

that it should then be advised by the Deputy Attorney General to deny liability in the hope that they can make a settlement for a smaller amount of damages.

As we say in our report, given the great advantages that attend the Crown as litigant, "particularly in relation to citizens with limited means, it seems to your Committee right and proper that the Crown should readily admit its liability when it has a legal opinion to that effect. If a satisfactory settlement cannot be reached, any litigation should be confined to the quantum of damages."

It is, I might add, astonishing that the government should be so insensitive to what is right and proper, as to blatantly disclose in a regulation that they are prepared to approve tactics which would not normally be adopted by any decent and honourable individual, or corporation in the private sector.

On motion of Senator Macdonald, for Senator Nurgitz, debate adjourned.

● (1450)

BROADCASTING

REGION 2 MF (AM) BROADCASTING CONFERENCE (SECOND SESSION)—ORDER DISCHARGED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Stollery calling the attention of the Senate to the Region 2 MF (AM) Broadcasting Conference (Second Session) held during November and December, 1981, in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.—(*Honourable Senator Frith*).

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, Order No. 10 calls for the resumption of the debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Stollery calling the attention of the Senate to the Region 2 MF (AM) Broadcasting Conference. I moved the adjournment of this debate to allow honourable senators to participate, if they so wished. If no other senator desires to speak, then I would suggest that the order be discharged.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, is it agreed?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Order discharged.

EDUCATION

CONCERN FOR FUTURE OF POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS—
DEBATE CONTINUED

The Senate resumed from Thursday, February 18, the debate on the inquiry of Senator Macquarrie calling the attention of the Senate to the widespread expressions of concern from educational leaders concerning the future of post-secondary institutions in Canada, in particular with reference to governmental grants.

Hon. Frederick W. Rowe: Honourable senators, first of all, I should like to congratulate Senator Macquarrie for taking the initiative in bringing this very important matter of post-

[Senator Godfrey.]

secondary education in Canada to our attention and, through us, to the attention of the Canadian nation as a whole. I listened to, and subsequently read, Senator Macquarrie's speech, much of which was of a humorous nature but, nevertheless, serious. I did not agree with everything he said, as would be expected.

There are a couple of things in his speech that I am going to refer to. At one point he said:

I rarely run across a cheerful administrator.

He was referring to the universities and institutions of higher learning. He also said:

It is a time of crisis for the universities.

Like Senator Macquarrie, I have had some experience with universities in one way or another, and that covers a period going back to when I first went to university—52 years ago. At one period Senator Smith and I were both provincial ministers of highways and also successive Presidents of the Canadian Roads Association—the Canadian Good Roads Association, I believe they called it then—and it was our duty and practice—I do not know where it originated—as president of the association, to make what was called a presidential tour across Canada. In doing that, we would visit all of the universities of Canada. I do not know if that practice still continues, but it was a very valuable and enlightening one. We met with the presidents of universities and technical colleges, and my recollection is that, without exception, every university we visited was going through a period of crisis. I do not think we came across one administrator who was cheerful about the situation, to use Senator Macquarrie's term.

Senator Macquarrie, in relation to post-secondary education—and I believe he was speaking extemporaneously, and used words that are rather too strong at the present time—said:

—what the Minister of Finance is putting forward is almost incomprehensible. I think it is also iniquitous.

I do not agree with that, and I will deal with it further on in my speech.

I should also like to congratulate the Leader of the Government—although I notice that he is not in the chamber at the moment—for the excellent speech he made in reply to Senator Macquarrie. What Senator Perrault gave us was an excellent outline of federal-provincial relationships in this matter of post-secondary education. Also, he reminded us of something that I am inclined to forget, and that is that the federal government's contribution to post-secondary education is not limited to these transferred grants—or whatever we might call them—that they make directly for post-secondary education. As Senator Perrault pointed out, we have such things as military education, student loans, manpower training and many other fields where Ottawa is making a direct or an indirect contribution to the overall costs of education.

I want to congratulate my colleague and esteemed educator, Senator Hicks, for the very interesting and valuable contribution he made to this debate. He gave us statistics, that I had never seen before, showing the contributions through the years