

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Monday, April 2, 1973

[The House met at 2:30 o'clock.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 26 The Police Act, 1973

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Police Act, 1973. The purpose of this bill is to replace the existing Police Act, and it proposes, Mr. Speaker, a number of important changes in the existing legislation.

Firstly it removes the authority of the Lieutenant Governor in Council to establish a provincial police force.

Secondly, it removes the authority of a chief of police to commit persons for contempt.

Thirdly, it removes the Alberta Police Commission.

Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, it returns to local government the jurisdiction to appoint local police commissions.

And fifthly, and perhaps most important of all, it establishes a new system of dealing with complaints about the conduct of policemen. It establishes a Law Enforcement Review Board. Mr. Speaker, that is a body that will not have any policing function, that is, it will be totally separate and apart from the policing function.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 26 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 14

The Private Investigators and Security Guards Amendment Act, 1973

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Private Investigators and Security Guards Amendment Act, 1973. The prime purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to provide a simplified appeal procedure from the decision of the administrator not to license a person as a private investigator or security guard. In addition Mr. Speaker, the bill provides for a number of administrative changes in the existing Act.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 14 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. Pr. 11 An Act to amend The Alberta Wheat Pool Act, 1970

MR. DOAN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being An Act to amend The Alberta Wheat Pool Act, 1970. Mr. Speaker, this only has to do with the payment of reserves.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. Pr. 11 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. Pr. 13
An Act to amend An Act to
Incorporate the Mennonite Brethren in Christ Church

MR. DOAN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate the Mennonite Brethren in Christ Church. This has to do with just the changing of the name of the church, the United Missionary Church.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. Pr. 13 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 214 An Act to amend The Pharmaceutical Association Act

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, An Act to amend The Pharmaceutical Association Act.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that I introduced the same bill last year. This bill is not to be construed as a criticism of our doctors or druggists; rather it will provide the legislative authority for a druggist to dispense the drug that is lower in cost than the one prescribed, providing it contains a drug or drugs in the same amount and in the same active ingredients and the same dosage. The Act provides that a doctor or purchaser may direct that a certain name brand be dispensed irrespective of the cost.

The bill defines an interchangeable pharmaceutical product as one that contains a drug or drugs in the same amount and in the same active ingredients and the same dosage. The bill provides that it is an offence on the part of the druggist if he dispenses a product at a price in excess of the cost of the lowest priced interchangeable product plus, of course, the dispensing fee.

The bill deals with the records that must be kept, and these must be made available to the Minister of Health and Social Development upon request. The bill, if passed, will save Albertans and especially our senior citizens thousands of dollars every year. May I provide two examples --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please. The hon. member, with the greatest respect, is now going into the realm of debate on the merits of the bill. Possibly the introduction of the bill as given so far may suffice.

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 214 was introduced and read a first time.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, in your gallery, Mrs. Marie-Therese Altrogge and her daughter from Munich, Bavaria. Mrs. Altrogge is here on a visit und "ich moechte sie auf's herzlichste hier in Alberta willkommen heissen, ihr einen schoenen aufenthalt wuenschen -- und bitte, gruessen Sie meine geburtsstadt, Herrn Polizeipraesident Schreiber und Herrn Konsul Holzmueller wenn sie zurueckkehren."

Our visitors are accompanied by Mr. Clarkson who brought them here from Calgary. Would they now rise and be recognized.

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me this afternoon to introduce to you 48 junior high school students from the Andrew Junior High School. They are accompanied by their social studies teacher, Mr. Semenuk, and their bus driver, Mr. Matiaza. They are in both galleries, the members and the public galleries. Would they rise now and be recognized by the Assembly?

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly some 30 Grade 9 students from the Senator Patrick Burns High School in the late hon. Len Werry's constituency of Calgary Foothills adjacent to my own riding of Calgary North Hill. Their school is named for one of Alberta's most famous pioneers, the son of poor Irish immigrants who came west at the age of 22 and established himself as a cattle dealer, rancher and slaughterhouse operator in Calgary in 1890. His company prospered and became one of the largest meat packing operations in the world. He was appointed to the Senate in 1931, resigned in 1936 and died in Calgary in 1937 at the age of 81.

His life stands as stirring testament for these young people with us today of the limitless opportunities in our free Canadian society. He was reported to be no scholar in the academic sense but proved that he could use the old math to good effect.

They are accompanied today by their teacher, Mrs. Szulczyk and parents Mrs. Dudka and Mrs. Mortenson. They are seated in the members gallery and I would ask them to rise and be recognized.

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you and to the hon. members of this Assembly some 37 Grade 9 students from the Winterburn School, which is located in the east part of the Stony Plain constituency. Accompanying them today is their principal, Mr. Hrasko, teacher Mr. Brian Woolmer and their lady bus driver Mrs. Bartel. I would ask them to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure again today to introduce a group of students from the High Park school in my constituency. There are some 60 youngsters from Grade 6 and they are accompanied today by their principal, Mr. Adams and teachers, Mr. Vlad Eshenko and Mr. Sten Gunderson and two parents. I would ask them to rise and be recognized in the public gallery.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, in accord with the government's intent to table as much environmental information on the tar sands as possible, I am pleased to table a summary report of the de-watering scheme for the overburden of the Great Canadian Oil Sands.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table, for the assistance of members, 74 envelopes for delivery to them containing estimated revenue for 1973 of each of the school districts and divisions within their respective constituencies. I would point out that these revenue statements are prepared from information which we have available as of this date. To some extent they are estimates in the sense the per pupil population counts are not known and they are also subject to further monies going to the school boards for special education and under the early childhood services and educational opportunity plans.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table request for Return 112.

CRAI QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Western Economic Opportunities Conference

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Premier. As a preface I am pleased to see that the chilly winds of confrontation last winter have been replaced by the sunny smiles of cooperation.

Can I ask the hon. Premier whether or not the government plans to table a position paper outlining those areas of joint cooperation between Alberta and the other three western provinces that they intend to make at the western economic conference?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think "table" might not be the appropriate word in this case, but what was agreed at the meeting in Winnipeg -- which had the historical significance of, in essence, broadening the Prairie Economic Council into a four province basis -- was that we would meet again in Victoria on June 18 at which time our various officials and ministers would hopefully be in a position of producing a western position paper on the items which would be contained on the agenda in the July summer conference called by the federal government on western economic opportunities.

As of now and subject to the meeting in Victoria and concurrence on the basic details of those position papers, it would be our intention that the four premiers involved make those papers public. At the same time we would be happy to make them available to members of the Legislative Assembly. And of course they would be made available to the federal government with the view that the federal government would have the documents in advance of the public.

Then we would hope that at the conference in July, the position we would be in would be that the federal government might respond at that time to the positions of the West and the western region of Canada. We think that would be preferable to a conference where we approached the conference and, at the time of the conference, made the presentation. The federal government then merely would be in the position of saying that they would take it under advisement.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview with a supplementary, followed by another supplementary by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight and then the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury with a supplementary and perhaps that might exhaust this topic for the time being.

MR. NOTLEY:

I would like to ask a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Mr. Speaker, last week you suggested in the question period that consideration be given to the idea of making this proposed economic conference an all-party conference. My question to you, Mr. Premier, is did you specifically consult with the other premiers on this suggestion and if you did, what was their reaction?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I didn't consult and I think that the Hansard record would show that as far as official delegations were concerned, it would clearly be delegations of governments only.

I did however undertake to give consideration to the question of observer status from various groups within our society in this province and that to some extent would depend on whether or not the conference was an open or a closed conference. On that point we did have a discussion. We reached an agreement between the four governments involved. But at this stage we would be moving in the direction of the July conference being at least partly open and perhaps partly closed as has been the case normally of First Ministers' Meetings.

I for one favoured and argued that the hope would be that the significant portion of the conference would be open, even though there might be occasions when it would be closed.

MR. LEE:

A supplementary question. Following last weekend's meeting has it been accepted that Calgary is the true decision centre of the West, and will now be the host for the July federal-provincial conference?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is fairly close to certain that the Western Economic Opportunities Conference will be held within the Province of Alberta in the City of Calgary. The Prime Minister, in a telegram to us in advance of our meeting, suggested that Calgary would be a useful site. The concurrence of the four governments in Winnipeg was to the effect that Calgary would be an acceptable site. For that reason then I think we can take it as subject to perhaps some final communication and some formalization that this conference called by the federal government on western economic opportunity will be held within Alberta and in the City of Calgary.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, will you table in the Legislature the briefs submitted to the Premiers by the railroading executives?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to table in this Legislature the briefs provided by the railways, if the briefs, as such, had in fact been provided. What has happened -- and I think it is pretty clear -- is that the railways made a verbal submission to us in Winnipeg and they received a verbal response.

I hope that we will see in the next few weeks because of the importance of some major changes in transportation policy -- and I would like to speak further about this during the course of debate -- a clear understanding that there should be full disclosure by the national railways to the provincial governments so the provincial governments can effectively evaluate whether or not the present freight rate structure, the present rate structure of railroads, is in the best interests of all of Canada, and particularly in the best interests of the development of the West.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the Premier's answer, may I ask a further supplementary? Mr. Premier, have the Premiers requested that the railroad executive prepare that brief and be present at the meeting that you alluded to in June?

MR. LOUGHEED:

No, Mr. Speaker. The specific request made to the railways was that they make available any and all information that we felt, through our ministers responsible for transportation, would be required by us for preparation of a position on behalf of the West with regard to transportation, which would be a subject on the agenda.

The Government of the Province of Alberta will be the prime mover on that particular item on the agenda, and our Minister of Industry and Commerce who is responsible for these matters of transportation will, therefore, be convening a further ministerial meeting. That ministerial meeting involving the four western governments will probably lead to a further meeting with the railways.

We hope for, and we underline the nature of this, the full cooperation of the railways in the development of the data and the material that we think is so essential to put our case in the strongest possible way at the meeting in Calgary this July.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight.

Preservation of Historical Buildings

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Is it your intention to introduce legislation in the very near future to protect Alberta's historical and archaeological resources?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, it's the government's intention to introduce legislation of this type. Perhaps the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation may wish to give you more information on this matter.

MR. SCHMID:

It's under consideration, Mr. Speaker, that's all I can say.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Will the government hold off demolition of Rundle Lodge in Calgary until its historic value is measured under the proposed new legislative terms of reference?

MR. RUSSELL:

No, Mr. Speaker, we are not prepared to do that. We have made arrangements through Alberta Housing Corporation, the holders of the title to the old lodge, to try and incorporate what portions of the old building we can into suitable landscaping memorials.

But I think this controversy should be put to rest. The old lodge is coming down. We will incorporate the best parts of it that we can according to the report that we received. There are many other buildings on the list ahead of that old building to be preserved.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, may I just add to this? This decision was arrived at by an independent body which had been called into being by the government. The report should be very familiar to the hon. member and he should not have to ask questions on that.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Have you received communications recently from the Victoria Neighbourhood Services Society regarding the use of federal funds for the redevelopment of Rundle Lodge?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, unless that would have come in in the last day or two I can't recall receiving it. I have received a communication from Jack Long, the architect, from the local Council of Women and one or two others, but I don't recall that one.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Regarding the communication from Jack Long, would you prepared to advise this House as to the nature of it?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Long was the architect for the new lodge. He was also involved in the society for the preservation of the old one. And when the decision, after many months of consultation, had finally been reached that the old lodge would come down we asked Mr. Long, as the interested architect, if he would, in fact, do the necessary design work for the features that I mentioned earlier. He has declined to this, so we are looking for another architect.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McKnight's question apparently has been asked. The hon. Member for Taber-Warner, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

Potatoes for Eastern Markets

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Highways. Does the hon. Minister of Highways know that potatoes have been moving from the Taber and Vauxhall areas over Highways No. 36 and No. 3 to eastern markets?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Did you say potatoes?

MR. D. MILLER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of potatoes moving from Vauxhall to eastern Canadian markets.

MR. D. MILLER:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister look into the ban on these two highways, 75 per cent from Vauxhall to No. 1 -- 75 per cent of the average load -- and 50 per cent on No. 1 east of Taber?

It is imperative that these potatoes be delivered. I understand around Scandia if there was a four-mile detour at Scandia it wouldn't affect the road north of Vauxhall to No. 1 which is in good condition in all but that one spot.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce to the House that the potatoes are on their way and those in eastern Canada will not be doing without Alberta potatoes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall, followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

Agrimart

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs regarding the Agrimart. Have you been contacted by the representatives of the municipality of Rocky View regarding their invitation to the Alberta Livestock Co-op to locate the Agrimart in their district?

MR. RUSSELL:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the statement you made in the House on March 8, 1973, and I quote, "The province will do everything possible to find an ultimate or suitable site for the Agrimart other than where it is located." Are you now prepared to call a meeting of the representatives of the north east Calgary community, the Livestock Co-op, the Municipality of Rocky View to further investigate the possibility of relocating this in that area?

MR. RUSSELL:

No, Mr. Speaker, I am not because we mentioned the government would do everything within its resources to find a suitable alternative site and I don't consider the site I have read about in the newspaper as suitable. We did finally provide a very suitable alternative site in the town of Airdrie and that

offer still stands. But this new one has been put forward entirely on the initiative of the M.D. of Rocky View.

MR. HO LEM:

In view of the various sites suggested, the one on McKnight Road as well as the recent one and as well as the one which you have just mentioned, are you prepared to list on a priority basis what sites you would recommend?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I could do that now if the hon. member wanted me to. I think the first most attractive site, in our view, has to be the Airdrie one. The second, but substantially less attractive one, would be the one put forward by the M.D. of Rocky View. The third most attractive one would be the one on the southern boundary of McCall Field, and the fourth one would be the original one in Vista Heights.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary --

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary with regard to the Agrimart.

MR. HO LEM:

What is the government prepared to do in order to facilitate the priorities which you have just mentioned?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have done so much to try and persuade Agrimart to come to Airdrie and they have been very definite that they won't. I don't think we can do any more.

We have tried to indicate to the elected officials in the City of Calgary that we support the view of the citizens, that it is not really a desirable use for an urban setting but notwithstanding that, the Calgary City Council and the Development Appeal Board supported the position earlier taken. So we have done a substantial amount of work.

I think it is fair to say that Agrimart has definitely refused the invitation to come to Airdrie. But in that regard the government is proceeding nonetheless with the plans that it has for Airdrie and work is underway at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

University Theatre Project

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Advanced Education. When can the people of Lethbridge and particularly the university community expect a decision on the theatre project currently before the Universities Commission?

MR. FOSTER:

Which project?

MR. ANDERSON:

Theatre -- it's a theatre project which was in the paper, and the Universities Commission said they were going to --

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I received a letter in the mail today from the Universities Commission concerning the multi-purpose theatre complex at the University of Lethbridge. I have not yet had the opportunity of reading it or knowing what its contents are, but hopefully I'll be doing so in the course of today.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Member for Highwood.

Food Allowances For Welfare Recipients

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question today was really for the Minister of Welfare, but I think it involves The Bill of Rights so maybe the hon. Premier might be able to answer it for me.

It has to do with the recent increase of 9 per cent that the government announced on food allowances for welfare recipients. And I'm having complaints from the ladies who feel they are being discriminated against, that a man gets \$3 or \$4 more a month than a lady and they want to know the reason why the government doesn't make them equal, in payments, because they both have to eat.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice. Incidentally, I believe the proper title for the minister is the Minister of Health and Social Development which was a change, a very forward change made by the previous administration. And I'll pass it on to him and hope to have an answer back.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Highwood, followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Gas and Energy Policy

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the hon. Premier. In consideration of the shortage of gasoline in the United States now and the report that we sold more gas last year than we found new reserves, is it the government's policy to change or disregard the policy of keeping or maintaining a certain amount of reserves in the province for Albertans?

MR. LOUGHEED:

No, Mr. Speaker, the three-year requirement for Alberta requirements is still in full force and effect, and will continue in full force and effect and those are the instructions to the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Health Care Fee Schedule

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister Responsible for the Medicare Commission. Has the Alberta Medical Association asked for an increase in the fee schedule for this year?

MISS HUNLEY:

We have been discussing with the members of the Alberta Medical Association, a number of things of which this is one.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary, can the hon. minister advise the House how much extra billing there is above and beyond the fee schedule paid by the Medicare Commission?

MISS HUNLEY:

No, Mr. Speaker, we don't have that information.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary question to the minister. Is the amount that a patient can be billed above the fee schedule limited to specialists only?

MISS HUNLEY:

No, I think if you're familiar with the original Act, it hasn't been changed -- in which we allow the market place to set the price. The fee for service is what is paid by Alberta Health Care and the practitioner is allowed under the Act to charge over and above that.

DR. BUCK:

Are you correct in saying, or is my interpretation correct, that there is no limit to the amount that can be charged above the fee schedule that is paid by the Health Care Commission?

MISS HUNLEY:

Not that I'm aware of unless there happens to be some agreement within the Alberta Medical Association in which they direct their practitioners.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for --

Gas and Energy Policy (Cont.)

MR. LOUGHEED:

I wonder if I could clarify and perhaps expand slightly upon my answer to the question raised by the hon. Member for Highwood.

If I understood the hon. member's question, he started with a comment regarding gasoline rationing within the United States --

MR. BENOIT:

The shortage.

MR. LOUGHEED:

And shortage. Of course, gasoline is a product, after processing and refining of crude oil, so the key is to relate that matter to the reserves for crude oil. And, of course, within the situation there of crude oil, the Province of Alberta is in a very fortunate position. In addition to the conventional oil reserves, there are of course, the very vast reserves of synthetic oil which can come, and we hope will be coming in increasing quantities from the Athabasca Tar Sands.

I believe the hon. member's question then went on to refer to gas reserves as such within this province. In that sense we are talking about natural gas reserves so my answer related to the natural gas reserves. But the gasoline -- which is important because of the difficulty of the nomenclature here -- the gasoline relates to the question of the demands by the United States for crude or synthetic oil from throughout the world.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

Sexsmith Rapeseed Processing Plant

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the Minister of Agriculture advise the House what formal consultation took place with the farm organizations in the Peace River country prior to the announcement of building a rapeseed plant at Sexsmith?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the principles in the rapeseed plant in Sexsmith -- is a private enterprise endeavour and our only connection with that was to assist in

the formation of co-operatives so that the farmers would have some active part and ownership in the plant.

I might say -- and I know the hon. member is referring to the telegram and the meeting that the people have had in the Peace River country in relation to location. And I might say very publicly, Mr. Speaker, that I abhor towns fighting with one another about where plants should go. Rather these other towns should get off their fannies and be doing things about developing plants and processing provisions in their own communities without being a dog in the manger about where a particular plant goes or otherwise.

DR. BUCK:

You tell them, Hugh.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the hon. Minister. Has the government any study of the cost of trucking to producers of the site in Sexsmith compared to other sites, particularly the one in the central Peace?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, that again is related to private enterprise in Alberta in relation to a crushing facility that's related not only to -- and we're conscious of the costs of farmers trucking towards the plant.

I might say, at the present time, of course, there is no outlet to a crusher in Alberta to the Peace River farmers. The only crusher we have is in Lethbridge. Therefore I think that, prior to the announcement, the farmers in the Peace River country growing rapeseed did have a legitimate complaint in regard to the question of quota allocation to other farmers in Alberta who had an opportunity to deliver to a crusher.

There are other factors that are involved in relation to getting the meal to market, getting the oil to market; the question of how big an area you can service with a plant. And this is a pretty sizable plant. Again I say, rather than bring up these things, that I would strongly suggest those other areas start bringing their attention to other aspects or other processing facilities which they might develop within their own area.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question to the minister. The co-operative, backed by the provincial government or at least the money put up by the farmers which is to be backed by the government, is to raise, I understand, 30 per cent of the capital. Can the minister advise the House what representation they will have on the board of directors of this company? Will it be related to the percentage of equity capital or will it be related to percentage of overall capital involved?

DR. HORNER:

It will be related, as I understand it Mr. Speaker, to the percentage of overall capital involved, which is the same -- they will have 30 per cent of the ownership of the structure. And I would imagine that they would have 30 per cent on the board of directors.

MR. NOTLEY:

One final supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise the House how much of the overall project would be financed by equity capital and how much would be financed by debt capital?

DR. HORNER:

I can get that information I believe, Mr. Speaker. I don't have it at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury with a supplementary and then with a question.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture is, Mr. Minister, did you or senior officials of your department express any preference to the people putting the plant together as to where this plant should be located?

DR. HORNER:

No, Mr. Speaker.

Grants to Private Colleges

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Advanced Education. I would like to ask you, Mr. Minister, where do private colleges in the province apply for an increase in their grant or discussion with officials of the Department of Advanced Education for building projects?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, the reason I hesitated in replying to it is because I thought the answer would be obvious. The grants are paid by the Department of Advanced Education and I trust it will therefore be appropriate if the colleges contact my office.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister anticipate any planned change, in light of the legislation now before the House, that would change that arrangement between private colleges coming directly to you for their grants?

MR. FOSTER:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Little Bow, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Canada Pension Plan Amendments

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Provincial Treasurer, and I have given some notice of the question. It is with regard to the government's position on proposed amendments to the Canada Pension Plan. These amendments, supposedly, will permit certain groups to be excluded on religious grounds.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the question arises out of the fact that the Canada Pension Plan legislation, which is a federal Act, up until the present time has been universal and there has been no provision for opting out by citizens in the country. And I understand that it is reported that Mr. Lalonde, the federal Minister of Health has stated that he will introduce, in his words, "a minor amendment to the Canada Pension Plan," which would allow what the hon. member has stated, basically the opting out of groups in Canada who, for religious reasons, feel that they would not want to participate in the Canada Pension Plan.

The research that I have done into it, Mr. Speaker, would appear to indicate first, that it is totally a federal Act and a federal jurisdiction. Secondly, in the case of this amendment, the approval of the provinces is not required. So therefore, it is a federal Act and a federal matter.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Supplementary. In light of it being a federal matter and one that concerns Albertans, will the provincial government be making representation, either through your department, or through the Minister of Health and Social Development who is more directly involved?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, as I said, it is a matter of a federal Act coming under federal jurisdiction. Mr. Lalonde is not seeking the positions of the provinces in the matter, so unless my colleague, Mr. Getty, would like to comment further, that's all I can say.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Latta Case

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. the Attorney General, and I hope I have that correct, seeing as I was calling the other minister.

Hon. Attorney General, some weeks ago, I questioned you regarding a prisoner serving a life sentence in the Drumheller Penitentiary, Mr. Keith Latta. His family and Mr. Latta are anxious to know what decision you and your department may come to on his case. Have you anything to report to the House today?

MR. LEITCH:

I haven't, Mr. Speaker. I'm still waiting for some legal opinions I have asked for.

Cadotte Lake Road

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Highways. I gave him notice of this matter last week. It concerns the road out of Cadotte Lake which, I'm told, is impassable. I gather that trucks have been banned on it. Is the department doing anything to open up the road so that emergency vehicles can get in and out of the community?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I have brought that to the attention of my department. I have not received a report today on what the condition of the road is, or if, in fact, it has been brought to a passable condition, but I understood it would be.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ECINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. I wish to correct an important typographical error in the press which is causing some embarrassment to the Public Utilities Board.

In Hansard of March 30, on page 1514, I was quoted quite correctly as having said that in reference to Anchor Pipelines,

There was an order of the Public Utilities Board last month which declared that these interest rates on overdue utility accounts were illegal and they should be repaid.

In Saturday's Edmonton Journal on page 28 there is a typographical error which read like this, saying that:

Roy Farran said the company is in receivership, however the Public Utilities Board last month declared the interest rates on overdue accounts legal.

Now that is incorrect. The word should have been 'illegal' and not 'legal'. In other words, "not legal", not "legal".

AN HON. MEMBER:

Thanks a lot.

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Second Reading)

Bill No. 1 The Investment Contracts Amendment Act, 1973

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, Bill No. 1, The Investment Contracts Amendment Act.

Essentially this is an administrative change. The bill results from the change in the administration of the Act from the Alberta Securities Commission to the Superintendent of Insurance.

[The motion was carried, Bill No. 1 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 4 The Garagemen's Lien Amendment Act, 1973

MR. HANSEN:

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 4, seconded by Mr. Batiuk. I would just like to say a few words on this bill. Section 4 of the Garagemen's Lien Act as presently written, there have to be two -- an alphabetical list and also a numeral list -- which is kept by The Motor Vehicles Act. This will do away with the alphabetical list and do away with the time and money. It will save in looking after this. Also, there is another list kept by the Motor Vehicles Registration Branch that could be used, so all this will do is do away with the one list.

[The motion was carried, Bill No. 4 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 10 The Public Service Vehicles Amendment Act, 1973

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, second reading of Bill No. 10 being The Public Service Vehicles Amendment Act, 1973. This bill will amend Chapter 300 and will strike out Section 35 and will permit commercial and public service vehicles to carry a passenger without charge.

[The motion was carried, Bill No. 10 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 12 The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Amendment Act, 1973

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 12, The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Amendment Act, 1973, seconded by the hon. Member for Athabasca. The basic principle of this amendment is to permit the administrator to waive the notice required by the Act of notice in writing. At the moment this is required where a claim is for \$500 or less. It now permits it to be broadened so that the minister can, in fact, waive the requirement of the notice.

The other basic principle of the bill is to permit an injured person to receive the benefits of the Act where, in fact, he cannot make the application himself. These applications have been made in the past and it is not permitted by the Act. The Provincial Auditor has insisted that in order to make the payments this amendment should be placed in the Act.

[The motion was carried, Bill No. 12 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 8
The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act, 1973

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Hyndman, that Bill No. 8, The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act, 1973 be now read a second time.

I believe all hon. members are familiar with the general principle of the Act.

[The motion was carried, Bill No. 8, The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act, 1973 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 9, The Alberta Loan Act, 1973

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the hon. Mr. Hyndman, that Bill No. 9, The Alberta Loan Act, 1973 be now read a second time.

Again I believe all hon. members are fully familiar with the principle of the bill.

[The motion was carried, Bill No. 9, The Alberta Loan Act, 1973 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 6
The Agricultural Service Board Amendment Act, 1973

MR. BATHUK:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Lloydminster, Bill No. 6, being The Agricultural Service Board Amendment Act, 1973.

Section 3 is amended by adding the following subsection after subsection (5).

A person who is a member of a board ceases to be a member of the board if, without being authorized by a resolution of the board to do so, he absents himself from three consecutive regular meetings of the board.

I think that this is a must. In local government there is provision that when a member misses three consecutive meetings, by resolution the member may be ousted.

This puts a burden on the person who has to make a resolution, not so bad if all the members concurred with the resolution. But should it be defeated, I wonder what the harmony would be among the members afterwards?

This way if a person feels that he will have to be absent because of health reasons, a vacation or anything, he may get the concurrence of the board, and I think it is far more favourable that way.

Also, Section 16, subsection (1) is amended by striking out the word 'farm'. At present the Agricultural Service Board is obliged to see and control the areas, as far as the noxious weeds, on farm lands.

Now we realize there are more and more subdivisions outside the cities, smaller plots, and many of these are infested with noxious weeds which could pollute the entire province in a short time. With the word 'farm' taken out from 'land' the Agriculture Service Board will look after the entire area and I think this deserves support.

[The motion was carried, Bill No. 6, The Agricultural Service Board Amendment Act, 1973, was read a second time.]

Bill No. 7, The Agricultural Societies Amendment Act, 1973

MR. J. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I move Bill No. 7, The Agricultural Societies Amendment Act, 1973, seconded by the hon. Mr. Chambers.

The original Agricultural Societies Act was enacted in the early 1900's and has been enforced with very little change since that time. In fact, agricultural societies were in operation before 1905 under ordinance of the territorial government. At present there are 91 agricultural societies in Alberta and of these we have 5 that operate Class 'A' fairs, 7 Class 'B' fairs, 14 Class 'C' fairs, and 65 other agricultural societies.

We find that agricultural societies involve all members of the community. We propose three amendments to the Act which deal with horse racing, awarding of grants and loan guarantees.

The amendment concerning horse racing is proposed as one of the objects of agricultural societies. It is not included now, and from time to time there are agricultural societies that desire to become involved in horse racing and para-mutuel betting. To satisfy the requirements of The Criminal Code, an agricultural society, or any other group for that matter, must have as one of its objects the conduct of racing. For this reason it is deemed most appropriate to amend The Agricultural Societies Amendment Act by adding horse racing to its list of objectives.

The Government of Canada through the Department of Agriculture is charged with the responsibility of providing for the requirement of the Criminal Code as related to horse racing with para-mutuel wagering.

The second amendment that is proposed concerns the awarding of grants. At present Section 35 limits payments pretty largely to a portion of prize money paid out by societies.

There is a growing trend to minimize competition and prizes at fairs in favour of educational type displays and demonstrations. For example, there is the displaying of a group of exotic breeds of cattle. We feel there should be broader provisions in the Act so the specifics regarding methods of payout can be accommodated by regulation.

The third amendment concerns the limits allowed on loan guarantees to agricultural societies. At present there is a \$10 million limit. We propose this be raised to \$15 million. The PEP program of capital grants to agricultural societies has resulted in very considerable interest in the construction of community facilities and consequently an increase in requests for guarantees. The amount presently outstanding in guarantees under the Act is \$6,488,500. Agricultural societies are providing facilities for all the people of Alberta.

[The motion was carried, and Bill No. 7 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 22

The Marketing of Agricultural Products Amendment Act, 1973

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 22, seconded by the hon. Member for Stettler, The Marketing of Agricultural Products.

This bill has three amendments to the original Agricultural Products Act. The first of these deals with Section 9 and adding after the words "licence fees", or "service charges or both." The reason for this is the fact that the deductions that are made at the place of the first receiver where produce is received sometimes are used for the purposes of the marketing board, sometimes maybe for the purpose of paying for the registration or licence fee of the producer. So that is why this change is brought about.

The second change in 14.1 allows the Agricultural Products Marketing Council to initiate amendments to the plan. Previously this was only permitted by the boards themselves.

The third amendment changes in Section 14.1(3) (b) -- changes authorization to put more responsibility on the producers for initiating action.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members of this Assembly acknowledge and, of course, very much appreciate the fact that there has been very tremendous and very dramatic progress in agricultural marketing in Alberta during the past 19 months.

One only has to read the market reports or the editorials and articles in farm publications to realize that the Alberta marketing policies are being viewed from coast to coast in Canada as showing outstanding leadership in this particular field. And also the fact that the policies emanating from the Alberta Department of Agriculture in marketing, as well as in other areas, are being used as models by many other provinces of Canada and in other parts of the world.

I realize of course, Mr. Speaker, that our Minister of Agriculture has mentioned this topic once or twice in the Assembly and also that many of the

government members and even some of the opposition members have spoken with enthusiasm on this topic as well.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that it is certainly very gratifying and very encouraging to all of rural Alberta to be part of these agricultural marketing policies, to have a voice in helping to formulate some of these policies and to be in a position where the agricultural population in Alberta is finally receiving the recognition, the interest and appreciation as well as the share of revenue that has long been overdue.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of the importance of agricultural marketing and the fact that it is at last being recognized in Alberta, and in order to clarify the marketing arrangements and the responsibilities between the producers, the marketing boards and the Agricultural Products Marketing Council that these amendments are being introduced.

[The motion was carried, Bill No. 22 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 23 The Universities Amendment Act, 1973

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of Bill No. 23 The Universities Amendment Act, 1973 which was seconded by my colleague, the Minister of Education. I would like to take a few moments of the House now if I may, Mr. Speaker, to talk about the commission and the principle and the reorganization of the Department of Advanced Education.

My colleague, the Minister of Education, last day in the House outlined this government's response from the Department of Education's point of view to the Commission on Educational Planning and indicated that both he and I, within the course of the next several weeks, would be tabling in the Legislature a series of position papers indicating our response and our position with respect to the several hundred recommendations in A Choice Of Futures.

I would like to endorse and confirm the comments made by the Minister of Education and I, too, will be participating in that process, as he indicated, in the coming weeks.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 23 is designed fundamentally to do one thing: to provide for the dissolution of the Universities Commission and for the transfer of their decision-making authority to that of the Department of Advanced Education.

The bill goes further in one particular in that it does provide for a different method of reporting, communicating and budget submission with respect to the Banff School of Fine Arts or the Banff Centre. I'll have some more to say about that in a few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege in the course of the last week to attend two dinners, one as guest and one as host, with each of the Universities Commission and the Colleges Commission. I took that opportunity to say a few words with respect to public members of commissions, which I would like to say before this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all of us who serve in government at whatever level as paid employees -- speaking on behalf of those of us who are in that capacity -- if I may take the liberty of speaking on behalf of members of the public generally, express our appreciation and thanks to all those public-spirited citizens of this province who give so freely of their time, their resources and their energy to serve the interests of the educational community and generally the people of Alberta in so many ways.

Outstanding examples of those kinds of people, Mr. Speaker, are those persons who have served, since its inception, on the Universities Commission, and I would make the same remarks with respect to members of the Colleges Commission.

It's my sincere hope, in fact I'm sure it's the hope of all of us, that should this amendment be approved, this and the specific amendment with respect to the Colleges Commission, that citizens of this province of similar and same spirit will stand ready and willing to assist us both in the Department of Advanced Education, and on boards of governors, and in other ways in which members of the public are called upon to assist and participate in the policy and decision-making process in education.

The Department of Advanced Education, Mr. Speaker, has been reorganized, and a document outlining the reorganization is available. I don't know how many members of the House have a copy of this, but if there are any who do not have a copy and who wish the same, I would be very happy to provide them with it. I don't intend to go through the contents of this document in detail, but I would like to make one or two comments with respect to it.

As I think the House recognizes, the department at the moment, Mr. Speaker, consists of four branches: the Division of Vocational and Technical Education, the Agricultural and Vocational Colleges, the Branch of Continuing Education, and the Students Finance Administration. As well, we share a number of services with the Department of Education.

The reorganization, Mr. Speaker, is set in the context of phase one. That is where we are now, or that is where we will be upon the completion and approval of the legislation before this House.

Now I was asked previously whether or not there would be public hearings with respect to amendments to The Universities Act and The Colleges Act. And that, Mr. Speaker, is phase two of the reorganization. It is my hope that in the course of the next year and a half to two years there will, in fact, be extensive public discussion and debate within this province concerning both The Universities Act and The Colleges Act in all of their many details. And that will be a time, Mr. Speaker, not unlike the review of The School Act some years ago which, in my view, was handled very well -- very public -- and several drafts of the legislation being brought forward for discussion by the public generally and by what I refer to as the stakeholder group, the institutions, the staff, the academic associations, the students, and other responsible citizens.

So phase two, Mr. Speaker, we anticipate will take a year and a half to two years and at that time we will enter into an extensive review of both pieces of legislation. The role implicit in that, of course, is the review of the role of government, vis-a-vis the advanced education institutions and naturally an examination of the internal functioning of universities and colleges.

I have been asked, in fact, I have heard it asked in this House on more than one occasion, who is the university? What is the university? Who speaks for the university? And one only has to examine the provisions of The Universities Act, Mr. Speaker, to identify the authorities and roles of the Board of Governors, the Senate, General Faculties Council, and Universities Coordinating Council to understand why it is that on occasion, those of us who are members of the public have some confusion in trying to answer that question.

Phase three of the reorganization, Mr. Speaker, will be an examination of the role of the Department of Advanced Education with respect to the new legislation as it may be, but that will be approximately two years down the road. And I want to emphasize that during this two year period -- for that matter it may take longer, hopefully not -- there will be a complete and total review of this legislation and of the role of the department. And I'm quite looking forward to that.

I'd like to make a comment, Mr. Speaker, with regard to governance, and by governance I mean the role of the boards of governors of universities and colleges. There has been some concern that the functions identified in this reorganization document are the functions carried on by boards of governors. And that is true, if there has been an error, Mr. Speaker, it has been that my friends and the boards of governors in the institutions have not been careful to recognize that the Department of Advanced Education also carries on those same functions.

I recognize the concern there would be within the university and college community if the Department of Advanced Education attempted to legislate new functions on boards of governors without complete and total public involvement and a series of hearings. That, of course, is not our intention, except within the framework of phase two and phase three to which I referred earlier.

So on the question of governance, Mr. Speaker, the role and the authority of a board of governors, whether it is university or college -- in this bill university -- is in my submission unaltered and not changed.

The boards of governors have been somewhat concerned that the organization model provided for a different line of communication between the universities and the office of the Minister of Advanced Education. And I have been, I think, very quick to reply and confirm that is not the case. The boards of governors

have and shall continue to have complete access to my office, if I may use the expression, Mr. Speaker, at all reasonable hours of the day and night.

The role of the universities co-ordinating committee or council, identified under The Universities Act, is not specifically dealt with as a part of this amendment. It will be, in terms of the total review, in phase two. And so it is that the reorganization model or proposed structure indicates a reference to the universities co-ordinating council, but not with any thought in mind as to specific changes.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

Those members of the House who are interested in advanced education and have not already done so, I would encourage them to examine the provisions of The Universities Act, and specifically the powers of that council with respect to professions and occupations and their authorities with respective courses.

Mr. Speaker, the internal structure, the co-ordinating structure of the Department of Advanced Education, is set out under three divisions, two of which we are establishing at this time; the other we will hold in abeyance for future development.

The three divisions are: Administrative Services, Program Services, and Student Services, and it is the latter that we are not proceeding with at the moment.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, the functions outlined with respect to these three divisions are functions which we carry on for our own institutions and which boards of governors should not fear we intend to carry on for them. I would point out, however, that the staff of the Department of Advanced Education will serve the function of both commissions in the same way as the staff of the commissions have done in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the report on the reorganization provides for a series of advisory committees. And I would like to deal for a moment with the structure, function and role of the advisory committees, and specifically, the Committee on University Affairs. I might say that I had a good deal of discussion on this particular subject going back some time, and just recently I attended a meeting at the University of Alberta with some 250 of their academic staff, discussing our reorganization, at which time we had the occasion to discuss the role of this committee as well.

It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that there should, in fact, be some body of persons, some agency, some organization which in a sense stands between the institutions on the one hand and government on the other. An organization which can initiate proposals for change, an organization which can react, respond, or advise the Department of Advanced Education in its planning, an agency or institution which will serve as a major policy forum for external affairs of the Department of Advanced Education. And it is our approach, Mr. Speaker, that that agency should, in fact, be a Committee on University Affairs.

Now what of this committee? The terms of reference in the structure of this committee, Mr. Speaker, have not yet been settled upon. Nor, for that matter, have they with respect to the other committees identified in our report, the other major committee, of course, being the Committee on College Affairs. This will be done, starting from this point forward, in the months ahead with the universities and with other organizations.

It is my view, and this is simply an opinion, that the Committee on University Affairs should, in fact, include members of the public drawn from across this province in the same way that the Universities Commission did in the past.

It is my view that the Committee of University Affairs should include a representative of each of Alberta's four universities, unlike the commission in the past. This was never the case before.

It is my view that the Committee on University Affairs probably should include representatives or a representative of the academic staff of the university community, unlike the commission in the past.

It may be, Mr. Speaker, that there are other interest groups which should be represented on the Committee on University Affairs.

Now you may say, well, how does this committee differ from the Universities Commission? It differs in one very primary way, Mr. Speaker, in that it does not have the executive authority to make decisions. It has, however, in my view, and should have, the role and the authority to carry on and participate and perform those functions to which I have referred, and to operate in that area between government and the institution.

I noticed, Mr. Speaker, that the committee of this House on Public Accounts is currently examining the Universities Commission of a year ago, and intends to do so with respect to College Accounts of a year ago. And I have looked forward to that debate. I have, frankly, been surprised at the interest and general concern on policy, and I know the members of the House will enjoy both the universities examination and colleges examination.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on University Affairs should stand as a very powerful body between the institution and government which has, as I said, the power to initiate change, to publish, to recommend to government.

As I said earlier, when we announced this, if we are not prepared to accept a substantial portion of the advice of the Committee on University Affairs, the committee system will not function. In my view, that would be very sad and wrong. I'm very hopeful that we can, as much as possible, do all of our business in public, that we can take the advice of this committee, and that where we disagree and when we disagree with this public committee we will do so in public and that we will state our reasons for all to see.

I know that there is a good deal of skepticism in certain quarters with respect to a committee. I appreciate that, but I feel very strongly this can work and I am prepared to bend every effort to ensure that it does work.

I'd like to emphasize one other aspect of the organization, Mr. Speaker, on which, at the moment, no decision has been taken, that is the possible establishment of an Alberta Education Council, which is referred to in our reorganization but for which no provision has been made at the moment.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that the provisions of A Choice of Futures of the Commission on Educational Planning referred to such a council. And if you have not had the occasion to examine that report I hope you will do so.

The Commission on Educational Planning said this, "There is a need for some mechanism for monitoring closely and systematically what Albertans, individually and collectively, expect from their system of schooling."

The principal advantage would be that more comprehensive and objective evaluation of the total education system could be obtained from a viewpoint external to government and its two education departments.

The function of that council, therefore, Mr. Speaker, is one of a group-ombudsman, or if you will, of an auditor-general of education. No decision has been taken on that council at the moment. It exists as a major recommendation of the report and will be dealt with in the course of time.

But there is yet another provision for an external authority completely outside of government to audit, express opinion, comment, prod, complain and do as it will with respect to education in this province.

There is some concern, Mr. Speaker, expressed with respect to the amendments before the House, that the Department of Advanced Education would start a line-by-line budget approval system for universities. This is not the case at all. The universities are, of course, familiar with this, as are the members of this House, because I have reported on more than one occasion that we are in the midst of developing a long-range university finance plan and will hope to do so with the colleges as well, but our first priority must obviously be universities. We are prepared to set down in writing an arrangement, a formula, an agreement whereby the funding of universities, and colleges in time, will be guaranteed a long-run basis of at least three years so that these institutions might have some commitment and some assurance as to the level of support in order that they may make the best use of their dollars and do the best possible planning for their futures.

That is not to say, however, Mr. Speaker, that we will not do a line-by-line analysis of what is going on in universities and colleges. But our function in doing that will be simply so that we can identify our concerns to boards of governors and other authorities as to how we feel their money might better be spent. But it certainly will not be done with a view to a line-by-

line budget approval. That commitment will come by way of a long-range agreement.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion with respect to the provisions of this bill as they relate to the delegation of power. There is some concern in the university community that the functions and authorities identified under The Universities Act not be transferred to the public service as such. The universities want some assurance that on matters of major policy and items of concern to them, they have and will continue to have access to my office for decision-making purposes and of course I quite agree with that.

One university is anxious to see the power of delegates deleted. Another university is anxious to see the power of delegation retained, for the moment, to examine how it might work. It is my view - and I have said before I am easy on this - that the power to delegate should be left in this bill for now, because I feel it will provide us with the flexibility and the possibility of delegation of certain of these decision-making functions that are identified in this bill.

I can assure the House, as I have the university community and other communities for that matter, that the delegation of such powers will only take place after consultation with them. I, for the moment, would like to leave that authority to delegate within the bill and to examine it in the course of phase two -- as we develop our committee structure, whether or not this delegation function should be retained and left as part of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I referred earlier to the fact that the Banff Centre was referred to in this bill. It is very simply a provision whereby the Banff Centre will submit its budgets -- instead of through the University of Calgary -- will submit them directly to the Department of Advanced Education with a copy to Calgary. Before this time the Banff Centre operated under the aegis of the University of Calgary and was required to submit its budget to the University of Calgary for comment and then the same was forwarded to the commission. In my discussions with both University of Calgary authorities and the Banff Centre authorities, it was mutually agreed that this budget approval procedure should be sent directly to my office with copies to Calgary. That is the other major change -- if it be major -- of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose at this time to go into an annual report of the Department of Advanced Education, or for that matter to comment with respect to A Choice of Futures. I propose doing so on that subject later in the session.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few comments on the legislation before us and also the comments made by the minister, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I might ask on a point of order if you would be agreeable to leaving us enough latitude in discussing Bill No. 23 also to flow over into Bill No. 18. That is the next bill that is discussed. The two of them are very similar. I think it would save a great deal of time, Mr. Speaker, if we could under some arrangement flow back and forth, because they are really dealing with the same. Would that be --

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, the government has no objection to that, provided there is not a duplication of debate under Bill No. 18.

MR. CLARK:

I give the House Leader, Mr. Speaker, my assurance that I won't duplicate the discussion on Bill No. 18. We are a very independent group over here and we speak for ourselves.

DR. HORNER:

[Inaudible]

MR. CLARK:

I'm pleased at your noticing that, Mr. Deputy Premier.

On a serious note, Mr. Speaker, might I say to start out that I am very pleased with the tone the Minister of Advanced Education used in initiating the discussion on this bill. I think all of us have seen enough editorials and have talked to enough people both inside and outside the university community, that

the temptation on occasion is to get very political with some of the legislation that we are dealing with on this particular matter. I suspect that some people could earn 'Brownie points' or lose 'Brownie points', depending upon your point of view, if that approach was taken.

First of all I would like to make some comments with regard to the points raised by the minister and say that the greatest concern we share I think deals with this question in which the Department of Advanced Education is involved in making some changes right now in the structure of the university and college operation in this province, at a period of time when the minister says that phase two of his long-range program is to look at the role of the boards of governors and the general faculties councils and so on.

So I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a major concern I have is that we are looking and we are making changes as far as one part of the university and college operation is concerned, and we are doing that in isolation. We are not looking at the role of the boards of governors, the general faculties councils, and in fact the whole question of to whom the university and college community is accountable. I think that is a mistake and I frankly wish we were not going that route at this particular time.

But in actuality, what we have before us now, Mr. Speaker, are amendments which phase out the Universities Commission and the Colleges Commission. In addition, we have a statement that the government and the Executive Council have approved which deals with reorganization of advanced education in this province. And then rather tacked to that as an amendment, we have an agreement with the University of Calgary that kind of supersedes one of the sections in the Act, at least as far as the University of Calgary is concerned. And then the minister in the course of his comments indicated that in the reorganization and the development of the department we were moving on several fronts but they are not moving forward in the area of student services at this time.

I am disappointed to hear that, Mr. Speaker, because it seems to me that all members of the Assembly should keep in mind that the only reason we have a Department of Advanced Education and universities and colleges, and whatever else, NAIT and SAIT and AVCs and so on, the only reason we have those institutions is because, in fact, there are students who make the choice of their own volition to go to those institutions. It would seem to me that the whole area of student services might receive a great deal more priority in what the Department of Advanced Education is doing now.

I commend the comments the minister has made as far as the Banff Centre is concerned. I think that is a move in the right direction. And I would agree with the comments made by the minister concerning those people from the public who have served on the Universities Commission, the Colleges Commission, and we could include people on boards of governors. They have made an excellent contribution to education in this particular province.

I would remind the members of the Assembly of the procedure that was used when The Universities Act and the Universities Commission were established a number of years back. And I do that not because of the nature of the government involved at that time at all, but because there were two very significant things that took place. One was the decision to grant autonomy to the University of Calgary. And so, in fact, we had a second university in the province at that time. We now have four universities in the province. And secondly, the decision was made that a universities commission or some type of formal legislative buffer be between the government and the university system in the province.

And at that time there were involved in those discussions people from the university community and from the broad general public. And these discussions took about a year and a half or two years. I believe the government and the minister would be much better advised to take a period of time like that while looking at the role of the universities and colleges commissions and, in fact, at the Department of Advanced Education in light of where the government sees that department going and then looking at the question of the role of the universities, the boards of governors, the general faculties councils and certainly of the college system and you can include NAIT and SAIT in there too.

So really what I am pleading for or asking, Mr. Speaker, is that the government seriously consider not a piecemeal approach to changes in the whole field of advanced education but a well thought out coordinated approach when we look at the differing roles of the boards of governors and the General Faculties Council and the coordinating council, as the minister mentioned. And I think the best route to move in this would be for a select committee of the Legislature to hold public hearings in Edmonton, Calgary and across the rest of

the province. Because by doing that there would be the kind of broad public input that really there hasn't been as far as this legislation is concerned.

The minister indicated to us earlier in question periods that he had had meetings with the boards of governors, the University of Calgary, the University of Alberta. I have talked to people from the General Faculties Council who up until very recently had not had an opportunity to officially discuss the matter with the minister. Certainly some of the students in the two largest universities have expressed some real concerns as to the piecemeal approach which the government is taking in this particular area.

Might I say, Mr. Speaker, that really the proposition which the government is putting before us in this legislation, and in light of the comments made by the minister, is that we have had the buffer of a Universities Commission for a number of years legislatively set out with its powers and responsibilities. Now we are being asked to remove that legislative buffer and we are being asked to give the minister approval for an advisory council on university affairs, not a legislative council at all but an advisory council, an advisory council whose terms of reference are not set yet, an advisory council on which we don't really know who the people are going to be.

The minister mentioned a broad representative group from the public. He mentioned representatives from each of the universities, which is good. He mentioned representation from the academic staff. But the question should also be asked what about the group for whom the whole system is supposedly set up, that is the students themselves? They certainly should have representation on this advisory committee on university affairs. I would go so far as to say that the non-academic staff people should also have some representation on this advisory committee.

But to get away from the argument of the make-up of the committee, I think the members of the Legislature should clearly recognize what we are being asked to do here. We are being asked to remove the Universities Commission as a buffer between the government and the universities, and the Colleges Commission as a buffer between the colleges and the universities. We are being asked to approve the removal of that and then to have an advisory committee on university affairs, which the minister is going to set up, on which we are not really sure of the terms of reference; we are not sure who is going to be on it. And frankly we are not too sure just how it is going to work.

I say to the members of the Legislature on both sides that I would feel much more comfortable of the move which the minister is asking us to make in supporting this legislation if he could give us the terms of reference that are going to be involved, if he could point out to us the kind of responsibilities that this advisory committee is going to shoulder.

Mr. Speaker, there are two other areas that I would like to comment on. There have been statements made that, in fact, the concern expressed about this particular bill and the bill to follow Bill No. 18 were just the concerns of the University of Calgary and that really not many other groups were that concerned. I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, without myself going out and soliciting complaints or concerns from people, that I have certainly had a number of people express what I consider to be legitimate concerns in this area.

One of the groups, who certainly on no prodding from myself or no other politician as far as I know, that expressed its concern on February 14 was the General Faculties Council executive of the University of Calgary. This concern was expressed to the minister, to the public of the province and really in the resolved part it says:

Be it resolved that the General Faculties Council of the University of Calgary call upon the Premier of Alberta to restore confidence in the government's educational policy by entering into serious discussions with the institutions concerned about the reorganization of the Department of Advanced Education.

I go back here, Mr. Speaker, and try to re-emphasize the point I hope I made earlier. That is that I have no objection, and no member should have objection, to the government looking again at the role of the Universities Commission and the Colleges Commission, the boards of governors, the general faculties councils, and other relevant groups.

But I think it is a mistake to do it on a piecemeal basis. I think it is a mistake to have done it through rather closed discussions between the boards of governors and some of the senior administrative staff.

I believe a much better approach, a much stronger approach, would have been to have the widest possible circulation of the alternatives which the department was looking at. I believe the department was looking at a number of alternatives from the administrative standpoint. Far better, it seems to me, to have made those suggestions public, far better for the government to have held public hearings. I think the whole post-secondary educational system in the province would have been better served.

Let me make this point here, Mr. Speaker. I don't think the Universities Commission or the Colleges Commission have been perfect by any stretch of the imagination. I do believe though, in fairness to them, that we have to say they have served a useful role during a very, very difficult period of time in university development in Alberta. That period of time has been difficult, really, for two reasons. One because of the tremendous growth of the system.

If you go back and look at the figures at the University of Calgary and the University of Alberta, they grew at horrendous rates for a period of time and then, without warning, the number of students entering those institutions declined very markedly. It is to the credit of the Universities Commission -- certainly the development of the university system in this province -- at that particular time.

I would say to those members of the Legislature who aren't concerned about the removal of the Universities Commission with an advisory group that will have no legislative status, I would ask you to look at what happened in Montana. For a number of years, the State of Montana really had as its approach to advanced education an approach similar to what we are being asked to approve here. Certainly from people to whom I have talked in Montana the system has not served the State of Montana well.

I believe also that the approach that we are being asked to consider in this particular bill and the following bill will go some distance to politicize the universities in this province.

I am sure that members of the Legislature will have representatives from the universities coming to them and asking them to go talk to the minister as far as buildings are concerned, as far as operating grants are concerned, as far as research schemes are concerned, and as far as allocation of funds are concerned.

The question of allocation of funds, once the government has made the decision of the large amount that is going to the university system for operating amounts, the allocation of those funds is a difficult enough job for a group that is somewhat removed from government and from the political activities involved in government. It is a difficult enough job then, let alone to be doing it perhaps through an advisory group that has no legislative responsibility, and is simply operating on a completely advisory basis.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that the Province of Ontario went the route, about five years ago, of moving away from sort of a buffer system to the commission system, to a system where a committee of presidents was selected. It is my understanding, from talking to people in the post-secondary education system in Ontario recently, that this committee of presidents -- one of their greatest responsibilities was to look over each other's shoulder to see that one institution wasn't getting more than the other. That was in no small way responsible for the decision the Ontario government made to go to the Wright Commission which, in fact, has now recommended that Ontario come back to a system very similar to a university commission system which we have in this province.

I am also told that the Province of British Columbia is thinking seriously of moving in the direction that we are now moving away from.

I make these comments, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, really for three reasons. First of all, in the minister's concluding comments -- Mr. Minister, if you would, would you spend some time in giving us the government's reasons or the whys and wherefores, but mainly the why in the decision to phase out the Universities and Colleges Commission. Because that was a decision made some time ago, in fact, relatively shortly after the department was announced, and I've had a number of people in the academic community of the university say frankly we've never been able to get any one to spell out to us why the government is choosing to phase out the Colleges Commission and the Universities Commission at this time.

Secondly I feel that until we have the terms of reference of the Advisory Committee on University Affairs that the minister refers to, but really what we

are being asked to do is to approve a pig in a poke, and I'm not in the least way enthusiastic about moving in that particular direction at this time.

As I've indicated earlier in the last point I wanted to make, I would far sooner -- in fact, I would hope that the government would reconsider its position of moving these three bills at this time, that rather they would set up a committee of members of the Legislature, look at the question of the role of the Universities Commission and the Colleges Commission, the boards of governors, general faculties councils, and the whole area of governance of post-secondary education institutions, and bring into the Legislature at the next spring session, or whenever it is possible, a number of recommendations and a report which have been developed after a great deal of broad public input across the province. I think in doing this the government would find itself in a much stronger position than it does at this particular time.

It's not really my business to be concerned about the government's way of doing this, but I believe in the interest of the universities and college community. Because universities are involved in not just imparting information, they are also involved in being the cutting edge of society, and they are also involved in being critical of government and being critical of politicians. It's for that reason that I think, we must, all of us in this Assembly regardless of where we sit, be prepared to guard zealously the autonomy and the independence of the universities.

I'm not suggesting at this time that the Minister of Advanced Education is attempting to push political influence into the university community or the college community, but what I'm saying is that moving in the direction we are, removing that buffer, that's a very real possibility and we're going to see a great deal more politicizing of the university and college system in this province as a result of the decision that the government apparently is moving on at this particular time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the members to keep this in mind and I'd certainly ask the minister if he would, to go into some detail about why the government has made the decision to phase out both commissions.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, first of all as I listened to the minister introduce this particular bill, I certainly agreed with the arguments behind phase two which is an effort to try and obtain as much public input as possible into the whole question of future roles for the university community and the universities in the province.

But it seems to me that phase one is really putting the cart before the horse in a sense. We're going to have a broad-ranging public discussion on this question. Surely there is no rush to do away with the Universities Commission. Surely this is something which can be deferred until such time as phase two is completed. I don't think any of the members of this Legislature would be opposed to the principles behind phase two, but it is really a little hard to follow why, when the government commits itself to taking this sort of open approach, one which would win commendation from both sides of the House, why it is that they seem compelled to proceed with the dissolution of the Universities Commission and also the Colleges Commission.

The second point that I would raise is with respect to the advisory committee for universities -- the University Advisory Committee. The minister quite properly points out that it is necessary to have some kind of buffer between the institutions on one hand and government on the other. I hardly need go into the arguments for this concept. We fully discussed it before in the Legislature, both in the Estimates a year ago, and for that matter, last fall during the discussion of the Worth Report. But it seems to me that the suggestion of an advisory committee being a realistic buffer is a little far-fetched, to put it mildly.

As the Member for Olds-Didsbury has already pointed out, the advisory committee will have absolutely no legislative status. It is not going to have any administrative power. In a sense, it is going to be an administrative unit. No matter how hard the minister attempts to make this committee work, I really doubt that it is going to command the respect and the status necessary to properly fulfil the responsibilities of being a buffer.

The third point I would make again follows up what the Member for Olds-Didsbury raised. It seems to me that there are a good deal of serious problems inherent in what might be termed the "cap in hand approach." The institutions

instead of going to a universities commission are going to be directly lobbying the minister. There will be an increase in political activity.

But we have had problems allocating funds, Mr. Speaker, when there were plenty of funds available to allocate. I suspect that we are going to have even more difficulty in the years ahead as the supply of public funds for post-secondary education, perhaps, become somewhat restricted at least in relation to the total overall budget in the province.

Therefore, the decision of how this money is to be allocated will be an extremely ticklish one, and one which I would frankly be a little worried about shouldering were I the minister. No matter what kind of decision he makes, no matter how honestly he arrives at these decisions when the question comes of dividing up scarcity, there are going to be complaints. And these complaints are going to be directed very definitely in the minister's direction. And the finger will be pointed at his office. That, I suspect, will generate an ongoing debate within the province which may in many respects improperly focus responsibility at the minister's doorstep.

So this just leads me to the view that a commission which can act as a buffer, a commission which has some legislative status, is not only in the interest of the institutions, but it is clearly in the interests of the government as well.

I would just close my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by saying that with the commitment the government has made to phase two, that is full-scale public participation in considering the future course that universities will take in this province, there is no real reason at this stage of the game why the commission should be dissolved. And therefore I feel that such a move at this stage is at the very best premature and at the very worst could lead to a somewhat less than satisfactory universities system in our province.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker --

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow, followed by the hon. Member --

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the debate on Bill No. 23 I must state that I am certainly less than fully convinced that this is the right step to take. In fact, I have some real concerns. First of all, I think that from Calgary we would certainly like to be reassured that Calgary will not have a branch plant university.

And I would just like to say a few words about the business of an advisory committee, Mr. Speaker. When the minister was speaking, he, I believe, assured us that it would be his intention to take some guidance from the advisory committee and so on. I would just like to refer back to some advice that has been sent to the government regarding the law faculty for Calgary, Mr. Speaker.

The University of Calgary prepared a prospectus on a proposed law faculty coming out very strongly in favour of it. The Benchers of the Law Society of Alberta unanimously endorsed the establishment of a law faculty at the University of Calgary. And this resolution was endorsed by the Calgary Bar Association. Then the subcommittee on establishing a Faculty of Law at the University of Calgary recommended that a law school be established. The subcommittee's final report was approved by the Academic Policy Committee, General Faculties Council, and the subcommittee's report was approved by the Board of Governors of the University of Calgary. The City of Calgary is in favour of a law faculty at the University of Calgary and has pledged financial support. The Calgary Herald has even come out in favour of a law faculty in Calgary, Mr. Speaker, but the Minister of Advanced Education says no. Now then, I'm just wondering --

MR. FOSTER:

Point of order. I'd like to clarify this for the umpteenth dozen time. The Minister of Advanced Education has not said no. The Universities Commission made a decision with respect to the establishment of a law school at the University of Calgary, and the very point, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend tries to make, makes my point with respect to commission government.

MR. CLARK:

That's no point of order. That's a Horner point of order.

MR. WILSON:

Well, Mr. Speaker, has the hon. minister closed debate on Bill No. 23?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of thing that gives us concern about putting confidence in advisory committees. The minister says that he has not said there will not be a law faculty at the University of Calgary. But what has he said? This is the type of thing that gives us concern.

I think that we would like to have some very clear cut, concrete suggestions as to what specifically will be done. I think we would like to know what the minister's opinion is about a school of chiropractic in Alberta, or a school of optometry in Alberta, as well as many other things. I think we would like to get down to specifics to get some idea of what the minister actually intends to do before we can have confidence in this bill.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, I've been very interested in the comments from the other side. In particular response I would like to answer one question that was brought up by the Member for Olds-Didsbury, and that is why are we now eliminating the Colleges and the Universities Commissions and integrating these activities into one body? I'd like to answer this question, as one who has worked within each one of these particular jurisdictions and observed, both from within and without as the chairman of a task force, some of the very inherent weaknesses in that particular kind of a system.

Before I do that though, I'd like to review for you, very quickly, just what the present system is, and reflect to you why there is a lack of integration at present. Within the Department of Advanced Education there are four universities responding to the government, to the minister, through the Universities Commission. I shouldn't say at present -- as up to March 31. There were six colleges under the jurisdiction of a Colleges Commission, two technical institutes answering directly to the minister, three agricultural colleges, three Alberta vocational centres, an Alberta petroleum industry training school, and a number of community vocational centres, each one of them responding to the public and answering to the minister in a different way. This, to a great extent, did bring about a lack of integration.

Also within the department we have two main divisions which respond to the public in a service sense. These are the Vocational Education Division, which initiates a great deal of industry-based kinds of training in regions throughout the province, and secondly, the Continuing Education Division, which facilitates local offerings of continuing education programs.

Let me reflect to you, then, my view of the weaknesses in the present system. I think it can all come down to this one statement: that the weakness is due to the fact that there is little cross-jurisdictional evaluation and planning, at present, between these different jurisdictional treatments of advanced education. We have a separation of function, a separation of policy, between the universities, the colleges and the technical institutes, largely because of the structure that we have placed them in up to this point. These are some of the results of this lack of cross-jurisdictional evaluation.

First of all, there is a lack of coordination and integration of the processes that occur within advanced education. In explaining this, let's look at what happens to a student when he or she goes into these particular processes. If a student were to go to, for instance, a technical institute at present, there this individual could take a certificate or a diploma program. But the disconcerting part about this is that after taking this diploma program, if this individual wanted to go to a college, or wanted to go to a university, he would virtually have to start from scratch with very little credit for the programs that he did take. There is no guarantee of transferability between the institutions.

The student now is forced, in going into university -- especially certain faculties -- to accept massive lump-like offers for this simple reason. He is required to attend for something up to six or seven years with no guarantee of a certificate or diploma to make him employable simply because of this lack of coordination, lack of transferability. This occurs, I might add, within and outside jurisdictions. The problem exists just as badly within the technical institute where the student has a difficulty in going from a certificate to a diploma program, from one degree to another within the universities. But the main problem is the cross-jurisdiction between the different types of institutions.

A second weakness and a second result of this is that there are unnecessary duplications in both instructional and support services. I think we can see this, if we were simply to stroll through some of the institutions we have now, that in a support sense each one of them has computers. Most of them have a system of accounting and records. Now I don't understand the whole process of computers, accounting, records and so on, but it would appear to me that there is room for a great deal of integration of function within this particular activity.

There is a certain duplication of programming. All you had to do was look at the response, for instance, in Calgary and Edmonton to the master plan recommendation on business administration programs as established at the community colleges. This problem originated because there was this cross-jurisdictional conflict. Business administration programs were developed at the technical institutes and in competition they were developed at the community colleges. As it stands now, I think it is warranted that there are business administration programs to be offered as they are. But most certainly there is a duplication in this kind of program.

English for New Canadians is an outright competition between jurisdictions, much to the harm of the client himself. Computer programming -- I think once again every jurisdiction offers a computer course. Well, do these people get jobs in the computer field, or is it just outright competition between jurisdictions? And perhaps it is an expensive kind of competition that we have to take a real good look at.

Thirdly, and probably one of the most disconcerting effects of this lack of coordination, is that there are gaps in and splintering of the activities that we now do have. The gaps that do exist in the educational programming in advanced education result mainly because of the "Let Frank do it" rationale. The idea that everything that happens within our post-secondary institutions has to happen within the four walls or within the campus constraints of the jurisdiction. This is where we get the concept of the ivory tower, when our institutions don't reach out into the community and serve some of the disadvantaged groups they should serve, some of the people like senior citizens, women on welfare, those people who can't perhaps come to the institution for the kinds of services the institution should be offering.

This is reflected in rural areas where we don't have a real strong regional development or delivery of post-secondary services. Once again, it is the old idea -- that's the job of the colleges. The universities should be doing that, or that is what the technical institutes should do. Perhaps they should all be doing it, but perhaps under a more integrated plan.

A fourth result is that, at present, there is probably an inadequate public participation within advanced education. I was very interested in the minister's comments on the advisory committees, both in the universities and the colleges sector. We always assume that because we appoint boards of governors or commissions that we are automatically representing the public.

Well, let's just take a look at that. When we appoint a commission or a board of governors we are in fact, appointing executives and although they are not directly within the public service, they certainly are an arm of the public service kind of rationale.

Having worked at the technical institute in Calgary, one of the things that interested me to a great extent was the lack of constraint with which advisory committees -- they didn't have any clout, they didn't have any executive capacity, but I was amazed at the impact they did have on the development of programming. And I firmly believe that advisory committees in fact can have more impact in the development in the advanced education community than perhaps can boards of governors and commissions.

And finally, a fifth weakness as I see in the present system, is the one that is reflected to the student and to the public. And those are some of the

outright inequities which exist in the present system. I feel personally that this inequity was illustrated here in the Legislature today.

The members, when they are speaking about advanced education, automatically fall into talking about universities, as if the universities are the only ones that are really serving the advanced education community and somewhere down the line that the community vocational centres, Alberta vocational centres, somehow are doing some kind of a minor job.

Well I just don't accept that. I think these inequities are illustrated in the following manner. In salaries, in staff salaries, why is the staff salary, for instance, different at a university than it is at a college or a technical institute?

Why, at certain institutions, do we have strong student service capacities such as placement services, learning assistance, counselling, and why don't we have it at others?

Why is there a difference in the teaching loads, the teaching loads at a university as compared to a college and technical institute, where in one case an instructor may have something like ten hours of instructional load, where at another one it might be twenty hours.

Why do certain programs cost more in some jurisdictions than others? And I am not just talking about the uniqueness of a program, I am talking about \$7 per student day as compared to \$4.50 as compared to \$12. Why this difference?

Why is there a difference in the continuing education program in initiatives that are now being offered in certain sectors as compared to others? It can't be just the initiative of the one staff compared to the other.

And why in some centres, do we have a difference in the financial assistance, difference in fees, some people on allowance? For instance, the PEP program illustrated this, where students in the vocational centres were subsidized throughout their program -- their tuition, their books, a living allowance was paid. Sitting right next to them is a student who had to pay the whole shot and his situation was much the same.

I suggest that many of these inequities result strictly because of a lack of integration, a lack of coordination of the system as a whole.

And I am very interested in this discussion about buffers. I for one, believe that there should be a buffer between government on one hand and the academic community on the other hand.

I would like to ask this question: just how many buffers do we want? For instance, right now we do have a buffer between the colleges, between the universities and government through the boards of governors? The boards of governors, in fact, do manage and act as a buffer between the institutions. The colleges and universities commissions were a second buffer. How many? Maybe we should carry it to its extreme. If in fact we need all these buffers between the institutions and government perhaps we should set up then, in addition to two commissions, another commission to look after the two, perhaps at the delivery level. Within the institutions we should have every program passed by the board of governors for that particular program.

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Now, when we are looking at buffers between the institutions and between government, there are probably two possibilities. And the first of them I just mentioned. I personally believe that the board of governors is a buffer and I believe that it is an effective buffer.

The second possibility would have been to establish a single commission which would amalgamate the college and the university commissions. If we are going to make it one buffer then I would suggest that it might mean the elimination of boards of governors. And I will have to admit that it is the one I do favour, the one I did recommend last year, the single commission with perhaps minister as the head.

But at this point it really is six of one and half a dozen of the other. Because each of them is an effective buffer and the minister has chosen this one direction and I suggest that it is a buffer.

I would like to mention just briefly some of the positive effects that I see occurring now from the reorganization. First of all through the

reorganization I feel there will be an effective coordination of programming. There are three concepts that I would like to place to you. These are concepts which we faced in my task force and also in the Professions and Occupations Committee as they relate to the post-secondary institutions.

First of all, is what we call a 'career ladder' concept. The career ladder concept simply means this: that an individual should be able throughout his life, by taking modules of education, to upgrade himself through different levels of education. For instance, he should be able to start out by taking one course and this course should be creditable towards a certificate, should be creditable towards a diploma, creditable towards a degree and perhaps post-graduate kinds of training. It is the antithesis, the opposite of what I have just mentioned, where an individual should have to start from scratch in order to take a degree and so on.

The career ladder concept talks about continuity from one level to the other within and outside jurisdictions. It also suggests or implies a more extensive development of para-professional roles just as we have, for instance, in the engineering field.

A second result of coordination programming would be transferability. By transferability we simply mean this: when an individual takes a particular course or a particular program in one educational jurisdiction, then he should be eligible for some kind of credit or transfer to another institution. If a student takes a two-year business administration program at a community college, then why shouldn't he be given at least a year or a year and a half of some kind of credit towards a commerce degree at a university. Well, that is not the way it is right now unless this individual happens to sign up on a very structured, rigid transfer program within the college.

The third concept which would result out of coordination is what we call cooperative programming. I think it is one that was described very well in the master plan presented by the Colleges Commission. This is the idea that why should we have to take all of our courses within one jurisdiction? For instance, if a technical institute is recognized as having the best computer program in the City of Edmonton, then why shouldn't a student at the University of Alberta be able to go over to NAIT three hours a week, take a particular computer course and have it creditable towards his degree at the University of Alberta?

It's somewhat of an extension of the whole concept of transferability. But it's a more conscious effort and a recognition that the student can package his degree, can package his diploma from a number of different jurisdictions.

Now a second positive aspect I see in the reorganization is a more unified and more integrated program development and a research and planning capacity. The reason I think it will be integrated is that it does allow within one body, the advisory committee, for citizen participation within the total of planning in advanced education.

Instead of having planning coming up through the Colleges Commission, through the department and through the Universities Commission this integration, I think, will fill in gaps and avoid some of the duplications that now do occur.

In closing I would like to make just a few suggestions to the minister for phase two because I think these are considerations that would be looked at in phase two. I would like to make just three proposals.

First of all, I feel there has to be a very extensive integration of institutional offerings within a particular area. The minister, I know, is very aware of this when we look at the difficulty between the Alberta vocational centres, the technical institutes and the colleges within Edmonton and Calgary. And the very real question of where do you allow one to act as a single jurisdiction, where do you integrate their function?

I feel that within a particular community as far as possible the college, technical institute and Alberta vocational centre types of activities should be integrated.

There are a number of possibilities -- you can make one or more of them satellites. would prefer within colleges in Calgary and Edmonton more of a merger kind of a concept where you integrate, under a common board of governors, the activities of technical institutes, AVCs and colleges, thus allowing for the cooperative types of programming, transferability, and so on, while retaining the very unique flavour that each one of these institutions do have.

This type of integration, for instance, would assist in the development of records, accounting, computer programming and so on. In Calgary we have seen during the last four or five years the common use of a student housing registry where the four institutions got together and did this as a common function.

A second extension in phase two I would recommend is a more active accelerated use of advisory committees at all levels of education. This is one I am sure the minister does support in his comments on the advisory committee at the executive level. However, this can extend right down to the program level. Our colleges, technical institutes and universities now do use advisory committees in program development and it is something I think that should be accepted as part of the whole system and developed within the vocational centres and more extensively within all jurisdictions.

Finally, I would suggest that within the Department of Advanced Education a fourth functional division be developed. The three functional divisions now as mentioned by the minister are those of student services, program development, and Administrative Services. I would recommend the development of a fourth division of continuing or further education.

I feel this is important to facilitate the kinds of extensions and industry-based kinds of programming that we must have throughout the province. The other way we could go is to assume that the colleges, the universities and technical institutes can develop industry-based work experience programming. I don't believe they can. I think the past has shown that they can't and perhaps a division is required with a regional kind of activity to facilitate this kind of training.

As an illustration of this, the Priority Employment Program during the last year, I think, simply backs up this contention and this is that regional directors of the Department of Advanced Education in the Division of Vocational Education, in fact, facilitated much of the PEP programming that did occur in the different jurisdictions. It is my contention that PEP got off the ground not so much because of the institutions themselves but because of some very positive initiatives by the regional and field staff of the Vocational Education Division. Through a coordination of their activities with the colleges we had a very successful PEP program in the last two years.

Finally in talking about a division of continuing or further education, I simply mean here that the present activities of vocational and continuing education should be melded together, should be merged into one activity with a regional kind of direction. So these are just a few suggestions that I have and a few comments in supporting this Bill No. 23 along with Bills 18 and 17, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just a very few remarks. I think the debate on this bill has been enlightening and very positive, as a matter of fact, and the type of debate we can use in this Legislature if we want to get around to the business of making good decisions. I believe that the minister the way in which the minister outlined his program was one of his better efforts. As a matter of fact you alleviated a lot of my fears. You didn't satisfy them all but nevertheless I appreciate your concern. Also the Member for Olds-Didsbury, I think, mentioned a lot of things that had concerned me for quite some time regarding this bill.

I think I would be less than honest if I didn't say that in the past, having had some experience in education on boards of governors and so on and so forth, I have been apprehensive about the usefulness and effectiveness of the commissions. But I believe it was brought about because, well, being on a board, you do have that tendency that you want to go to the top. And the reason that we had that tendency was because -- I believe the boards of governors or the commissions in the past probably didn't have as much authority as they should have. Possibly they should have been boned up a little bit and I think this is one of the problems we had with the commissions in the past.

The reorganization that the minister speaks of is fine, but what I would like to do, and I go along with some of the other members who have spoken, I would like to know the complete program.

I really don't see the reason for rushing into this, that things went so badly that we couldn't do a little more study and have the total program that the minister and the department intends to embark on before we make the change. Because I would be very interested and I feel confident that those people

involved, like the colleges and the universities, also would feel more comfortable if they knew precisely what they were going to get.

In other words, we know what we're dropping, but do we know what we're getting completely? I think any time we make a decision, particularly a major decision, we like to say, well, what are the alternatives? We know what we are giving up, but do we know what we are getting? And I think all of us would feel more satisfied if we knew a little bit more about that.

So, in that regard, I strongly support the suggestion made by the Member for Olds-Didsbury, of a legislative committee which could have hearings, which could consult with the universities and colleges in particular, all post-secondary institutions in this province within the next couple of months -- it wouldn't take long -- and bring back a very thorough and meaningful report to this Legislature in the fall. This report would be one that I'm sure the minister would be most pleased to have because when he comes to set out these guidelines, hopefully in the new organization it wouldn't be one that was an interim or ad hoc type of situation. It would be one that he felt the people were really behind.

And I think this would mean an awful lot to me if I were in the position that he is in today. I say this because we all know, most of us I think, that there are no groups so jealous of their autonomy as are the universities and they really feel strongly about this, all post-secondary institutions, but universities in particular and I think they could be assured of this if this type of a procedure were followed.

One of the worries I have about taking away the commissions -- I believe in the commission concept for certain types of services. I think, if anything, health, education, and justice should not be political. I think those are areas which should be completely taken away from the political arena. They should be based entirely and solely on need.

That's one of the big concerns I have about across the line where superintendents of schools and judges are elected. You know they have to look over one shoulder to see whether they are going to get elected or not, and over the other one to see whether they are going to do the right thing or not. And I think this is a very serious and bad type of situation and I would hate to see us ever becoming involved in any type of situation that would tend in that direction.

The Member for Calgary McKnight has some very good points and ones which I could support wholeheartedly. One is on a single commission. This is what I really favour, one single post-secondary commission to look after all the schools of post-secondary education. And let's bring NAIT and SAIT into that. Why should they have been set aside all these years, not to come under the commissions? What about the AVCs, the schools of agriculture? I really think then we could get at this business that he had mentioned about transfer. This has been a bugbear in this province. And it's going to get worse as our colleges come up and sort of compete with the universities in some senses.

I think we have to decide where we are going to draw the line and there are going to have to be some changes made, I believe, in the future as to what courses are best taught in universities and colleges. Because, you know, from my own point of view, I still think the colleges are more of a vocational type of training generally speaking. Even teacher education, as far as I'm concerned -- Lord knows somebody would like to shoot me now -- should be probably in the colleges. I have a strong feeling that they should.

But these are the types of things that I think are important and I'd like to see, the one commission concept given some real serious thought. If this could be done it would be, I think, helpful to all people in the Province of Alberta.

So my recommendation is that we shouldn't be rushing into this. If I were making any recommendations, it would be this, that we bone up on the college commission concept, get it into one commission, bring all post-secondary institutions under that one commission. Then I would say you have the opportunity to coordinate. You have the opportunity to see that all of them are treated as equal as possible, as 'just' as possible I should say. We don't worry about really being treated 'equal'. I think you should be treated according to your needs in these types of services. And this has to be emphasized. I think that is really important.

So with these few thoughts, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the minister would react to those and maybe give some consideration to this type of approach.

MR. BENOIT:

I would like to say a word or two, Mr. Speaker, and also express my feelings with regard to the explanations made by the minister. They were very good, and I really appreciated them. They put me considerably at ease in some areas. But as some others have said, not altogether.

In attempting to reply to the question of why the change, the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight made some points, all of which I do not think were necessarily valid nor that the inequities that he spoke of were a result of the existing commissions. But if that is to constitute the answer to the question, and the minister is prepared to give his imprimatur to it, well that will have to be what we'll get. But I'd like to hear the minister's own views on why the change.

I think he must have had some ideas in mind. He must have thought of all pros and cons and as a result he must have thought of the advantages and the disadvantages of the change, and I'd like to hear both viewpoints. If he didn't find any disadvantages in the proposed change of Bill No. 23, then I think there must have been some lack of consideration of the whole picture. Because, in all fairness, I think most changes have both advantages and disadvantages attached to them.

Another question I would like to raise is how far is the government prepared -- and I use this word for lack of a better one -- to encroach upon the autonomy of the university in making this change? Is it going to limit its encroachment in the area of regulating the expenditures available to the university, or will it go farther and go into the area of dealing with the activities of the university insofar as the courses are concerned and that kind of thing?

What I am getting at, is that, as the minister mentioned, the public in attempting to find out who operates the university very often finds itself running up against a stone wall. How do we deal with a professor whose attitudes we don't appreciate? How do we get at the curriculum of the university to make some changes in it -- this kind of thing? Now, would we go to a commission, if the commission continues to exist, or does the government assume full responsibility now for not only the financing but also for the curriculum and the general university policy? Or is that going to be left in the hands of the advisory committee entirely? Who has the authority and where can the public go so that it can get some satisfaction and if you please, put some blame on somebody or give some credit to somebody for things that are done by the university? Will this new arrangement help to facilitate those matters? And if so, in what way?

I was very interested to hear that if someone phoned to the Universities Commission today, they would be told it was answered by the Department of Advanced Education rather than the Universities or the Colleges Commission. The change has taken place, but the Act is still in force. The change took place as of the first of the month apparently. And I would like to know how come that changed before the bill has been passed?

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there are too many changes sometimes just for the sake of change, without consultation and adequate planning in advance. And this has taken place on more than one occasion with regard to government activities in the past where a very plausible and quite acceptable plan had been proposed but when it was to be implemented, there was the lack of machinery to implement it. And that is what appears to be taking place here -- a change without having been fully planned and explained how it is going to be effective, so far as implementing the whole thing.

So probably we should just ask those questions -- not only why the change, but what is the hurry? I think the suggestion made is an excellent one, in light of all the circumstances here, that if this bill is given second reading, it would stay over until the fall portion of the session, or even, if necessary to get adequate discussion, into the next session in 1974.

I believe that is enough for this time, Mr. Speaker. There are some other thoughts that have been expressed by others, and I'll leave it at that.

MR. FOSTER:

May I close the debate?

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with obviously great interest to the remarks that have been made in the House concerning this bill. I appreciate the suggestion of the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury that we might deal with it in the broad context of universities and colleges legislation, because it is the same in principle.

I'd like to respond to some of the things that have been said. There was a suggestion that the agreement I have reached with the University of Calgary is just with Calgary and supersedes provisions of the bill. That's incorrect and invalid on both counts, Mr. Speaker. The undertaking I have given is one to the university community generally, and does not amount to an abrogation of any provisions of the amendment whatever. It does amount to a method of procedure which I am quite prepared to follow with respect to the implementation of the provisions of that bill.

The Member for Olds-Didsbury suggested that he was disappointed we were not going ahead with the students services division. He suggested this was a most important function and expressed some concern, and I would quite agree with the concern.

However, let me perhaps amplify what we are doing, because while we are not proceeding with the creation of a division per se, we are moving to accommodate the functions of the students services division within two divisions. We just don't want to create another division within the department until the level of operating in the department requires it. Recognizing that a division is to be headed by an assistant deputy minister, we didn't feel it was necessary to move in that area at the moment. It may well be down the road a piece. The students services division is concerned, obviously, with the whole question of student finance which, of course, we will continue doing, housing, to some extent, we'll be involved in; counselling, to some extent, with our own services; and the possibility of a central application system.

I'd like to take a moment of the time of the House to comment with respect to the central application system. This was one of those functions that was examined by my friends in the university community and they said, "My good heavens, the Department of Advanced Education is taking over our admission policy." We are not. We merely want to identify one area of possible assistance that we can be to universities and colleges, quite apart from whether or not the universities and colleges want us to function with the central application system. We are examining this with respect to our own institutions. And I'll give you an example.

In the Province of Ontario there is a central application system with respect to universities, so a student wishing to go to one of the many Ontario universities applies to one centre. He applies on one form and he pays one fee. The central computer system, of course, has links with the various institutions. That student deals with one centre to have his application handled, and that centre can then determine whether he is qualified; if so, to what institutions; where is there space available. The student can list three or four preferences as to where he wants to go, and the application can be handled in that way. It is not a desire or an intention to take over or assume the admission policy or the admission function of the institution. Interestingly enough, since this proposal came out I have had a very serious proposal from one of the public colleges, that we do, in fact, implement a central admission system for the public college system.

I'll give you an example of a student who wants to go to an institution of higher learning -- advanced education. He may apply to four or five. He may or may not provide an admission fee to get his application dealt with. He may be accepted in two or three locations. He may never reply.

I have used this example before in this House where we had 6,000 applicants for the first year courses in SAIT; 3,800 people filled those positions. We don't know where the rest of them went. We have a pretty good idea now, but we have 2,000 students, who for one reason or another, didn't show up and went someplace else.

Now I suggest to you that to do the kind of capital planning, on the basis of that kind of information alone leaves considerable question in my mind as to its usefulness.

So there is a function, the central application system that we were thinking about -- we still are with respect to our own institutions -- we have been invited to do so by the colleges. It may be that the universities of Alberta will find this has some use to them. I have had some discussions with people in that sector who feel this has possibilities. Obviously we won't move into that area without discussing with them and without working with them. We are only interested in doing those things which we can do more efficiently and better at one point than they can each do for themselves.

I recognize that is a very broad general definition, but the central application system is a possibility and one we would like to look at.

The concern about the student services division is valid, we will carry on those functions but they will be incorporated with other divisions for the moment and as we develop, depending on our role in the future, we will move into that area.

Mr. Speaker, some considerable concern has been expressed with respect to a buffer. There has been a good deal of comment in the House about this business of a buffer and my colleague Mr. Lee, has, I think, identified several points very well. The question of commission government was dealt with in A Choice of Futures, the Commission on Educational Planning. There are several reasons stated there for the abolition of a commission and after a year and a half in office and having had some experience with this question of commission government, I too have serious reservations about the existence of a buffer.

In principle, I think it is highly desirable. In fact, I don't know that it works all that well. The university community has, by intention or otherwise, created another organization for their own vehicle and they call it -- and Mr. Speaker, this has no political implications -- they call it the PCC Club. It is an organization of presidents, chairmen and chancellors which I have now met with, with respect to the long-range financing, on two and three occasions and will be meeting with them in the future. I have no doubt that I will, in the course of time, be having a series of regular meetings with this particular structure and this provides me with a tremendous access to the people in those institutions and provides them, of course, with access to the minister.

That is something the system has spawned as a result of the impending dissolution of the commissions. It may be there will be refinements on that organization, that something more formal will be created by the institutions themselves, a council of presidents or whatever.

My -- I was going to say my colleague, but really he's not -- the hon. member, Mr. Wilson, in discussing, I think, this whole question of commission government was talking about the law school in Calgary and how the minister had refused the law school in Calgary. My interjection, Mr. Speaker, was in my view well taken because the hon. member, in trying to make his point, has defeated himself with the very point that I choose to make, that in terms of the public mind today about this question of a law school, there is no doubt in Calgary that it is government which made that decision about the law school in Calgary.

The Minister of Advanced Education, I gather, has apparently made a decision there will be no law school for Calgary. The record, Mr. Speaker, to be correct, is that the Universities Commission dealt with the question of a law school and said, for the moment, primarily because of finances, we cannot approve a law school in Calgary.

I said, when I received that report, I will accept the decision of the commission -- which of course I must because they are a legal entity. But upon the dissolution of the commissions I am most willing to review and reappraise that decision.

But that was so -- if I may use that expression -- in the City of Calgary as a decision by government. Now where was the commission, where was the response to the buffer? In terms of public communication, Mr. Speaker, there was no buffer. The man in the street holds accountable the Minister of Advanced Education and that he is entitled to do. The institutions in this circumstance held accountable the Minister of Advanced Education, as well they are entitled to do. But in law and I suppose in fact, the decision on this occasion was made by a commission. Now we talk about buffers.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that many members of this Assembly would be surprised, very surprised, by some of the mail that I receive from the university and college community; submissions with respect to internal, indoor management decisions of universities and colleges coming to my office, asking for my intervention or involvement which goes beyond their board, which goes beyond the commission to my office.

A buffer, Mr. Speaker, is I think, very valid in principle. Unfortunately, as someone said, the institutions themselves, the public, the people involved, want to pin the responsibility on someone who is accountable to them. And that is a minister of this government, the Minister of Advanced Education. That is me. And I can say to you truthfully that I have had a good deal of comment and response in the course of the past year and a half, where the conclusion has been that the minister is, in fact, responsible.

I appreciated the remarks by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview when he talked about the loss of a buffer making the life of a minister of government, the Minister of Advanced Education, hot -- somewhat warmer than it has been in the past.

I think it would be very easy for me, and maybe it has been very easy for government in the past, to say to the public and to say to the House, "I am sorry, that decision was taken by a commission and I am not responsible for it, that decision has gone someplace else. And there may have been a propensity on the part of government on some occasions to use the buffer, to hide behind it.

Mr. Speaker, the public doesn't buy that kind of argument. They expect the people of this Legislature or government generally to be responsible. I have learned that through the course of the last several months. I have not been able to use nor have I wanted to use successfully, the argument that, well, someone else is responsible for this, I really can't say anything about it.

I appreciate the point. My life would probably be much more comfortable and perhaps longer, I don't know, if we had a commission because it would enable me to receive some insulation from the pressures in the system.

I guess what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is the institutions themselves and the public, recognizing that there is a minister of government responsible for advanced education, feel and respond to that office as if he is responsible. And I feel I am and I know and appreciate the remarks that life in the future is not going to be easy.

I appreciated the remarks by the Member for Lethbridge, Mr. Gruenwald, with respect to the politicizing of relations between government and universities or between government and institutions and this was also said by the Member for Olds-Didsbury. I would sincerely hope that is not the case. I have to recognize however, that when the public -- the public will want to come to someone who in their view is responsible and so will the institutions.

I am looking forward to the future with great anticipation and great optimism, but I know it is not going to be easy and I would ask for the assistance of the House in not politicizing these relations. It will no doubt be inevitable that some decisions will be taken which will be hard decisions and difficult for some, and on those occasions we may be in debate on the floor of this Legislature. I am sure we will be.

I am not unmindful of the role that a Department of Advanced Education is in when there is no commission. And I recognize that one alternative that has been suggested would be one commission. I have my doubts frankly that one commission would be able to do the same kind of job because it would suffer from, I think, the principle fact that the two commissions have in the past, and that is: there was always someone else, someone else higher in the scale of things if I may use that expression, someone responsible to this Legislature, someone who was having to take responsibility for the allocation of funds. And I guess what I am saying, is that when it comes to the allocation of funds, there is one place where the responsibility ultimately lies and I believe that should be on the floor of this House.

The Member for Olds-Didsbury talked about the role of students on the Committee of University Affairs. I am sure you are aware that the committees within the department's organization refer also to a committee on student affairs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said that the role and function of those committees is yet to be finally determined. I have a prejudice or a bias which says that the committee structure of university affairs should be as I have

already outlined them. It should not include students, not because their voice is not important, and not because their concern should not be heard, but because we have, in my view, developed a more effective medium through which student opinion in this province can be brought to bear in a way that these committees are designed and that is the Committee on Student Affairs.

It is my hope that this committee may be representative of students from all the advanced education institutions in the province, universities, colleges and the others. And the arlit of their concern and their expression and their inquiry will include not just university affairs, not just college affairs, but the entire field of advanced education.

Now I recognize that perhaps the student will say, "We feel very strongly that we should have a voice on the committee of college affairs or university affairs." Of course I am prepared to look at that. It is my hope that the student voice will be more effective, in my view, if they were represented on one committee with the responsibility of the entire advanced education community and, of course, I will be discussing that with the students in the weeks and months ahead.

The Member for Olds-Didsbury referred to the final report of the Wright Commission in Ontario and some historical context and the suggestion there -- a series of commissions were recommended in that commission. The hon. member, I believe, suggested that the Ontario government is going back to the commission structure. With great respect, that is not my information with respect to the response of the officials in Ontario to the Wright Commission. Obviously I am not able to speak for the Ontario government, sometimes I wish I could, but it's my information that they are not going in that direction notwithstanding that the Wright Commission in Ontario has suggested a return to commission.

The Member for Lethbridge in urging more time to consult over the dissolution of the commissions seemed to be suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the autonomy of the university would be assured if there were hearings on this bill. That argument escapes me. I'm sorry I don't really understand what point the hon. member is attempting to make. I would like to re-emphasize that the functions and powers that are identified in Bill 23 with respect to the commission are not functions or powers which were previously the responsibility of a board of governors. I would like to suggest to the House, and I firmly believe, that the autonomy of the institution per se is in no jeopardy whatever by virtue of these amendments. If we were, in fact, legislating on the powers of the boards of governors or for that matter on the senates or general faculties councils, which is phase two of our reorganization also to which I referred to earlier, then the hon. member's point would be valid.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. My point was on the hearing; that the universities would, in fact, then feel satisfied that this autonomy was not going to be threatened. That was all.

MR. FOSTER:

I see. I have had, Mr. Speaker, as the House well knows, a long series of discussions with the university community on this subject and, of course, many others. I don't now believe that there is any real concern whatever within the universities community or college community that institutional autonomy is in jeopardy. I respect the member's view that he feels that one commission, one comprehensive commission would be a better instrument of advanced education.

This government has chosen a Department of Advanced Education and chosen to attempt to do the job of one commission with the department, but involving the public in every way we can, the stake-holder groups and the institutions themselves in the policy decisions of advanced education. I am very optimistic that while this organization is flexible it will be effective and can respond to change relatively quickly. This was not always the case in the past.

Mr. Speaker, there were other questions with respect to the effect of these amendments and specifically what I am inclined to call "indoor management" of universities and colleges and that is personnel policies. The hon. member referred to someone not liking a professor and who do you speak to when you have problems of that nature. It certainly isn't the Minister of Advanced Education. I can assure you of that although I will be happy to listen.

When you have policies with programs and forces and curricula within the institution to whom do you speak? Again, it is not the Minister of Advanced Education, although I would be happy to listen. These are internal functions of

the institution. Program development, the research and development necessary to create new programs to the point of approval, is something done within the institution. I am now talking about universities. To a large extent this is also true of colleges.

But the Department of Advanced Education has no right and no authority to intrude or enter into "indirect management" as defined by the provisions of both The Universities Act, and The Colleges Act. We have every right to, on behalf of this House or the members of the public, speak with the authorities there about some of these concerns, but no right to make any decisions.

The function that the commissions played with respect to program approval and new programs and the function the department, Mr. Speaker, will play in the future with respect to this, is merely to approve new programs on the basis that there is not then unnecessary or undesirable duplication. Now, implicit in that obviously is that some duplication is necessary and some duplication is desirable. But the Department of Advanced Education will not have the jurisdiction, nor do we seek the jurisdiction to order a program cancellation of any university or college. That is an integral and internal matter.

If, however, a university or college in its judgment and in its wisdom continues to offer courses with one or two students in them year after year after year with several people on staff, I come back to my earlier comments about line-by-line budgeting. While we have a long-term university financing arrangement we are, of course, interested in line-by-line budgeting so that we might know what is going on within the institution from an expenditure point of view. When we discover circumstances such as that we would take that opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to raise that issue, for that matter, with the lawful authority -- in this case the board of governors -- and suggest ways to them that we feel their expenditures might be more properly met. They may choose to disagree with us. That is their privilege. You may quarrel, Mr. Speaker, that that should not be their privilege. At the moment I am not challenging that. I come back to phase two and that is to review the roles of boards of governors, senates and general faculties council.

I think there has been a good deal of discussion, Mr. Speaker, with respect to commissions and commission government, reasons for the change and reasons for the timing. If there has not been, let me suggest, and I don't mean this facetiously, that we will always endeavour to discuss and consult. I have done a good deal of that and look forward to doing a good deal more in the future.

But let me remind the House that there comes a time for decision. You may quarrel with the extent of the consultation, you may quarrel with the extent of the discussion. I have to be ever mindful of the fact that that is important. But there comes a time for some decisions.

There was a Commission on Educational Planning which for three years held hearings around this province on a great many subjects, and the Minister of Education and I will be responding to those in the course of the next several weeks. One of the recommendations of that report, which is not primarily my reason for this decision, was the dissolution of these commissions. Now I agree that we could add the question of commission government to phase two and we could go on for another two years or three years and totally review this whole question of university and college affairs and maybe in two or three years we would have the legislation.

I hope I will not be accused of trying to move too quickly. I will be ever mindful of that but there are times for decision and I think this decision is sound and valid at this time, but I am also reminding the House that it is part of phase two and we will have another look at this question of governance both within the institution and between the institution and government. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[The motion was carried, Bill No. 23 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 18 The Colleges Amendment Act, 1973

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 18 The Colleges Amendment Act, 1973.

[Not Recorded]

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, the opinions expressed by the member of this side of the House regarding Bill No. 23 apply equally well to Bill No. 18. The Minister of Advanced Education has not convinced me of the wisdom of this legislation.

[The motion was carried, Bill No. 18 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 17 The Department of Advanced Education Amendment Act, 1973

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 17 The Department of Advanced Education Amendment Act, 1973 seconded by the Minister of Highways. The purpose of this bill is to transfer to the Department of Advanced Education from the Department of Education the responsibility for funding of adult education and training programs in the public school system.

And secondly, to provide to the Department of Advanced Education the authority to coordinate programs and services between the various advanced education ...[Not recorded.]

[The motion was carried, Bill No. 17 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 16
The Students Loan Guarantee Amendment Act, 1973

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move second reading of Bill No. 16 The Students Loan Guarantee Amendment Act 1973, seconded by the Minister of Highways and Transport.

The effect of this bill, Mr. Speaker, will be to raise the ceiling for guarantee purposes from presently \$25 million to \$35 million for the fund and to provide for the consolidation and subsequent guarantee of debts of students.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I would not want this bill to be read as a total acknowledgement by the Minister of Advanced Education of the policies and philosophy of the student finance as it exists in Canada. I am quite aware of the fact that there are deficiencies in the system. We are looking forward to discussing matters of student finance with the officials of the federal government and hope to be in a position to respond with an improved system of student finance in this province in the course of the next year or so.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might do two things. First I am going to ask the House Leader. This bill doesn't appear on our list of bills for the day and in light of that I wonder if we might have it held because of the upcoming meeting that we have. We'd perhaps like to shed some light from that meeting on the minister's point of view.

MR. HYNDMAN:

That is satisfactory, Mr. Speaker. I move that we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it the House agrees that it is 5:30.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:26 o'clock.]