education.

Thank you.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Chairman, when I first heard that the Member for Lethbridge-West was appointed our Minister of Advanced Education, I was quite delighted. I had always worked well with him before, and I knew -- or thought, for sure -- I could as a Minister of Advanced Education. But I remember I thought -- I still think -- that certainly there are a lot of good things in the budget, and I certainly support the minister on most of those, but there is a bit of a cloud, in particular for Bow Valley.

Now, in the February 17 throne speech it quotes that "the Brooks campus for Medicine Hat College will [be proceeded with.]" I was quite delighted with that announcement, Mr. Chairman. And then in the June 1 budget there was a commitment to reaffirm all of our priorities that we'd set out in the February 17 budget. So I still felt very good about what's happening. Now, Brooks operates a campus; it's called Brooks campus of Medicine Hat College. It operates now out of an old hospital building, very inadequate for the amount of students they've got and for the potential for students they could draw if they had proper facilities. Some 10 years ago or so a Harry Veiner donated 60 acres of land as a building site for Brooks campus, Medicine Hat College. The appraisal of that land was \$1.15 million. It was supposed to be matched out of the endowment fund, so it looked like we had a real go-ahead with the Brooks campus. We still felt there was something in the budget for the campus until just recently.

Now we come to the cloudy part, because I had told my constituents that this government honours her commitments, and I still believe that we do honour our commitments. However, this morning when I left home, I got about halfway to Edmonton and my phone in my car started to ring. And of course it rang steadily from there all the way till I got to the city. Now, there was a communication from the minister to the chairman of the board of directors in Medicine Hat College. It's dated today, by the way, and the mayor of Brooks phoned me at 8 o'clock this morning, so they must have gotten it really early today. It followed on from the radio station, the newspaper, some people from the college all phoning me. What it says is that the endowment, \$1.15 million, will be allotted for the planning and possible construction of Brooks campus.

Now, the campus is not a very expensive building, because the total cost of it is something between \$5 million and \$6 million, of which they have already raised close to \$2 million. And recognizing that the Medicine Hat College board does have some reserve funds, of those they have committed \$700,000 to the Brooks campus. But they're saying that that's the limit they're prepared to put into the Brooks campus, recognizing that they are in line for an expansion in Medicine Hat also.

So people were saying that there isn't a commitment of any sort to fund the Brooks campus, and after getting ahold of the letter and reading it, it could be interpreted a lot of ways but you could certainly interpret it that way. It says to go ahead with the planning of the college. Now, I'm not sure how far something in the order of \$2 million goes toward the planning. I'm not sure how long it takes to plan a building of that sort, but it does say to look to the 1991 budget to discuss cost-sharing arrangements. Now, that could mean that the 1991 budget would have some funding for the college, and it may not. I'm certainly confused now about where we stand with the Brooks campus. I would ask the minister first off to explain what the planning

process amounts to, how long it is going to take, how much it's going to cost, and where we are going from there. I'm certainly looking forward to seeing a college building in Brooks and would certainly appreciate the minister's remarks on that issue.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a couple of questions that I'd like to address tonight. Prior to doing that, I'd like to extend to the minister my congratulations as well for his appointment as the Minister of Advanced Education. I'm told that when the Member for Lethbridge-West was the chairman of AADAC, he gave up alcohol during the tenure of his chair of that area. Now I see that as the Minister of Advanced Education he's got a number of hospitals that fall under his portfolio, and I look forward to him weaning himself off the pipe so we can get a nice smoke-free environment in this Assembly. I'm working on the Member for Edmonton-Highlands as well.

Anyway, I did want to speak about Grant MacEwan Community College. I know that the Member for Edmonton-Highlands did briefly touch upon the needs of Grant MacEwan Community College in her remarks, but what I want to add is that what's happened over the course of time, in fact over a very short period of time, is that in 1971 when Grant MacEwan first opened it started with 400 full-time students; it currently has something in the neighbourhood of about 4,500 students, and the projections are that they're going to climb to about 6,500 full-time students by 1995. Now, there are, of course, a number of reasons why students would pick a community college over a university or a technical institution. Some of those might be related to tuition, the cost of housing, travel arrangements that have to be made inside a city. The average GPA, grade point average, that one has to attain now in order to get into a university is much higher than it was a short time ago. So for many people community college offers an opportunity to get into formal, postsecondary education. That's an important offering to make to an awful lot of people that otherwise may stop the formal educational process in their lives.

In the northeast end of the city we've got the Cromdale campus of Grant MacEwan. It's certainly old and in a condition that I'm told is getting very expensive to constantly maintain and repair, but we're also told that with the proposed opening of a downtown campus, that's going to alleviate the need for that northeast end. Well, perhaps that is going to take away some of the actual pressures that GMCC is facing overall, but I worry about what it's going to do in the northeast end or what it's not going to do. In the northeast end I think we do need some kind of facility that's in the community. The important component of a community college is that if you see it in the community, you know it's there on a daily basis; it's part of the structure of the community. You go there or you pass by there and you know it's a place where you can go at a later time, and that's important. There are an awful lot of folk that reside in the northeast end that don't venture to the south side to take a look at the university, and I think having a postsecondary institution would be a real asset in the northeast end of Edmonton.

I also worry about the cost of the proposal that goes on for the downtown campus. Now, I'm told that it certainly isn't in this minister's area of concern -- well, I'm sure it's in this minister's area of concern -- but the transportation is going to run, if

there's an LRT extension to GMCC downtown, to be about \$200 million, at \$100 million a mile for an underground LRT. That's an extraordinary amount of money. As I say, I know it doesn't necessarily fall within the scope of this minister's office, but \$200 million out of the taxpayers' pocket is still \$200 million out of the taxpayers' pocket whether it comes out of Municipal Affairs, the city of Edmonton, or Advanced Education. And those are considerations that I hope will be made by the government when it shares its collective wisdom around the cabinet table. Maybe what ought to be considered is the need that's going to be there in 1995: the total number of full-time enrollments will be 6,500. Perhaps what we ought to be doing is looking at that need as well and developing for that instead of just being limited to the 4,500 students we have currently.

My colleague from Edmonton-Centre touched upon the need for increased concern for psychiatric nursing. Now, Alberta Hospital Edmonton is in my constituency. I've gone out many times to look at the programs that are offered to the students and to the patients at AHE. I, too, am very concerned about the declining amount of money that's going in. It's only \$43,000 that is being reduced to AHE, but when you've got a budget of approximately \$600,000, that is a significant cut to that budget. You know, with our society changing as it is, with the stress levels increasing, we have brain damage due to any variety of diseases: alcoholism, drug abuse; we have brain damage from motor vehicle accidents; we have more people going in and requiring the kind of psychiatric care that's being offered. I worry about losing that. So I am concerned about where the training is going to take place.

I would like to have those two primary questions responded to. Thank you.

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Chairman, first off I'd also like to congratulate the minister on his new appointment. I'm very pleased to see this minister have this appointment, because I think he's going to do a great job for us, especially when I heard of his pride in the University of Lethbridge. I noticed in one of the reference numbers under the Minister's Office, 1.0.1, that they're asking less money in '89 than they received in '88. If they can do that type of thing, maybe we should make him the next Provincial Treasurer.

Speaking of pride in the University of Lethbridge, I too have a little pride there. My youngest daughter graduated from there, and she later went on and got her second degree at the University of Alberta. Strangely enough, I later asked her about the universities, and she preferred the University of Lethbridge. She said it was perhaps a little better education and a little more personal attention, which brings me to one interesting point regarding the philosophy of this government and our universities; that is, are we going to let our universities keep growing bigger and bigger? Because if you stop and rationalize that for a minute, if we'd just let the University of Calgary and the University of Alberta grow a little bigger, there would have been no University of Lethbridge. But I don't think it was that desirable.

I gave it a lot of thought that perhaps we should someday get a world-class university, get professors with big names, ones that are not from Alberta, from over a hundred miles from Alberta because anybody from over a hundred miles usually comes in as an expert, and we take our best university, give them lots of dollars, and we get a lot of prestige. We can't afford two world-class universities, so of course we'd have to build this at our better university in our larger city, Calgary, where, of

course, they have more high technology, more of the head offices. But I don't think that would be fair to Edmonton. But then Edmonton hasn't always been fair to Calgary.

If you ever look back, the capital was supposed to go to Calgary. If you ever check the history of it, some real weird, strange things happened. [interjections] No, you check your history books. It was supposed to go to Calgary, if you ever check back in history. Edmonton actually captured that capital and wouldn't let it go, so they made a compromise and made a promise to Calgary that, okay, if Edmonton got the capital and the capital buildings, then Calgary would get the university. And of course we know what happened to that.

So if we let all that little bit of history go by the boards, to be fair to our students, all our students should be given fair and equal treatment. I think we can forgo the luxury and the prestige of wanting to go for any world-class universities, because I cannot see the fairness or the reason to have classrooms of 150 at one university -- in the amphitheatre there is one professor teaching 150 -- and you go down to another university and they've got 480, 490 students in a classroom. That is not good education, and I do hope we get some consideration on that. One question I have for the minister; I hope he will take a hard look and give me his thoughts. Rather than expand our two major universities further and further, let's build more of our smaller universities, our colleges. There's nothing wrong with a college. Mount Royal College in Calgary has given a lot of education to a lot of students. And even there, Mount Royal is getting big. Maybe a satellite campus over on the other end of town might be something to look at.

I guess my last comment here is that I do want to congratulate your department and the work they have done on getting the private sector to donate money, the alumni to donate their time and their money. I did hear -- or maybe I misunderstood him -- one of the hon. members speaking before me saying something to the effect that perhaps they are going to make money off the universities. Holy smokes. Maybe I misunderstood him, and I hope I did. Anyway, maybe the other question we can ask: one of our very good corporate citizens in Calgary -- was it Ralph Scurfield? -- put up millions of dollars. He got our business faculty going there, helped build that building. I would like to know: how much money did Ralph Scurfield ever make off the university of Calgary?

I think that ends my questions. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to add to the many congratulations that have preceded mine. My congratulations to the new Minister of Advanced Education. I have always admired his stature in the House, looked up to him in fact, and have often thought he is nice enough to be a Liberal. I am hoping he takes that predisposition with him to his work, and if he does that then we will undoubtedly have enlightened Advanced Education policy.

Several quick questions. I am concerned about technology transfer from research developed in the university to the private sector. I would appreciate the minister identifying what specific policy he has to encourage technology transfer within the university, whether there are obstacles he and his department are identifying and what they are doing about them, what they propose to do about them, whether there are areas where progress

can be made in that regard.

Secondly, with respect to vote 3, Financial Assistance to Students, I am struck that in vote 1 and vote 2, both those expenditures have increased. Vote 3, Financial Assistance to Students, has decreased, and of the many varied problems we encounter on behalf of our constituents in our constituency office, student assistance problems rank very, very high. I would be concerned that diminished funding in this vote could exacerbate those problems. It's all very well and good to have good institutions well funded, but if students simply cannot afford to attend them and to remain focused on their studies because they have financial problems, then that leaves something to be desired.

Thirdly, the centre for new venture development at Calgary's business school: I have heard it is encountering some funding problems. I am concerned. I believe that while it may not as yet be perfect, it is an initiative that requires patience, an initiative that exists in an important area for economic development, bridging again the initiatives taken by universities and the importance of entrepreneurship in the private sector.

Fourth question -- and I'm not certain at all that I would want the minister to do that, to direct research or encourage research in certain areas over other areas. But something that has been brought to my attention recently is the state of SIDS research, sudden infant death syndrome research. While it may not be an area that is specifically within the purview of this minister or whether he can specifically do something about it, I would ask him to keep it in mind to contribute to the debate, as I'm hoping I am even now contributing to the debate, over that very, very important area of research which has to some extent, I believe, been forgotten. It is something that our universities, through our medical faculty and various research initiatives, might be encouraged over time to begin to focus on.

I have heard that the University of Alberta is interested in promoting its graduate student enrollment and diminishing its undergraduate student enrollment. That would concern me. I have also heard that this initiative may be due to the fact that there is some anomaly in funding that would encourage graduate student enrollment in the university institution, to pursue that over undergraduate enrollment. While there needs to be a balance, at a time like this in particular I would be very, very reluctant to see undergraduate enrollment diminished.

Finally, and very specifically, a constituent of mine has a concern with training facilities at Westerra. He owns a printing company. He requires trained web printers. He has been concerned that Westerra, which purports to train printers, doesn't have the equipment to train web printers. If the minister could look into some of these questions and comment on them, I would greatly appreciate it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The hon. Member for Calgary-Foothills.

MRS. BLACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, would like to congratulate the Member for Lethbridge-West. I'm sure he will do the portfolio honour, and I feel confident with him at the helm. In view of the hour, I will try and keep my comments very brief and come to the point.

The University of Calgary is within my riding, so I therefore have some grave concerns with its future and, in particular, with an aspect within the Faculty of Management. In 1973 the University of Calgary received approval to set up a new MBA program with entrepreneurship as a designated area of concentra-

tion. By 1981 the faculty was offering four entrepreneurship courses. The new venture development group was formed within the Faculty of Management in 1984 and by 1985 offered seven MBA courses, the first cross-faculty graduate course in management of technological innovations and two outreach programs available to community entrepreneurs. Supportive links were developed between the university's office of technology transfer, the Calgary Chamber of Commerce, the Calgary Economic Development Authority, Alberta Economic Development, and other universities and the private sector. In 1984 a co-operative effort between Management and Environmental Design resulted in a course developed and taught by members of both faculties. In 1986, with the cooperation of the law faculty, the legal assistance clinic was created, a vehicle by which small business people in the early stages of venture development would have access to information on the law as it applies to them.

The current status of this centre is in keeping with its original goal. It has attracted a number of prominent experts in the field of entrepreneurship as participants in a number of its activities from all over the world. In 1986 it hosted the International Council for Small Business. In 1988 it was the host for the Babson Conference in Entrepreneurship Research, which attracted prominent academics and researchers from, again, all over the world. In a recent Science Council of Canada report it was stated:

In the area of research on centres of excellence in innovation and entrepreneurship, Canada lags far behind the United States The closest we have to a centre appears to be the Entrepreneurship and New Venture Development Program at the University of Calgary.

My concern was echoed earlier by my colleague from Calgary-Fish Creek. I too have received letters of concern with regard to the future funding of this program. In the one letter, this fellow was a graduate of the program; he stated that he started his company in 1984 and has now employed 25 full-time employees. This is a computer software company. Another one is a realty firm that also has used the resource group from the new venture development and: it has been responsible for much of the success of our firm.

I think there is a tremendous need for this type of program, as has been evidenced by its success. In keeping with the government's philosophy on diversification and economic development, coupled with its commitment to the further increase in the business management faculty at the University of Calgary, I would really like the minister to review the program and see if there is a commitment to continue on. This program has in fact been in existence for four years, and it has the staff and mechanism in place already. I have a concern that it may get lost in the shuffle in trying to tighten our belts. The program has been funded through government grants as well as through the private sector, and I think that is something we want to see happen within our communities and within our educational institutions.

I would really try to recommend that the government continue on funding with this program and try and work it into the enhancement for the business management faculty. My question to the minister is: was there any possible way to continue with this program?

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Hon. Minister of Advanced Education.

MR. GOGO: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I want to compliment hon. members. There were some 15 members who put questions on behalf of their constituents. I think indeed your constituents can be very proud of the questions you put tonight with regard to Advanced Education. Having been, Mr. Chairman, with respect, in your chair, how well I remember when only two or three participated, because of the apparent verbosity of members. Tonight they put very succinct questions, some of them indeed challenging to me. I'd like to say -- and I'm not the House leader tonight -- that any answers I don't get through tonight I assure hon. members will receive in writing from me just as soon as possible.

At the outset, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to remind hon. members that Thursday last we had the budget speech, and I simply quote from it because there seems to be an insatiable desire and perhaps demand for more education. One somehow has to reconcile the fact that there are perhaps limited resources. We are now in the process, according to the hon. Treasurer, of spending about \$1.15 of every dollar we collect. I would urge hon. members to give very serious thought to the ability of the taxpayers of Alberta to maintain the very high standards we have, and I'm sure hon. members are well aware of that. I would quote from the budget document: "Alberta ranks first in per capita spending on advanced education." This year that we're now in the process of trying to get through the Legislature, there is a total of about \$1.2 billion alone with advanced education. I point out as well, and I'll come to it, the base operating grant and how it affects the institutions.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Edmonton-Highlands raised some very interesting questions, and I'd like to respond. As I recall there were about 15 of them. I don't know whether I'll get through them all, because I have tried to prioritize matters of importance.

The first one, a very good question. Budget, the government of Canada with regard to EPF funding, established programs financing: what's the effect going to be? Well, the member should know at the outset that the government of Canada does not determine the priorities in this province for Advanced Education. This government does. This government will fund whatever is necessary to provide what they deem to be in the best interests of our people. It's no different, hon. member, than -- we don't take the profits from ALCB and put them into alcohol treatment, but if this government felt that was necessary, that's what would be done. So this government will set its priorities based on its need regardless or irrespective -- or irregardless, for the hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont, who has a very good understanding of that language -- of what Ottawa does.

The hon. member mentioned vote 3, the change in remissions and why the reductions are there with regard to students. That formula was changed a couple of years ago, Mr. Chairman, whereby the first \$1,000 of a student loan was exempt from the remission amount, and 40 percent of the total loan was then subject to certain conditions granted. Now, the government feels the average debt load of the students in Alberta is about \$6,100 and that's perhaps not an excessive amount.

Reference was also made by the hon. member that grants were reduced. Well, some \$3.6 million in that vote allows for an increase to the students' living allowances; \$3.6 million is a pretty substantial amount. There are some 55,000 students in the universities; 103,000 all together in our system. But of those, the 20-odd thousand who access the student loan fund

will be receiving an increase in the grants to provide for increased cost of living.

The hon. member also mentioned: why is the student assistance down? Well, one of the reasons, Mr. Chairman, with respect, is the number of students applying. We did have some 57,300 students in '87. In '88 we had 55,000, and we're basing our budget on that this year: 55,000, the same number of students who were in the system in 1988.

The hon. member has also raised the question of the LRT and Grant MacEwan Community College. With respect, this department has not been asked at this point for any involvement at all, so I really don't think it's appropriate for me to respond to that.

The hon. member also asked, particularly the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona about the endowment fund, the corporations buying cheap research by contributing. Well, I don't know how or why the hon. member understands that, because in no way does a corporation receive any credit for a contribution to the endowment fund if there is any direct benefit to the corporation. That's a condition of the endowment fund. Any hon. member who contributes on the basis of a direct benefit -- it's not allowed and does not receive a tax receipt.

The capital funding question, I think, is an excellent question. The capital formula funding which -- and the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona is correct, as he so often is. It has not been what everybody wants it to be, but I would point out that it's unique in Canada. No province in Canada has that capital formula funding, which is used for -- and the member made a very good point -- the replacement of technological equipment. I mean, we are changing at a very rapid rate, and it's not 33.3 years as the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands mentioned. That fund deals with replacement of furniture and equipment and renovations, and it's on a 10-year basis. It's amortized over 10 years. I won't argue for a moment that perhaps that should be reviewed. I would point out, though, that this year we're pleased -- again, we're the only province that has it -- to have a 5 percent increase, and 5 percent of something is probably better than 100 percent of nothing.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands mentioned degree-granting status for the ACA. That's a very serious question when I point out that the quality of -- those coming from the College of Art are accepted in a master's program. That's a question that I think should be addressed, and I want to comment later when we get into degree granting of other colleges.

The land negotiations at Grant MacEwan, that \$100 million commitment by this government, are under way between the CN and the city. The department doesn't really have a major role to play in that. I want to touch on Edmonton-Belmont's question in a moment as to the location. Frankly, it's not a matter of the department's view; it's a matter of the department being one of the players in the game.

Another question with regard to Edmonton-Highlands, also by the hon. member representing the U of A, was the renovation of residences. The hon. Dr. Warrack is in the gallery, vice-president U of A, who's well aware. First of all, let it be clearly understood that Lister Hall has been around a long, long time. As I'm told, some of the conditions within that building in terms of deterioration are as a result of water damage. I have some difficulty understanding how that's come about since I became minister on the 14th. The assumption is that it came overnight. It didn't come overnight. It's been there a long time, which raises a question about maintenance. It also raises the question

about the policy of the government. The policy of this government has for many years been that they will fund not only programs and capital investments for facilities, but student residences and food services within those residences have always been the responsibility of the institution. That's why they collect rents. Now, the caveat was put in: what about the Olympics in Calgary? Good point. What about the University of Lethbridge? The formula for collecting rents wouldn't meet; therefore, there are some special grants.

I'm prepared, Mr. Chairman, to consider -- I don't know to what degree because the Treasurer's sitting in front of me -- what, if anything, can be done with regard to that. But of this all members should make note: this government will not tolerate for one moment students in any postsecondary institution being in a building that's unsafe. So I assure the hon. members tonight that Lister Hall will certainly be made safe. The application for some \$2.5 million for fire protection and upgrading has not as yet crossed my desk. I understand that the board dealt with it a week ago Friday. Maybe they sent it by Canada Post. I don't know where it is.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to the Member for Calgary-McKnight: would the government consider a broad-based commission to look at advanced education? Well, I have some difficulty with that, hon. member. I mentioned earlier -- and I take exception to the comments by the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona: why tour? Why can't you sit in your ivory tower like so many other people do and make all these decisions? Frankly, I think one of the problems with government is that they often fail to ask the views of the users of the system. The question raised a little later by the hon. member was as to who the stakeholders are. I have a policy advisory committee that advises me. If I'm not going to listen, why have them? Why do I tour the institutions and talk to the students and the boards of governors, who legally control the institutions? Why do I talk to faculty? If hon. members think that we can leave all those people outside the system and set up some ivory tower group to determine the future of postsecondary education, I think that's fundamentally wrong. I don't for one moment deny the interest of the hon. Member for Calgary-McKnight, based on her knowledge and her experience, but I frankly don't think that's the way to go.

Capping enrollments: another excellent question raised. This government does not cap anything, except the heritage fund, which is another matter, a matter on which I happen to differ somewhat from my hon. colleague the Treasurer. The institutions do the capping. The U of A has set a 70 percent entry level in terms of academic qualifications. When I look at the histories of people who've become extremely well educated, who just barely got through high school, I have a little difficulty understanding that you set a 70 percent entry level. That's like telling me that only those with the highest GPA should be doctors. Where's the empathy involved in medicine if you're only going to go by highest standards in science? But that's the business of the board of governors at the U of A and the U of C. They've set the quota system. That's within their jurisdiction under the Act. Our jurisdiction is the golden rule. We supply supplementary funds for new students. That's why we have enrollment funds. Those that want to become a graduate school or a Harvard north, frankly, are going to have to somehow provide the funds to do their own thing.

I point out with great respect that the U of A is a world-class institution now, and I want someone to tell me: of 19 medical

schools in Canada, should we have two in Alberta? Perhaps the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona is saying, "Well, maybe the U of A should have medicine, and maybe Calgary should have law; maybe the U of A should have engineering, and Calgary should have medicine." I submit that we're going to have to give that very serious consideration if we're going to deal with the resources that are available to us.

Funding at Alberta Hospital Edmonton, the nurses' program; I assume it's the nurses' program. Psychiatric training is essential, I think, to the nurses' program. I would point out, though, that the practicum for the majority of all the nurses taking psych training is carried out at Ponoka. Enrollment at Alberta Hospital Edmonton is down some 25 percent. We don't determine who goes; we simply respond to enrollments. And if psychiatric nursing is down at Alberta Hospital Ponoka, then funding is down. As a matter of fact, there has been a request from them that perhaps that program be discontinued there.

Calgary-McKnight talked about the transfer program, along with the hon. Member for Red Deer-North. Mr. Chairman, this year we've committed \$2.1 million, as I recall, to transfer programs, which raises the question of degree granting at colleges, which I want to come to.

Calgary-McKnight also mentioned capital funding creating new spaces for students to deal with overcrowding. Well, part of the whole brick-and-mortar philosophy is to provide more room for those students and faculty in order to conduct their classes. It naturally follows that if that's done, there's going to have to be a commitment for program dollars. I would point out that we've expanded Lakeland by some \$800,000 in terms of the Lloydminster campus. That's exactly what that is, to provide available opportunities in that community for people who wish to go to school.

Did the U of C get its professional building? Well, I guess I'd simply point out to hon. members who put the question: it's a commitment by the government; it's a commitment that will be honoured. In this year's budget there's a \$3 million funding for the University of Calgary professional school for planning funds. Now, obviously the government wouldn't do that unless they were convinced not only that it was necessary but that it was going to be done.

With regard to the university giving ample warning regarding French 30. Now we're back again to prerogatives of the institution. The government does not set -- maybe they should, judging by the question -- what universities should do in terms of academic standards or entry levels. That's not the role of government; that's the role of these self-governing institutions. So that decision, with respect, hon. member, was made by the University of Alberta, which I believe has, through its associated college, an excellent French language program.

Edmonton-Strathcona asked about the endowment and incentive fund. With respect, hon. member, if you think you're putting me on the spot to deal with the AGT tower -- because that's what I sense when the hon. member says that the U of A is a pre-eminent institution, therefore over Calgary. Well, I have some trouble with this subject because the University of Calgary has raised more money for the endowment fund than the U of A. That's point one. Now, if we were to use a combination of the size, the students, operating grants, and success in fund raising, the U of A wouldn't come out so hot. I'm not here to criticize. In the new formula, similar institutions have received the same amounts. If the U of A were to receive its share based on operating grants and others, perhaps it wouldn't have come out the

same. What I've done as minister is try to reach a compromise which would accommodate all, recognizing fully that when you try to accommodate all, you invariably accommodate nobody. But I believe it's going to be very successful.

With libraries the hon. member is right. Some 2 percent of the operating budget of institutions goes to the library. So if you look at the operating budget at the U of A, it needs a very substantial amount. I would point out that the 5 percent general increase applies, of course, to the University of Alberta, the library as well as anywhere else. We would hope that's a help.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona again asked about the endowment fund. I would hope that once we distribute to the hon. members the breakdown, if they don't already have it, if they think it's not fair, if they think it's not equitable, then I would hope they would raise it. We're trying, in a way, to see that this very unique program of \$80 million spread over 10 years and unique to the country is going to be fully utilized.

With regard to section 50 of the Universities Act, I guess that's a very touchy matter. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona did make a very excellent suggestion. If the U of A in the past has talked to the citizens in the area, why not this time? I've had a tremendous amount of mail on this thing. I've no idea whether or not a change in the statute is appropriate. I haven't given it sufficient thought. I do know that if a university or a college is to be successful, community relations have to be one of the pre-eminent conditions in success. I would certainly urge, as the hon. member suggests, that the U of A spend some time, as it did in the past, discussing something like that with the citizens before the fact, not after the fact.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek along with the hon. Member for Calgary-Foothills raised the question of the new ventures program, the development program at the U of C. In the past, four departments have participated: career development, Alberta Ed, Advanced Ed, and economic development. There was a policy change sometime ago where they felt that Advanced Ed should be involved in educational matters and economic development should be involved in economic matters, and because this was not an academic program, the decision was made that Economic Development and Trade should deal with this. We are prepared, I am prepared as minister to have discussions with me hon. Minister of Economic Development and Trade to see what, if anything, can be resolved. I very much appreciate the hon. members for Calgary-Foothills and Calgary-Fish Creek raising this matter.

There were a series of other questions, Mr. Chairman; I've answered, I think, about the professional building.

With regard to Red Deer-North and Red Deer College degree-granting status, that is a delicate matter. First of all, this year's budget puts in place in Red Deer College, one of the most exciting colleges in the province. I spent an afternoon there: two aggressive MLAs, very exciting programs. They are, as hon. members know, participants now in the transfer program. I want to try and get to the accessibility question, which is the most important of many. Should they have degree-granting status?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. GOGO: Well, hon. members, it's sometimes very easy. Let's think of the student a moment. Is it in the best interests of the student? A student ends up in Detroit to go to Wayne State University for a master's degree. A graduate of Red Deer Col-

lege? How would that be taken? Let's think for a moment as to what's good for the student. Would that be a good thing for the student, or conversely should we expand the university system that grants degrees? As you know, at the moment colleges cannot grant degrees, only in concert with a university. I've not made a decision nor will I make a decision until I spend a lot of time listening, a lot of time learning and determining what's in the best interests of the focus of what I'm all about and that's the student in this province. It may be, Mr. Chairman, that we should expand those institutions now granting degrees.

The University of Lethbridge has a fair amount of space. It should be pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that we are coming to the point, in my view, where you don't necessarily go to the institution of your choice. You may have to go to the institution of someone else's choice. When we get this huge backlog that's talked about in terms of not being able to get in, we must consider two factors. One is: how many places did you apply? As you know, there are many multiple applications, no different than law school, and at the moment we don't have a tracking system to find out how many you've applied to at the same time. I think that's an important consideration. Secondly, we do provide financial assistance to go to other parts of the province.

What's the minister doing about the supply of nurses? Well, frankly, I'm not so sure we have a problem with the supply as much as we have with the training. I made some notes here because I think the question is very important and I would like to quote to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre, Mr. Chairman. This year we are committing \$1.57 million to nursing expansion. I very quickly want to go through the four steps. One is the postbasic acute care nursing. Now, surely, that's what nursing is all about caring. Secondly, that's three-quarters of a million, postbasic gerontology, long-term care nursing, which is a very, very important matter to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre, I know. There is some \$200,000. The postbasic baccalaureate in science: there is an increase of almost a half a million in that area, recognizing that that is important to many people. The improved integration between diploma and baccalaureate degrees: that's \$114,000 to develop collaboration curriculum models so that credit recognition or transfer, particularly for rural areas, can be arranged. I would point out that at the University of Lethbridge alone, Mr. Chairman, the average age of the student in that program is 34. So the member is right when you talk about family, when you talk about day care, when you talk about these other factors.

But, in my view, we do not have a problem with the supply of nurses. As a matter of fact when the hon. Minister of Health announces that periodically certain wards have closed down in hospitals, it's because of holidays of physicians and nurses; it's perhaps because, as the Hyndman commission points out of the stress of those working conditions. There are a lot of factors. In our view, there is no requirement for retraining because, as members know, if you haven't spent 230 hours at nursing in the past five years, you must go back for refresher training. If we paid for it and we did, it would be the only profession we did. I would submit that if you go back for that period of time, you start at \$29,000 and you are in great demand, so I'm not so sure that allowance is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member wants to talk about tenure, and talking about tenure to a university is like talking about doing away with bingo to the Pope, right? Now, that's a matter that one handles extremely delicately. As you know, no one has tenure at the university if the job disappears. That's de facto. If

the job's not there, tenure is not there. Now, I do have that sense of feeling that one has to have the feeling that, politics aside in the university, if that's possible -- if you get politics out of universities, good luck in the medical profession. Hon. member, I don't know, and it's not an area I'm about to tread on very lightly, because I sense the college system wants a tenure system too. It's the me-too philosophy. I really don't want to comment on it. I do have a strong feeling that it's nice to have some type of job security, outside of being a member of AUPE, for example, where I can stand up and speak up without fear of a president of a university dismissing me. So I think there's some merit in the tenure system.

I've come across another question by the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona that is only fighting words, because they deal with the University of Calgary. Perhaps I would be more comfortable answering that one in writing.

There are a couple of questions left. The Member for Edmonton-Centre mentioned, by the way, about research and who owns the patent. Well, if it was AOSTRA, I could answer you. That's a question I just don't know. I'll get to you in writing.

The Member for Cardston asked about the U of L teacher program going from four to five years. That's a request by the U of L apparently. What are the implications to the taxpayer of Alberta of stretching it another year? Frankly, I wonder with their B.Ed. program where the teachers are all going now. I understand they can't get jobs. So I don't know the motivation for the U of L wanting to extend it. One of the few decisions that's within the initiative of the Minister of Advanced Education is one of those.

The final two questions are both important, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Bow Valley mentioned the Brooks campus as an operating satellite of Medicine Hat. Well, I wrote a letter, and it's already been quoted by the hon. member so I assume I can quote it.

I can now confirm that approval has been given for the Medicine Hat College to proceed with planning for the expansion of the main campus and for the construction of the Brooks Campus.

That is a commitment and a promise of this government and one that will be honoured. It doesn't say when, but it's a commitment.

Now, with respect, so hon. members are aware, we have requests for some 140-odd capital projects that made their way under the B budget, a new program application form. There are four pages of them here, and I don't blame postsecondary institutions for requesting. Now, if one were to add up the total in

dollars, we have a \$93 million capital budget this year. I'm reluctant even to indicate to members of the committee, Mr. Chairman, what the total would have been in terms of the wish list. They got very serious consideration. The Brooks campus and Medicine Hat College have been advised that they can proceed with planning, and that commitment will be honoured. As to the source of funding, as hon. members will note, it's not in this year's budget, 1989-90. Whether it will be in next year's budget is in the hands not of the gods but of the Treasury Board and others. I will do my best to see that that is answered in a satisfactory manner.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I will honour my commitment to give members answers in writing that I've not got to, and I very much appreciate and am grateful for the questions tonight. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are members ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No?

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you concur in this report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, by way of information to the members, the House will sit tomorrow night and resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the estimates of the Department of Agriculture.

[At 10:50 p.m. the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]