

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday, March 14, 1974

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

Special Committee on Select Standing Committees

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure, as Chairman of the Special Committee on Standing Committees, to table the report of the committees On Law and Regulations, On Private Bills; On Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing and On Public Accounts.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the report of the said Special Committee be now received and concurred in.

[The motion was carried.]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 48 The Improvement Districts Amendment Act, 1974

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being The Improvement Districts Amendment Act, 1974. This bill, Mr. Speaker, proposes to give the Minister of Municipal Affairs the required authority to improve certain services in improvement districts. It proposes to do that by allowing the minister to do anything in an improvement district which might be done by municipal council by regulation or a resolution.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 48 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 36 The Students Finance Amendment Act, 1974

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being Bill No. 36, The Students Finance Amendment Act, 1974. The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to permit the Student Finance Board to grant a remission or to write off a portion of funds loaned to students pursuant to the provisions of the Canada Student Loans Act.

MR. SPEAKER:

You have heard the request for leave by the hon. Minister of Advanced Education to introduce Bill No. 36, The Students Finance Amendment Act, 1974. As I understand it this is a money bill. Does the hon. minister have the recommendation of the hon. Lieutenant Governor in Council?

MR. FOSTER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is attached to the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the rules require that this be drawn to the attention of the House at the time of the introduction of the bill.

In view of the recommendation, having been attached to the bill, being in proper form would all those in favour of the request for leave to introduce the bill please say aye.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 36 was introduced and read a first time.]

#### TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a supplementary answer to Question No. 104.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table copies of the Municipal Statistics Report for the year 1972.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to file a report prepared for the Alberta Department of Advanced Education, and the British Columbia Department of Education, a copy of which report, Mr. Speaker, is being tabled on this date as well in the B.C. Legislature. The report is entitled, Toward A System of Adult Education for Northwestern Alberta and Northeastern British Columbia.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

##### Department of Industry and Commerce

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to report today on the significant outcome of yesterday's meeting in Vancouver of the four western provincial ministers responsible for transportation with the federal minister, the Hon. Jean Marchand.

As members of this House will recall, Premier Lougheed and the four western governments called upon the federal government at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference in Calgary to amend the National Transportation Act to ensure that transportation systems in Canada are responsive to regional development. And further, to ensure that, in areas where competition is not effective, appropriate government policy is involved.

Mr. Speaker, last July the federal government strenuously resisted the West's suggestion that this Act be amended. I am now pleased to report that at our meeting yesterday the federal Minister of Transport joined unanimously with the western ministers [saying] that "major revisions are required in national transportation policy". Mr. Marchand has joined the western viewpoint and has stressed the need that a mechanism be developed, so that the governments have an appropriate degree of influence in management of transportation systems in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, this is a significant change indeed. It is indicative of the success achieved as a result of the position taken by the Premier at the Western Economic

Opportunities Conference in Calgary. Mr. Marchand has agreed, as members of this House may have seen in the press last Friday and supported by his statements during the meeting yesterday, that competition, which is the basis of the National Transportation Act, is not working in some regions. Mr. Marchand has undertaken to discuss this matter with the federal cabinet and consult with the provinces so that we can actively participate in the development of a revitalized transportation policy which would be responsive to the regional needs of the country as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, it is important for members of this House to note that with regard to competition Mr. Marchand said, I quote:

I am not saying we should get away from competition as a basic concept, but we do need more effective controls where competition does not, in fact, exist.

I emphatically support this approach.

With regard to the important subject of rail cost disclosure, Mr. Marchand has now agreed to immediately investigate with his federal colleagues the introduction of legislation to ensure railways' cost disclosure, and continuance of that disclosure and data on rail costing, a subject of critical importance raised by Premier Lougheed at last summer's Calgary conference. The federal-provincial committee of officials on transportation has in this regard been asked to prepare a paper by September on why and in which regions competition has not proven effective, and to define alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, the question of the rapeseed transportation case was discussed. In view of the unsatisfactory decision by the Canadian Transport Commission, the western provinces decided to petition the federal government, via the [Lieutenant] Governor in Council, to initiate a full inquiry into the Canadian Transport Commission's rapeseed decision. The provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba yesterday signed a formal petition so that the federal cabinet, and not the Canadian Transport Commission, must now make its decision.

Many members of the Assembly may be aware that the railways recently announced significant freight rate increases on steel moving into western Canada. Following our discussion, Mr. Marchand has agreed to require the railways to remove these increases. In addition, the railways had intended to implement a 3.4 per cent surcharge tariff on all frozen rail rates to cover their increased fuel cost. We had lengthy discussion concerning the surcharge and I am pleased to announce that no surcharge will be allowed on any of the commodities classified under the rail rate freeze.

Mr. Speaker, western concerns over the availability of equipment for the movement of our commodities was extensively discussed. Most westerners are aware of the current chronic shortage of rail cars to move our products to market.

Two approaches have been devised to help correct this situation. First, a federal-provincial monitoring group is to be established to collect information on rail car inventories and availability. A report will be ready for our review at the next meeting of ministers to be held within several weeks.

Second, the federal government has agreed to spend \$3.4 million on a rail car repair program. They are also seriously considering the purchase of new cars. Mr. Marchand has also advised us that this department will be represented on the emergency grain movement committee in Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, one of the items on the agenda was that of air transportation. The western provinces pressed for significant consultation on Canada's strategy for air bilateral negotiations. As a preliminary step to achieving this, the Federal-Provincial Western Transportation Committee will develop a proposed mechanism for meaningful consultation on international air route negotiations. The four western ministers strongly stressed our need for input into third-level carriers. However there is still much more to be discussed on this subject.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that the meeting was very productive, in that for the first time the federal Minister of Transport, the Hon. Jean Marchand, agreed that "major revisions are required in national transportation policy." If you will excuse the pun, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are finally on the right track.

MR. CLAPK:

Mr. Speaker, in responding to the comments made by the Minister of Industry concerning the transportation meeting in Vancouver yesterday, might I say that we on this side of the House are pleased that the federal Minister of Transport at long last seems to be upon the right track. I think the fact that he is on this track now is indicative of the action of a large number of people in the business community, not only in this province but in western Canada, over a period of many years. Also, in fairness, Mr. Speaker, it's the

result of actions of the present administration and also action of the former administration, and particularly my colleague to my left, the former Minister of Highways.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we've had a very glowing report from the Minister of Industry today. The real test, though, is when the federal government puts these things out of words, but into real action. We've heard these kinds of commitments from Ottawa before, and actions will speak a darn sight more forcefully for legitimate western concerns than will announcements made by the federal Minister of Transport.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

#### Petrochemical Industry

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to continue the dialogue with the Minister of Industry and Commerce and ask the minister to report to the Assembly on his meetings this morning with the Hon. Mr. Gillespie and [to state] if the federal government is now in a position to support the concept of processing upstream as far as petrochemical plants are concerned in Alberta.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we had a three-hour meeting with Mr. Gillespie, my officials and his, and then Mr. Getty, Mr. Gillespie and I had a joint meeting. I think it was a good meeting. There appear to be indications that a change in attitude is present. Discussions were carried on on the potential of the petrochemical industry in Alberta, its growth and what the two governments might do and can do to hasten its becoming a reality and move on with the job.

Industrial objectives were discussed and I am pleased to state that in general terms the industrial objectives on the federal level and the provincial level are not that far apart, that is the processing of our resources. We would like to make it more definitive and say at the source, and that was an area of discussion. We also covered the matter of tariffs that was raised at WEOC. We had an opportunity to propose the involvement in the consulting process of the new Foreign Investment Review Act.

I might say in conclusion the federal minister covered quite extensively their continuing objective on the federal level of decentralising and allowing more regional decision or more regional input into the decision making of their department. Generally speaking Mr. Speaker, I think it was a very productive three hours.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Did the federal government through the hon. Mr. Gillespie make any specific commitment to help the government of the Province of Alberta in the development of a full-scale petrochemical industry in this province?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, as a definite definitive commitment, no. There were some general areas of mutual interest and concerns discussed with the intent that we would go back to our respective cabinets and discuss them.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question. Could the hon. minister tell the House whether or not the federal minister discussed with him the impact of the federal Foreign Investment Review Act on the Dow proposal?

MR. PEACOCK:

Not as a specific proposal, Mr. Speaker. But as I pointed out, we do have a mechanism now where the consulting process will have an Alberta input.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, can the minister advise the Assembly whether or not the Dow proposal will meet the requirements set out by the federal Foreign Investment Review Act?

MR. PEACOCK:

One word, Mr. Speaker. At this time I would say personally, yes.

Food Price Monitoring

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. I ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs if he is now prepared to table in the House the food-monitoring results that the Department of Consumer Affairs has been involved in?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, we can have some of those available within a short time. If the hon. member would give me a couple of days I will have them available.

I would like to table the information requested by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I have three copies.

MR. CLARK:

A follow-up question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Did the minister say that he would be prepared to table all the food-monitoring reports that the department has done, or some? I'd like all the reports from the department.

MR. DOWLING:

We will prepare exactly what we have available at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of the minister's answer yesterday, with respect to the fact that the increase in food prices in Alberta has been lower than the national average, can the hon. minister advise the Assembly from his sophisticated monitoring process why it is that the cost of living has gone up faster in Edmonton and Calgary than in Regina, Saskatoon, Winnipeg and Toronto?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I think bearing in mind the statistics of Statistics Canada and the national food prices index, I think it's rather amazing that in the two fastest growing cities of Canada, Edmonton and Calgary, there isn't an escalation of a further degree. I would like to also say, Mr. Speaker, that we now have, as I understand from the Minister of Manpower and Labour, something in the order of 100,000 new employees in this year as opposed to last year. Last month we had 8,000 new employees and 1,000 off the unemployment rolls. I don't think we are doing very badly in Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for clarification then. Can the minister advise the Assembly why it is that in the also rapidly growing city of Toronto the cost of living increase was lower than in the two cities in Alberta?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. There was some doubt about the propriety of the preceding supplementary, and this one is leading even further into the area of debate. I would suggest that if the hon. member wishes to debate that topic he might put it on the Order Paper in the usual way.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, could I ask a further supplementary question of the hon. minister? Can the minister advise the Assembly whether he has any information to give us some insight as to the difference between the cost of food increase in Saskatoon and Regina on the one hand, and Edmonton and Calgary on the other hand? The food increase, by way of explanation, in the two cities in Alberta was an 18 per cent increase, in the two ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member is proceeding to answer his own question. If he wants the information from the minister ...

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, on a further supplementary, the question was whether or not the government has any information as to the reasons why that difference exists.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, we do not have that type of information at the moment. However, the hon. member knows that one of the priorities of the present government is to develop processing plants, canning factories, et cetera, in western Canada rather than having to import all of these items from eastern Canada. I would imagine the fact that we now don't have all of these plants we would like to have in Alberta has some bearing on the costs in these other jurisdictions.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Foothills followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

#### Pheasant Population

MR. MCCRAE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Lands and Forests. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the winter has apparently ended in southern Alberta, I wonder if the minister could advise us what, if any, arrangements he has made for determining the number of pheasant birds that may have survived the winter down there, so that we will know what breeding population there will be next spring or summer?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, as a follow-up to questions on this subject from the hon. member late last year, we have undertaken to do a very careful assessment this spring of the pheasant population situation in their habitat areas of southern Alberta. This is done by having very precise crowing counts done at the appropriate time during the mating season. At that time we will be in a position to have a better assessment of what the population will be in 1975.

MR. MCCRAE:

A supplemental, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could advise us whether the Brooks hatchery will be open this year, or operational, and what progress is being made for a new hatchery in southern Alberta?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, the Brooks pheasant hatchery will be operational but at a very low level as it had been wound down by the previous government, having regard to the fact that the area that is occupied in Brooks is leased from the town of Brooks and the town of Brooks needs that land for future expansion - the happy situation of an expanding rural town in Alberta. We are integrating the future Brooks fish hatchery with the Brooks horticultural station as expanded by the Department of Agriculture.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

A supplementary to the minister. Is the minister still considering, in light of the material he has at this time, closing the 1974 pheasant season?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, that suggestion has been made to me. I do consider all suggestions and, of course, I am aware of the survey by the hon. member.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I would like to ask the hon. minister, if it would help him I've got two pheasants in my yard.

DR. WARRACK:

I didn't hear him so I hope he was joking.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You missed that one.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Carburetion Devices

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Has the hon. minister anything to report on his trip to Ottawa, particularly on major oil companies withholding carburetors of modern nature?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I haven't been able to locate any concrete information with regard to major oil companies withholding or preventing improved carburetion devices from coming on the market.

However, I can say that the new 1975 models will contain improved carburetion and also improved ignition systems as well as, I understand, catalytic mufflers. With these three devices, it is expected fuel efficiency will increase by something like about 13 per cent. However, I should indicate that the catalytic devices have to use non-leaded gasoline, and I'm not sure that there are too many outlets for non-leaded gasoline in Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

Farm Supplies - Shortages

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. What actions has the minister taken to investigate the bumper crop of shortages in farm supplies, such as bailer twine, fertilizer and barbed wire?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact those items have been adequately covered by the Minister of Agriculture and Deputy Premier. I would ask him to respond if he would.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond. Indeed at the meeting of the western premiers we also agreed to work with them jointly in relation to the serious situation in twine and barbed wire, particularly, which are in a major short supply because of world shortages. As a matter of fact, we have looked around the world for additional sources of twine, but world conditions in regard to the production of sisal in Bangladesh, Brazil, Portugal and Mexico have been such that the crop is short and twine is in a substantially short position on the world market. As a result of that the price is substantially higher.

We are, in my understanding, meeting with some of the agricultural suppliers and we are now going to get an increased supply from Mexico, but the price is going to be substantially higher than it was a year ago. With regard to barbed wire, this is one of the shortages of steel that really plagues us in western Canada and we are attempting to do something about it.

In relation to fertilizer, we are working jointly with the other western provinces in an attempt to have just as much fertilizer as we possibly can here in western Canada for use by our farmers. I did say, previously, that the demand, of course, is substantial but the production is also increased.

MR. SORENSON:

Supplementary to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Has the minister considered establishing a farm consumer committee composed of interested farmers to look into matters such as these?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I could also answer that supplementary question. In these inputs in agriculture, we are vitally concerned and I have asked the farm organizations to join with my department in a general monitoring situation with regard to input, costs and shortages in particular lines.

MR. SORENSON:

Supplementary to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Are there any farmers involved in research into any of our farm consumer problems in the Department of Consumer Affairs?

MR. DOWLING:

No, but as the Minister of Agriculture indicated they are in the Department of Agriculture.

#### WEOC Panels of Review

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question if I may to the hon. Deputy Premier. Can the Minister of Agriculture tell the Assembly whether or not the panels of review as set out in the communique of the Western Economic Opportunities Conference in Saskatoon, have been formally appointed as yet and set up?

DR. HORNER:

I'm not sure whether they have been formally appointed as yet, but certainly our officials have been informally in touch with the other provinces in this area. As a matter of fact, prior to the premiers' meeting, we had initiated such as a discussion with Saskatchewan in particular. I might just say, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation, this government works as a team.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

#### Provincial Parks - Tourist Accommodation

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Lands and Forests. In view of the very large increase expected in the number of tourists to Alberta during 1974, as announced by the Minister of Tourism, does the minister have any immediate plans for increasing tourist accommodation in provincial parks?

DR. WARRACK:

More than that, Mr. Speaker, we are doing it. We are in the midst of a very substantial expansion program as announced in the policy position paper tabled in this House in May of 1973. What we are doing is developing the previously undeveloped provincial parks of the province, for example, the substantial up-grading at Aspen Beach Provincial Park, the badly needed upgrading that was necessary in provincial parks and also we have established the Fish Creek Park in Calgary and are looking towards a comparable park in Edmonton.

MR. DRAIN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. minister considering adding Allison Creek, that very unique area, to the parks that can be developed?

DR. WARRACK:

Would the location of that creek happen to be in the member's constituency?

MR. DRAIN:

I confess that's correct.



MR. SPEAKER:

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

Hospitals - Gas Line Inspection

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, my question today is directed to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the minister advise the House if statutory regulations are being contemplated requiring that hospital gas lines be checked upon installation to prevent a mix-up such as occurred in Sudbury Hospital?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there are already in existence regulations that cover at least part of the sort of difficulty that was experienced at the Sudbury Hospital and which has become a nationally-known tragedy. To say that the regulations all exist in one set of regulations and relate specifically to gas lines is something that I couldn't call to mind without referring back to them, but a combination of requirements of the various building codes, I believe, taken together with established practices give reasonable - I would say fully adequate - protection. But I would be willing to review the matter again because of the hon. member's question.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister feel that a certified statement of an engineer or an architect on the job that the lines have been properly connected - is that considered adequate?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is clearly a matter of opinion. Perhaps he could rephrase it in some unobjectionable way.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the province have any inspectors to ensure that lines are properly hooked up?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there are, of course, building inspectors and gas installation inspectors who inspect all projects within the province. The brief review that I did of the Alberta regulations that relate to this was [done] at the time the Sudbury story became well-known, which is several weeks ago now. I think that what I should do is review that matter and if the hon. member's interest in it continues, as I'm sure it will, I'd be quite glad to deal with it later on.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Lethbridge Provincial Building

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Department of Public Works. Have tenders been called for the new provincial building in Lethbridge?

DR. BACKUS:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ANDERSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate as to when these tenders will be called?

MR. BACKUS:

I can't give an exact date, Mr. Speaker, but they will be called this year.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Alberta Oil Prices

MR. DIXON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the hon. the Premier. Mr. Premier, my question is in reference to oil prices and the statement in the Ontario Legislature yesterday by the Minister of Energy there that if Alberta attempted to market oil at world prices, they were going to appeal to the Ottawa government to freeze the price at around \$6 per barrel.

So, my direct question is, have there been any meetings or meetings scheduled with Ontario in order that we can get our story, or our issues, before them?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, there have been meetings with the government of the Province of Ontario with regard to the matter. I don't think it's too surprising to Canadians to see the Government of Ontario take such a decision, having regard to the fact that I'm sure they would be delighted to maintain the status quo in Canada of having a substantially higher per capita income in that province than exists here in the Province of Alberta, having over 50 per cent of the manufacturing in Canada, where we have about 4 per cent, and then continue to get cheap oil and cheap natural gas from the Province of Alberta.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Then if this is the case, we can take it that Alberta is not going to pay any attention to Ontario's reference to the federal government.

I was wondering, and I'd like to add this, Mr. Premier, as part of my question, does this weaken Alberta's constitutional case, with Ontario siding with Alberta that the federal government has constitutional control over oil prices at the wellhead in Alberta?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is clearly asking for some legal advice.

AN HON. MEMBER:

See your lawyer.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I'm not asking for legal advice, I'm asking, does Alberta agree that the federal government has constitutional rights? I think this is the issue we want to know as a people in the province.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the nature of that question really is answered. What I have said is that it is not surprising that the Government of Ontario takes that position. We will have further discussions with them but we would not anticipate that they would want to do anything other than keep the status quo and we are obviously taking the position that we shouldn't be involved in a position of selling a depleting natural resource, such as oil or natural gas, below value. When it comes to the matter of the constitutional position involved, that is just something we are going to have to see in the due course of time. All we can hope is that the members of this Legislative Assembly and the people of Alberta will support our position in attempting to assure that the provincial ownership over resources is maintained.

MR. DIXON:

A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, regarding prices. I take it from the Premier's remarks that anything below world prices would be selling Alberta resources at less than what they are valued at?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, when one talks about world prices it's a very complex subject and there are meetings going on all over the world today on the matter of pricing. I'm not in a

position to make any further comment with regard to pricing at this time. I certainly have seen an indication, in any event from Ontario, of a recognition that there should be a minimum of a 50 per cent increase in crude oil pricing. That in itself I suppose is some progress since late January.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Cypress with a supplementary, followed by a final supplementary by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

MR. STROM:

Is it the intention of the government to phase in to the world prices following the lifting of the freeze, if it is lifted, on April 1? I realize the hon. the Premier, Mr. Speaker, has suggested that he does not want to make a further statement on it, but I believe he has been reported in the press as saying he is not against that. Could he advise the House if this is still the intention?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'm just not in a position to elaborate further upon that important matter at this time.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier made reference of the fact that he wishes that he has support for his views in this House and I'm prefacing ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question, question.

MR. LUDWIG:

... my remarks with the fact that it appears that he has, but I'd like to ask him the question, has he got any commitment from the Conservative caucus in Ottawa whether they are with us or not?

[Interjections]

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes - because I don't think he has.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we take the view and we have taken it now for some nine years that we have a responsibility to the people of Alberta in the policy decisions we make in the Alberta ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please. Order please!

Perhaps we can come back to this very interesting topic if there is time left at the end of the Question Period.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview ...

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

Crowsnest Pass Freight Rates

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to either the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce or perhaps to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. In light of concern expressed by almost all farm leaders in the country about the actions of the rail ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please come directly to the matter of his own concerns.

MR. NOTLEY:

Can the hon. minister advise the Assembly what the discussion was with respect to the Crowsnest Pass rates at the recent meeting?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, the Crowsnest Pass rates are statutory and would take an act of parliament to change it and so we didn't discuss that.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. In light of the fact that many farm leaders are suggesting that the railways are deliberately trying to sabotage the hauling of grain, my question to you is, what is the position of the Alberta government with respect to the continuance of the Crowsnest Pass rates?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment from the point of view with regard to the Department of Agriculture.

I am very pleased to see that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview now appreciates there are such rates. The important facts, Mr. Speaker, are two. One - and we have been pressing this fact with Mr. Lang in relation to the feed grain policy - the important fact is this, that the Crowsnest Pass rates have been erroneously used to move feed grains into central Canada for the past 100 years at a subsidy of something like \$75 million a year to the people in central Canada. That does not mean to say that we should give up our Crowsnest Pass rates which are in effect for movement of grain into export position.

Boxcar Allocation

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question to either one of the ministers. Can either minister advise the House what the position of the government is with respect to mandatory allocation of boxcars by the federal government? Was this discussed at the meeting?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I thought I thoroughly discussed that on my report. There were three procedures that were discussed at the conference yesterday and action taken.

One was the fact that we would immediately effect a mechanism to monitor the systems, that is, the railway systems, to determine and identify the usage of of the cars and get the maximum usage.

Two was the repair of cars that the federal government had proceeded with in regard to the two rail systems, CPR and CNR.

Thirdly, there were independent areas in the Province of B.C. and Manitoba who were also directing their attention to the building of cars and that the federal government was doing an analysis to come up with a program of further construction of hopper cars.

MR. NOTLEY:

Just one final supplementary question for clarification, Mr. Speaker. Was there any discussion at the meeting, of the need or of the wisdom for parliament to pass an act

which would set a mandatory allocation of boxcars for grain deliveries and force the railroads by legislation to do this?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, in the Railway Act at the present time that in fact exists in Section 22 - I believe I quote - the systems will provide adequate vehicles or adequate equipment to move the commodity to market.

What the problem and the qualifier to it is, is that when a problem is uneconomic, which the railways are discussing and stating that it is because of a rate differential; we say there is no way that railways or anybody else can make those comments until we have full cost disclosure and know where we stand. And that is the position we are in.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

#### Hunting, - Provincial Parks

MR. WYSE:

A question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Will the provincial government's policy continue disallowing all hunting in Elkwater provincial park and the Cypress Hills?

DR. WARRACK:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, it is Cypress Hills Provincial Park and Elkwater is the townsite within it. We do intend to maintain the prohibition against hunting in provincial parks and that would, of course, include Cypress Hills Provincial Park.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Has the government any plans, or is it considering to any extent to thin out the elk and the moose in the park this year? And if they are, when will this take place and how will it take place?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Put it on the Order Paper.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, it is true that the number of elk in the park is becoming large enough to be of some difficulty, not only within the park as far as the available habitat is concerned, but in addition to that, as a boundary problem for the surrounding ranchers. We've been working with these people and discussing the matter with them to find ways, short of hunting within the provincial park, to deal with the problem.

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. When will the slaughter take place and who will be doing it, the game wardens or ...

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The same way as the black bear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is hypothetical, certainly in its practical effect, since the hon. minister has indicated the matter is under consideration.

MR. LUDWIG:

It's not a hypothetical question.

MR. STROM:

If I may, has the government made any decision as to a date when they will determine whether or not they will be thinning out the herd by permitting killing by staff or by someone else?

DR. WARRACK:

No, Mr. Speaker, we're not convinced that the circumstance is anything like that difficult at this time.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, one further supplementary question, then. Is the hon. minister saying that there really is no study being made of it at this time if there is no need of the thinning out as suggested?

DR. WARRACK:

No. As a matter of fact I said that we were making that study, Mr. Speaker, and that the results of the study to date did not indicate any need for a killing of the animals within the provincial park, and therefore, of course, there would be no slaughter.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Little Bow followed by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray.

#### Rural Gas Co-ops

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Telephones and Utilities. Is any consideration being given to increase subsidization of rural gas co-ops for the installation cost of outlets for irrigation sprinkler systems?

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, there is no intention at the present time for changing the ground rules for the rural gas plan as announced last year.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, to the minister, is it the policy of the government then to have each gas outlet, whether residential or for farm purposes such as irrigation - to each pay \$1,700?

MR. FARRAN:

No, Mr. Speaker, that's not part of the rural gas plan, if the hon. member has read it. The basic premise is that the farmer pays \$1,700 towards the capital cost and a government grant of \$1,300 brings it up to a total of \$3,000. But there are many gas co-ops that can and do, by a free vote of their board of directors, tie on other classes of customers such as hamlets, rural service stations, maybe sometimes giving two outlets to a farmer at a slightly extra cost. These co-operatives are completely independent in the way they operate above those guidelines.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

#### Fort McMurray Highway

DR. BOUVIER:

I'd like to direct my question today to the Minister of Highways and ask the hon. minister if they are planning to complete the McMurray Highway this year, cement being available?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have every intention of completing that project this year, in 1974, weather permitting.

DR. BOUVIER:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the department also planning a scale on the highway north of Wandering River so as to protect the highway that is being built?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we're planning scales in several locations in the province in this coming year to protect the highways.

DR. BOUVIER:

Another supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister also planning any construction on a road north of Fort McMurray towards Fort Chipewyan and Fort Smith - and it probably could serve Russellville at the same time?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, during the Estimates that will be dealt with.

DR. BOUVIER:

One further supplementary, probably to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. What is being done at the present time in Fort McMurray where developments are taking place to protect the gravel for future use on the highways and so forth?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is probably aware, there has been a pretty extensive gravel-removal and stockpiling program under way. This was based on two things: first of all, the needs of government and the projected needs of private industry in the Fort McMurray region for the coming years, and secondly, the development plans which are underway for new residential subdivisions. So in summary one could say there's a coordinated, phased program of gravel removal, rehabilitation of the site and conversion to future residential subdivisions where those gravel deposits occur.

DR. BOUVIER:

One final supplementary, if I may, to the Minister of Highways. Are there any plans this year in the department for any improvement to the airport road from Highway 63 to the McMurray airport?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Not actually Mr. Premier, or Mr. ...

[Laughter]

... the hon. gentleman for Lac La Biche.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

#### Spring Floods

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment. With the ever-increasing amount of snowfall, has his department made an assessment or a study as it relates to possible flooding this spring?

MR. YURKO:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is a process that goes on continuously within my department at this time of the year.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Could we have the latest summary then as it relates at this time?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member, I believe, used the word "summary", and if it is, then perhaps it could be dealt with now, and if it's otherwise the hon. minister might wish to make a statement at the appropriate time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar followed by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

Telephone Listings - Government of Canada

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, just a word of explanation. I just happen to have the Edmonton telephone directory here and my ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

B-U-C-K.

[Laughter]

DR. BUCK:

... and my question is to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. The thing that irritates me, Mr. Speaker, is that when you look under Government of Canada the first listings are in French, and then you have the Alberta government listings and then the English ones. My question is, would the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs be so kind as to commence negotiations with the Quebec government so that in their directory we will be listed in English first and French secondly?

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. member might direct his question to the federal and Quebec governments and the city of Edmonton.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this is what the department was set up for, intergovernmental affairs, and I would ask the hon. minister if he could start negotiations with the Quebec government to have this change made in their directory?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, there are a series of irritants that we've been able to establish between ourselves and ...

[Laughter]

... the federal government, but the one the hon. member raises is well down on the list of priorities.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, this question is to the Attorney General in order mostly that he won't feel neglected during the question period. It has to do, Mr. Speaker, with a study by an Ontario law committee, which concluded that the division of assets at the dissolution of a marriage was not equitable. My question to him is, is there any consideration being given to reopening The Dower Act with a view to making amendments to overcome these inequalities which do exist in the Province of Alberta at this time?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, that matter was dealt with, as I recall, at some length by the hon. Solicitor General a little while ago when she reported on the progress of an extensive study in this entire area which has been under way with the Institute of Law Research and Reform for some time. As I recall, the substance of that report by the hon. Solicitor



General was to the effect that the Institute hoped to have a working paper out in the immediate future and would then solicit comments from all those persons who were interested in that subject.

In light of that work and the eminence of that report, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't anticipate introducing any amendments such as the hon. member refers to.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

#### The Veterans' Land Act

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. the Premier. Can the Premier advise if his government has had an opportunity to assist the impact on Alberta veterans, should the federal government terminate The Veterans' Land Act on March 31?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I haven't. At one stage I considered that question might be hypothetical but I'd revise it and take it as notice.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the hon. Premier advise if it is the intention of his government to make representation to the Prime Minister on behalf of Alberta's veterans, in view of the federal government's commitment to reconsider terminating The Veterans' Land Act?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that is the sort of situation in which we consider it very appropriately and clearly within the jurisdiction entirely of the federal government. We believe the responsibility of the federal Members of Parliament is in that area. I think it is important that the provincial government, if it is taking strong positions with regard to its own jurisdiction, equally respect the jurisdiction of other governments.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder.

#### Landlord-Tenant Legislation

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I believe my question should be to the hon. Attorney General.

Will the government be bringing in any landlord and tenant legislation in this session?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I don't anticipate the government to be bringing in any legislation in that area at this session.

MR. LUDWIG:

Is any study being conducted to determine whether there may be a need for amending or bringing in a new act?

MR. LEITCH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Just recently I arranged with the expanded Institute of Law Research and Reform to undertake a review of tenancy law within the Province of Alberta. I was speaking to the deputy director just recently. He is very optimistic about being able to get some expert assistance in that area during the coming summer. If that turns out to be the fact, I would hope that there would be a report within our hands within a relatively short time on that topic.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Calder.

Suffield Block

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Mines and Minerals. It's with regard to the drilling program and the evaluation program at Suffield. I was wondering what the current status is? How many wells have been drilled to date and what is the success ratio? Could he give us any idea of the reserves that have been developed to date?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is clearly one of considerable importance but it does have the ring of a question which perhaps should be put on the Order Paper.

The Chair regrets that again there were several members who did not get an opportunity to ask their first questions. Perhaps it may be necessary to have a closer look at the rules with regard to questions and answers, so that we may get to all the members who wish to ask at least their first question.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER:

May I respectfully draw to the attention of members of the House that there is not on the Order Paper any item which would ordinarily come up on Thursday afternoon at 4:30 o'clock. Hon. members may wish to give some thought as to what might occur at that time.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, in that connection, pursuant to Rule 8, if there are no public bills by private members at 4:30 o'clock, my understanding is we would move to Government Bills and Orders and second readings. However, if at 4:30 o'clock the debate is of such a nature and extent that the House feels it would wish to pursue the resolution about to be started or other resolutions, then we will certainly not press the point at that time.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend that since this is private members' day, notwithstanding that there are no private bills or private public bills on the Order Paper, that we deal with private members' issues on a Thursday, which is the day allotted to private members.

MR. SPEAKER:

I assume that the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View is aware that a departure from the rules would require the unanimous consent of the House.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

105. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following question:

(a) How many abortions did Medicare pay for in

1. the year 1972?
2. the year 1973?

(b) What was the total amount of money paid by Medicare for abortions in

1. the year 1972?
2. the year 1973?

## MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Mr. Diachuk proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

Be it resolved that our universities and public colleges be encouraged to

- (a) grant a preference in favour of Canadians rather than non-Canadians in hiring academic staff, and
- (b) ensure that non-Canadian students have access to all programs of study provided that Canadian students occupy a very high percentage of the spaces available in each program.

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in introducing this motion shown as Motion No. 1 on the Order Paper. These questions are so often a topic of discussion amongst groups of people, and as I have worded my resolution that preference be given in favour of Canadians, I wish to elaborate on the resolution.

First, I would like to set the records clear that I have no interest in any university or college, neither am I against any university or college in particular. But on any one day of the week, one can get an earful that, for example, some 90 per cent of our textbooks are printed outside of Canada. Our children know more about the United States' geography, the United States' history, the United States' politics than they do about their Canadian history and geography.

Now unless some solid and exact guidelines are set up to favour Canadians - and here I would like to elaborate that I look at the people involved in the field of secondary education who are not landed immigrants, or are here on visitors' visas, or exchange visas and are only here temporarily. These people are exempted from my argument. My argument is that the people who spend years in this country get even a security of tenure on the staff of one of the schools of secondary education, and continue to maintain their citizenship outside of Canada.

Immediately we look at some of the standards that these people come from, we do have different objectives and even different goals. We must be aware that whether the people are academics from the United States or other parts of the world, it takes them some time to accept, agree or even to promote and work towards the objectives and goals that our society looks for. I have noticed that academic people seem to favour, and it is natural, to favour fellow graduates from their own alma mater, and this is very easy when you get someone from another school to come in and become a head of a faculty, a head of a department or a head of a college and then completely fill that staff with people from that particular school, and so often people who are non-Canadians.

We look at the amounts of money that are budgeted throughout our country, which is definitely in the millions of dollars, to create jobs for our Canadian young people, and then we close our eyes when job opportunities are lost to non-Canadians. And even before they have sufficient residence or even before they have citizenship, people take the jobs that we attempt to get for our young Canadian people, or even people who have continued further studies.

Many arguments can be placed with regard to the fact that it doesn't take much investment in these people who come with complete education from another country and become members of our academic staff. We don't invest anything in their secondary or elementary education, or their high school education and, therefore, even their university education. Here we have a finished product that didn't cost us one cent and they are serving and producing. When they do that on an exchange, on a temporary visa or a visitor's visa, I can accept it. But when they continue this for a very long period of time, I raise a question. And that is why I've phrased my first part of the resolution that Canadians rather than non-Canadians be given preference in being hired to these schools.

In the case of the second part of my resolution pertaining to students, here I say that only when space is available non-Canadians be encouraged to take up the space and even be permitted to come in as students to our schools of secondary education. In this way, a very high percentage, I am confident, would be occupied by Canadians, by the sons and daughters of the people who pay our taxes.

In the case of foreign students who come on post-graduate work, I have been advised that in some fields - and I will not mention any specific field here - but in some fields some of these people become professional students. They go on to their second and third time doing post-graduate studies. His or her parent, or whoever is the sponsor of their studies here in this country, seems to be able to have sufficient funds to continue their studies here and they occupy a place in our school of post-graduate studies - may it be medicine, may it be engineering or any other. The same should apply to post-graduate students. This should be on a basis of Canadian students getting first preference. If there are any vacancies, then the opportunity and even encouragement should be given to students from the United States or any other land, to come and take up the space.

Looking at some of these areas, it is an ideal way to come in and get a foothold on becoming a Canadian citizen. This, in a way, is almost contrary to some of our far-reaching and expansive foreign aid programs.

We can't really legislate, but we must encourage the people - give these people permission to come in and work their way into becoming citizens when they find out what a great land it is to live in, when they initially came in on a promise to return to their homeland to do further work in their land - that they do hold to their promise and return then on the same basis that any one of their other countrymen have to come in.

I appreciate that immigration is not a provincial responsibility but here is an area in which we must influence the powers that be, possibly through our universities, by indicating to them that they do give preference here to students who are of Canadian origin or of Canadian birth.

I urge that our Minister of Advanced Education, in discussions with the federal authorities and particularly when it comes to discussion of the cost of our post-graduate or secondary schools, raise these items and that the federal people be aware that some of us are concerned that students return to their homeland and then apply - as all other citizens, whether of the United States or any country in Asia, Europe, Africa or even Australia - and that they come in on the same basis as anyone else from that nation.

We don't want to sound as if we are going to be discriminating against them. All we want to do is give preference to our Canadian academic staff and to our Canadian student population to have the first opportunity for places rather than have a high ratio of people coming in and then find out that our people must seek accommodation in schools of higher education, possibly even in the United States.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this motion I appreciate the very fine motives of the honourable mover, but I'm a little disturbed about an approach of this nature. When I look at this Assembly I realize how many of our parents and grandparents would probably never have made it across the prairies if there were any kind of intention to exclude the outsider.

So when we look at the universities and we have professors coming from all over, one couldn't deny the fact that perhaps we had some we were not happy with. Some professors, some great people who perhaps just didn't fit with us, or maybe told us things about ourselves that we didn't like to hear. But all in all, our universities became great because we had a tremendous input from people from other universities throughout the world. I think that to that extent we are way ahead of what we might have gained by being restrictive and by giving preference to our own. It's very nice to be that way. I think that by and large it's human nature to sort of tend to favour those who are here and are closer, but how long does a person have to be in Alberta to become an Albertan?

We may become sort of a little nationalistic, if I may use that word, with reference to our province. It's a wide-open system in Canada, there are no borders at which we have to show our passports, we are a migratory kind of fast-moving country. Even when we become smug about our wealth and oil and everything, Mr. Speaker, people from other provinces can move here, if we have more industry and the means of earning a living, move in overnight and share everything we have without exception. Many of us got here probably in the same way.

I'm beginning to feel more and more, when I look around Alberta, that some of the blessings we have came from outsiders, some of the ethnic influences. If we go back far enough, we'll find that perhaps the foreigner who took some of our jobs away is the man

who made our country a little bit more worth-while. If you carry this back far enough you'll find that perhaps we ought to be prepared a bit to share with those who come here. Perhaps because they are starving in their country, they see a good thing and are reluctant to go back. I am even beginning to think in recent days, that maybe when we see how we are bulging with money even though we are complaining about the cost of food et cetera, we have lots. Maybe we could even afford to show a little bit of a humanitarian and a civilized attitude and start sharing some of our things voluntarily with people who are starving, who are dying from want.

So I can't begrudge someone who came from some country like India or any of these countries that are really down and out, came here to make a living. They haven't deprived us of anything, maybe some opportunities, but competition makes us all the stronger. I think that if there is anywhere we don't want to get this kind of attitude - we've got it made and everybody else keep off - it is in our education system.

We're teaching tolerance, we're teaching understanding and we're teaching appreciation of the view of the other person, and I favour this. I favour that if people want to come here and they have something to offer, or they are prepared to work a day's work even if they might displace someone in this country who thinks he has it made and isn't cutting it, then in the long run we're going to win.

Something else that concerns me and ought to concern a lot of us is, we will never be able to remain in a population vacuum in this province. We'd like to keep it all to ourselves, but our instincts tell us we need more industry, we need more of everything, more facilities, because we are going to get more people. Everything we do, everything we say is beckoning other people to come here because we have lots of things. It might happen that we might have to share the things we have with more people, who perhaps when they come here as foreigners don't even understand us but when they come here sometimes they become more grateful than the people who were born here.

So I always felt that if an Alberta graduate wanted a job, he should be given the job, all things being equal. But I was never too concerned about someone coming from outside who had better qualifications if someone needs him. But under our system generally they will not refuse a person from another province, from the U.S. or from Britain or from wherever you might name. They will not refuse to hire a good man or a good lady or anyone.

I've had teachers who came from foreign lands and I think they've imparted something more to me than I might have got had we had a sort of restrictive policy towards people coming in. I believe that even our English language may have improved considerably because we permitted immigrants, and not only those from Britain.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to question the motives of the honourable mover, but this kind of motion could lend itself to misinterpretation as to what the result will be. Surely we tend to favour our own as I stated, but once a person comes to this country and establishes himself and shows that he can get a job whether he is black, white, or red, or what have you, then he becomes one of us and he is accepted. We help him. In fact we protect his rights to practise his own culture and encourage it and spend money, not because we want somebody to speak a foreign language, but we feel that it will enrich our own life and we know this.

In our city alone, this city is great for all the different ethnic groups we have. It's becoming a great city, not because we said we have a sign that we don't want any foreigners to tell us what to do, but because in practise the opposite is true. We can go around everywhere and enjoy the benefits of other cultures, other peoples' arts, other peoples' food, other peoples' ways of life and we all know this and we've all appreciated it.

I think that as time went by we began just not to tolerate people who come from outside, but we like them to come here now. Sometimes their children and even they will take some of our jobs.

I don't know where to stand on this motion really, because we are all human and we wouldn't want to see Albertans graduate without jobs. But if there were not jobs available generally, people would not be coming here because when they come here they must get employment and establish themselves. Perhaps all of them don't, but I'm thinking that some day, and it's fast becoming that way, Alberta will be one of the greatest places to live because we are tolerant and we're understanding.

In our universities, it never bothered me that the people who sat on either side of me were either coloured or something else, I didn't take note of it. Perhaps we can reverse our position and state that we are prepared to appreciate some of the fortunes we have here. But for the grace of God we'd be begging somewhere else for jobs too. Some of these fortunes that fell to us were not the result of our own industry and our own policy and ingenuity, but we happened to inherit something and other countries would do as well, if not better, if they had these things.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that the general tone of the motion doesn't rest too well in light of the practice we have undertaken. We practise a rather great and not a benevolent attitude, I don't feel we are doing anybody a favour who wants to come here and work seven or eight days a week to earn a living. But we've done well. I think that some of these people who come here with nothing in their pockets but a desire to make good are paying taxes and helping pay our way perhaps. Perhaps we ought to look at some of the things we are doing in our society. Where are we breaking down, perhaps from within - where our own people, rather than progressing and competing and forging ahead, are gravitating towards the guaranteed income by way of welfare.

I know there are exceptions. We've had some professors from the U.S. for whom certainly it would have been best if they had been turned back. But I'd hate to know what this province and our university would be like if we had a closed-door policy to employment, Alberta-first, Canada-first, and everybody else after. I think this would be a pretty poor place to live in, and I hope that someone amends this motion or that we just let it sit where it is. I don't think we want to publicize the fact that we'd like to keep a little bit of a dog-in-the-manger attitude.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

I would like to stress the fact that we should look and see, with the benefits we have and the money that is coming in rather freely at the expense, perhaps, of other countries, whether we couldn't be a little more generous and extend an invitation to help those who want to come here, more than we are now, let them study here, and those who wish to, go back. Many have gone back. Some other hon. members might take issue with me, but I believe what I said was sincere and I think that no matter whether we pass this motion or not, we will continue to practise a rather open-door policy.

We have hundreds of millions of acres of land in this province which haven't been touched yet. Beyond the borders of this province, there is wilderness as far as you can see. Sometimes you get tired flying over it, while other people are crawling over each other like ants. I think we could be a little more open-minded about people coming in.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed, agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

I wouldn't mind whether they come from any part of the world in fact, some of us wouldn't mind if we had more people from Quebec come in here and help us develop this wonderful province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I have a few views on this which I would like to express and I'll do my utmost to be as brief and close to the point as possible. I guess I could discourse about flying over the many millions of acres which are untouched yet in Canada and our need to populate them all. But I don't think the resolution really directs itself to that issue at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, the first portion of the resolution deals with the preference or otherwise in favour of Canadians relative to non-Canadians in the staffing of our educational institutions.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that all else being equal, of two applicants, and I underline all else being equal - that means the qualifications of two applicants - if one is Canadian and the other is non-Canadian, then I would think it would be desirable to employ the Canadian. I say that simply from the point of view of the continuity at the educational institution.

At the same time, I would have to add a slight qualification. I think it is essential in our universities and institutions of education that we have a sufficient variety of background to represent a broad perspective. I think there are more ways than hiring non-Canadians that this can be achieved and one of these ways, of course, is to employ staff who have been trained other than in Canada, which relates rather interestingly to the second point in the resolution.

I do not think we have a problem of any consequence in our universities at the present time in this respect. I am not aware of one, so I have to say that from my present

knowledge of the situation, I do not think this to be a concern. It may have been, Mr. Speaker, a concern some years ago. And I think I can put my finger on some reasons why some people may have been concerned a few years ago.

We went through a very rapid expansion of our educational institutions, particularly our universities. At that time it was well-nigh impossible to find Canadians who were trained and qualified relative to the non-Canadians who were available to staff those institutions. The reason is a very simple one. There were not, at that time, graduate schools available in Canada to train Canadians. Generally speaking, insufficient numbers had travelled abroad for training overseas, in the United States or outside our borders.

It's no secret that, if we look at the proportion of the population which is university trained in Canada as opposed to those in the United States, the United States leads by a considerable number. This was even more so, I believe, a few years back. So I would submit that given equal qualifications and having in mind the desirability especially in some faculties, of having a breadth of perspective, it would be, I think, desirable to hire Canadians first.

I would like to believe we should be proud of our nation. We should consider some Canadian influence as a desirable and necessary characteristic towards the strengthening of the nation and this should be felt, at least to some extent, in our universities. I would like to suggest that there may be in some of our hiring practices a desire to employ a 'made in Harvard' or 'made in Cambridge' label. This was, I believe, again more true in years past than today. I understand it is quite a feather in one's cap to have now a 'made in Alberta' label, especially if one is from the Faculty of Education or several other faculties, which are very highly regarded. I believe rather than a blanket label 'made in Harvard', 'made in Chicago', or whatever it is, which used to reflect a bit of class-consciousness among the world of the academics, we are now a little more discriminating and there is a sincere effort to consider the strength of the particular faculty at a given university. So again I believe we have moved away from what may have been a bit of a concern some years ago.

Referring to the second portion of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, I would like to state my view on the Canadian versus non-Canadian student in this way, we have a responsibility in this province to make the opportunity available to all students from Alberta. I think that is our prior responsibility. I think we have a responsibility to accept students from other countries. Landed immigrants I suppose would have a preference over those who are not. But, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that our land is wealthy enough and our society is wealthy and sufficient enough that we should be proud of the opportunity to do our bit to make the world family a more pleasant, better qualified, and better educated family. I believe this means we should accept students from other lands.

This has to follow, Mr. Speaker, from my own background. I was partially trained outside of Canada. I may say at the time when I tried to obtain training, in the circumstances in which I found myself, I just couldn't find a comparable opportunity in Canada. I can say in retrospect that even had I been able to find it, I am sure the training I received was more beneficial, in the circumstances in which I received it, than a training in Canada. It gave me a different perspective than I otherwise would have obtained, a different outlook. I think that is all to the good.

Mr. Speaker, we overcame our shortage of trained, well-qualified Canadian staff members by having these staff members trained outside of our borders. I think it would be a shame indeed if we were to adopt a policy that would close opportunity to students from other lands to take advantage of similar opportunities in Alberta. I reiterate that I do think we have to have regard to a priority, which is our own students. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that we have ample opportunity in our Alberta institutions to do both and that furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we have a responsibility to do both. To do otherwise, would be to fail to accept our responsibility to the worldwide human family. Mr. Speaker, I believe that expresses the very brief viewpoint that I wish to address to the members.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a few comments to the motion which has been sponsored by the Member for Edmonton Beverly. In saying that, I would like to say that I, too, am a Canadian as is the Member for Edmonton Beverly, and a proud one. When I first looked at the motion several days ago, I thought that on the surface it was a good one. But then in giving it further consideration I can see that it produces many problems, problems which, if in fact we were to proceed with this resolution, would be contrary to The Alberta Bill of Rights in principle, because the wording of the resolution mentions preference and favouritism. Whenever you give preference and favouritism, certainly somewhere you have to discriminate.

But I'm not going to debate the pros and cons on that aspect of the resolution. I think that when we come down to the nitty gritty of selecting people to staff our universities and colleges, I think we should take a look at the qualifications and experience of the applicant rather than his nationality. We must be sure that we are getting the very best of staff for our universities and colleges to ensure that we can impart the proper educational standards to our students.

I think one of the problems in the past is that we had a lot of migration, an exodus if you will, of qualified Canadian people going to other countries. This was indeed a problem and at that time, a decade ago, it was called the brain drain from Canada into the U.S.

AN HON. MEMBER:

We should have let a few more go. Some we kept, we didn't need.

MR. HO LEM:

The solution to this problem, of course, and it has resulted in some measure of success, is that in the meantime we were able to provide adequate facilities, facilities that were competitive with facilities found elsewhere in the world. We were able to offer competitive courses in these facilities with background and backup technical personnel. I think because of that, we were able to overcome that problem. Information Canada now says that the foreign personnel coming into Canada continues but, on the other hand, Canadian personnel going out of this country has somewhat stabilized. So on the strength of that statement, I feel we can say that certainly some of the problems have been arrested.

But what about the people who are coming into Canada and staffing our universities? What is the situation there? I think we can simply say that it is the process of the law of supply and demand in regard to university personnel. If the Canadian supply does not meet the present demands, the importation of foreign people is necessary to fill these slots. It's just that simple.

Part (b) of the resolutions reads:

ensure that non-Canadian students have access to all programs of study provided that Canadian students occupy a very high percentage of the spaces available in each program.

I think that sounds very nice if it can be achieved, but the problem there is again, when we're talking about enrolment in universities, many universities, because of the drop in their enrolment, are playing the numbers game. They have to get the numbers in in order to get their grants. So this takes precedence over the selectivity of the actual student.

Here again, we have to go back to the principle of competition, how our universities in Canada or in Alberta compare with others. If it's favourable, we're going to have our students naturally choose to study within our own institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just speak briefly regarding the Chinese students in the Alberta universities and colleges. I recall last year there was a statement made by a dean of the University of Alberta suggesting at that time that a quota system be set up and applied to Chinese students in Alberta. We felt that this statement was most unfair. It was based on little thought and no research, nor was thought given to the actual problem, if there was one. There were statements made by the same dean saying that the Chinese students were undesirable because they were clannish; they didn't want to mix with people. I suppose that in his eyes, the Chinese students were a visible minority because they are smaller-built in stature and they have a different complexion, and if one or two get together they are very noticable, more noticable perhaps than the other ethnic members of the student body.

There were other charges that as a result of that, the Chinese students took the initiative to call a meeting with the hon. Minister of Advanced Education to bring forth their points. It was proven at that meeting, you recall, that the Chinese student population stayed together in certain groups because of mutual interests - language, food and cultural interests - and in fact it was pointed out to the minister that these Chinese students were good students. They had good academic achievements. The students, Mr. Speaker, objected violently to the proposed increase in fees which were changed from \$400 in one institution to \$1,000, applying only to foreign students. We feel that this is very unfair, and I hope that the minister would be able to review that procedure again.

Mr. Speaker, if one of the purposes of this motion is to try to achieve a better degree of Canadian context or a higher degree of Canadian context, a greater degree of Canadianism, in the area of more facts, information and examples that relate to our social and political context, then I accept that the objective is a valid one and a desirable one. I would suggest that such a principle would be acceptable to most members of this Assembly. But it is not necessarily achieved by making sure that teachers are Canadians.



Surely I think that the emphasis should be put on our textbooks, to make sure that they contain information on our own country. I don't care if our teachers are from Timbuktu, so long as they are teaching from the textbooks which have been accepted by Albertans and by Canadians.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I have to oppose this resolution. I oppose giving preferences to Canadians in the hiring of staff because we must be completely objective in this area in order to obtain the best staff available for the benefit of our students. I oppose the quota system as such. We must encourage - and not legislate - Canadians to attend our own universities and colleges by ensuring that our institutions are highly competitive in all areas such as facilities, adequate staffing and other other amenities.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the mover is taking a very paternal attitude towards our students in this regard. I don't think this is really necessary. I for one, like many others, am proud to be a Canadian and to do those things that would benefit all Canadians. I don't think this resolution is really intended to produce that type of result.

I think further, Mr. Speaker, it is insulting to our Canadian professional teachers and professors to suggest that they must be given preference to compete for a position. I'm sure that they are not requesting this type of preference and they wouldn't be very happy with this proposal.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I don't feel that we should take this first step towards a closed-shop concept, which will ultimately, if this motion is passed, result in that type of discriminatory action by our Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, to speak on such an item as education, the core, the hub of our society, at this time in a rapidly expanding knowledge-packed world, is certainly very timely. Mr. Speaker, to speak on this motion "Be it resolved that our universities and public colleges be encouraged to" and specifically referring to (a), "grant a preference in favour of Canadians rather than non-Canadians in hiring academic staff," I would like to make these few comments.

The answer is simply this. They do have a preference. They have a preference because they are here. They are here in Canada and Alberta in greater numbers. They live here, they've been educated here, and the opportunity for them is first. And I hope that is the only preferential treatment that would be granted to them.

Having said this, Mr. Speaker, there is a great number of other points that I suggest should be considered with respect to this item, that is, regarding Canadian or non-Canadian academic staff at universities or colleges. I would hope that when this item in fact is applied and a decision has to be made regarding the choice, all aspects are considered regarding that particular individual. Not only his academic training, but also his experience. When I speak of experience, I mean not necessarily experience in a specific academic field, but experience in having gone far afield in other parts of the world. That experience, I think, is very valuable.

In addition to that, of course, Mr. Speaker, there is the item of research, background and experience and added to those, personality and so forth. So, Mr. Speaker, on the surface this item (a) may appear very minor in fact. But, when one considers all the items with respect to this - training, experience - it becomes much more complex than it appears in the resolution itself. I think the important thing here, Mr. Speaker, is that we, as Canadians - and I'm sure all countries have the same problem - that the public at large has to accept this when in fact it does happen that a non-Canadian is accepted over a Canadian. The question has to be asked, why does this happen and why is the public not informed? I think this is an important area and I think universities as well as governments have a responsible role here to explain this clearly, as has been explained, as a matter of fact, by some members already. So as I speak on this experience, research, academic training, and background I think it plays a very vital role in the final selection of that person even if the academic training is actually equal.

This experience, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, brings about a new breadth, a new depth in the learning experience, not only amongst the academic staff themselves at the university level, but also a new depth and breadth to the students themselves. For after all, we have stated that universities and colleges are seekers of universal truths.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker - and there are many people outside of Canada, of course, who are trained extremely well as we all know, and I'm sure will acknowledge - this is not to say that Canadians themselves have not contributed fantastically in many, many areas of the arts and science around the world and for Canada. But the bringing in of non-Canadians to the academic field, or any field for that matter, bringing about this so-called - if I may use the expression - cross-breeding, must result in a better product, in new thoughts, new experiences and so forth. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think that the application of the non-Canadian in the academic staff is vital in order to assure ourselves that we in Canada do not become narrowed, stagnant and apathetic.

Concluding on this particular point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend very strongly that non-Canadian academic staff who do in fact obtain positions in our Canadian and Albertan universities and colleges remain here only for one, two, possibly three or four years. If they do remain after that point they should be required to apply for landed immigrant status and citizenship. If they remain beyond that point - x-point that could be defined, and I suggest it should be, the question has to be asked, why not?

The other recommendation I make regarding this point (a), Mr. Speaker, is an expanded item for consideration by our government, the Canadian government, that more Canadians in fact, should be encouraged to take up academic posts. All too often we hear Canadians crying, and I suggest they are false tears. They say, how come a non-Canadian has taken that position? Yet when you check with the head of the department at the university or college you hear very clearly the sound coming through that our Canadian boys are not interested in that area because it doesn't pay as much, the business world is much more interesting. I suggest that maybe a little bit of public relations by the university, et cetera, would fill this post.

Mr. Speaker, turning to point (b) on the item, that is:

ensure that non-Canadian students have access to all programs of study provided that Canadian students occupy a very high percentage of the spaces available in each program.

Mr. Speaker, again there can be no quarrel with this item in principle because in fact, again, I suggest that our students are here, they are trained here and the accessibility of the post-secondary institutions are already there.

However, the question must be asked, and has been asked by many of our constituents - and I'm sure everyone's constituents here - how many, what percentage of non-Canadians take up our seats at our universities and colleges while our daughters, our sons are turned away? Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you and to the members of this Assembly this is a very highly-charged question, especially when a son or daughter or anyone is turned away because of a difference in percentage of maybe a half per cent, a point of a per cent, 1, 2 or 3 per cent. Or worse still, when in fact, the son or daughter of that individual has an average mark of 70 per cent, 80 per cent or even 90 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, the percentage of [non-]Canadian students who are admitted is probably not very high but it's high enough when it affects those specific individuals. And if it's a specific son or daughter and a non-Canadian comes in and takes up that position, I feel it's a very, very difficult thing to accept - and very difficult to explain to constituents. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the question that should be asked, if not in fact demanded, is what is the policy of each faculty at university and college level in this regard specifically. Why is this not made public? I think this knowledge should, in fact, be public. It is a very important item. It affects all of us. Of course, I don't think we should object to non-Canadians taking up positions. But if in fact they do, the numbers should be known clearly for the citizens at large to also voice their acceptance or rejection based on some judgment.

Mr. Speaker, it is a difficult question obviously, but I don't think it is that difficult if we address our minds to it. I suggest in conclusion that universities and colleges have a responsibility to advise the public clearly regarding numbers and percentages of non-Canadian students who occupy various positions, to explain clearly to the public why and what the rationale is behind it.

Mr. Speaker, although I generally agree that Canadian students should be first - and they are first - because of their presence here, I also feel very strongly and unequivocally that non-Canadian students - an X percentage, and probably a very low percentage - should also have that opportunity. These questions, Mr. Speaker, must be answered again with a rationale that will apply to non-Canadian academic staff as well as non-Canadian students. Students, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, get a new perspective by coming to Canada. They get a more universal perspective and by being here and relating to our students they in turn get a new, fresh perspective.

Mr. Speaker, finally on a conciliatory note, I think it is vital for all the members of the Assembly to recognize and realize that many, many of our students also go abroad and obtain their post-secondary education at other universities. As a matter of fact, it

has been stated that sometime in the past number of years more of our students have occupied spaces in some [other] universities. I think this is gradually reversing. Thus the benefits, Mr. Speaker, are in fact bilateral for the Canadians and non-Canadians. If we close our doors to non-Canadians we would undoubtedly lose a very important, vital universal benefit - the benefit of other countries in experience and perspective - and vital, I think, in a shrinking world. A world bubbling with knowledge.

Having said this, there is another issue relating to this in the resolution concerning non-Canadians. It is exemplified by those students who have a student visa and decide to stay here after they obtain their post-secondary education rather than return to their homeland to give their people in their homeland the necessary expertise that undoubtedly they require. Mr. Speaker, we undoubtedly benefit if these people stay here, because that expertise stays here, but unfortunately their homeland, where it is probably needed more, suffers.

Then the question must be asked at that juncture, should we deny these students the right to stay and become citizens of Canada? Maybe we should. After all when they came here with a student visa the intent was clear that they should go back to their country to help their parents and their country. So the question could be asked or suggested or a recommendation could be made, Mr. Speaker, that maybe the students who come here with student visas, with the intent of receiving a post-secondary education and going back, should be denied residency or citizenship in Canada for five or ten years because of the intent.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, again the policies are very fluid. They are not clear to our public and, I suggest, not clear to our members of the Legislative Assembly here. The question has to be asked, why? So without elaborating I think it is quite clear in our minds, or should be, that our country is multi-cultural. It's made up of 50-plus ethnic groups that came here from many, many countries. Many non-Canadians started this country. Therefore it exemplifies tolerance and I suggest we carry on this tolerance. I suggest also that we must think universal, not parochial, not provincial, not national. We must set down our policies clearly in order that the citizens who made our universities and colleges and educational system will understand and they will, in fact, accept. I am confident they will. If universities and colleges do not explain what they are doing, I suggest, without any hesitation, that we demand this in order to get that information out to the public. This is not infringing on university autonomy or college autonomy. I believe our citizens have a right to know.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, if there is time.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is it established that we go on past 4:30?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I think that insofar as there appears to be some momentum generated in the debate, the government would be prepared to have the debate continue to 5:30 on resolutions, provided it is understood this is not a precedent. Under the normal rules of Rule 8 we would be moving, if there is no private business, to government business. But today I suggest there is enough interest in this sitting that we continue to 5:30 on this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it there is unanimous consent by the House that we follow the course suggested by the hon. Government House Leader.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, thank you.

On speaking to this motion, Mr. Speaker, I look at it and I have some questions about the wording of the motion. The thing that bothers me to start with is that it talks about "encouragement" and I am wondering who, in fact, is giving encouragement to whom. I was concerned when I read the motion. As I noted in the past the Department of Advanced Education has, in fact, indicated its encroachment on the autonomy on our present university. I am just wondering if now their suggestion is they are going to go to the boards of governors of our universities in the Province of Alberta and tell them what instructors they can hire and from where they must come.

The reason I mention that, Mr. Speaker, is because I was not only surprised and shocked - as a matter of fact I was appalled - to get a couple of phone calls from professors at the University of Lethbridge when the Deputy Minister of Advanced Education had been down there and left the university there with the impression that the General Faculty Council was, to say the least, in jeopardy and would possibly be discontinued in the future.

So this is the reason for my tremendous concern about the autonomy of our universities. If the Minister of Advanced Education or his deputy is going to handle university government from within completely, then I would say we have a little bit of concern. Possibly the Minister of Advanced Education would like to comment on that, but it is a concern to the universities in Alberta. So is this lack of autonomy within the campus.

On the motion itself, Mr. Speaker, on both parts of it, I would have to say that I lack enthusiasm. I lack enthusiasm in particular because I am not convinced there is a problem there. I think many of us will remember and possibly some of us have read the Moir Report that did quite an extensive study, I think it was, on the foreign content of our Canadian universities. As I recall, there wasn't enough in that report that would indicate to me that we have a really serious problem in this area.

But surely we must remember, as I think most people agree because two or three have already so indicated, that excellence certainly must be our prime objective. This has to be number one on the list. I am pretty unenthusiastic about hiring anyone or appointing anyone to do any type of job assuming that because they belong to a particular ethnic group, because they belong to a particular religious group or because they belong to a particular political group or anything like that, that that in itself gives them any qualifications whatsoever. I am pretty high on saying, prove your point, fella. These labels mean little or nothing to me, as a matter of fact. So I think we must keep this in mind, Mr. Speaker. Also, as has been pointed out, we, in the Province of Alberta, and I'm sure in other provinces, do have a substantial number of non-Canadians on our academic staffs within the universities. They came at a time when, I believe, many of them were invited. They did fill a void, they performed a very worthwhile function and I certainly would be sorry to see any kind of a motion, or anything that would indicate that they should now lose their status here as employed people in our universities, particularly those who have been doing a good job. Of course, if they haven't been doing a good job, they shouldn't be there anyway. So there again, you know, it just isn't sufficient reason.

Having said that, I would also agree that, all things being equal when we are hiring people, I'd say, sure, go ahead, go the Canadian route for the most of them, keeping in mind that a little mix is real good for our universities. I think it is pretty important to get the flavour of other ethnic groups, whether they are Americans, Indonesians or Asians. It doesn't make any difference. I mean, people should learn about each other, should learn to accept and understand their points of view and I think this is a pretty valuable part of education in any country or in any province.

I wouldn't object strenuously to non-Canadians being asked to take out Canadian citizenship after having been in this province or in this country and employed there for quite some time. I think there should be some time when people should make up their minds if they want to belong or not, so to speak. I think that is a worthwhile observation, but the main thing is, let us be sure that first of all we have a problem before we start trying to cure something that just isn't there. Let's just take a real close look at them.

Let's remember also, Mr. Speaker, that a goodly number of our Canadian students, professors, instructors, university personnel and school personnel, go particularly to the northwest United States to take post-graduate studies. Certainly, if we are going to follow the concept that they had to be Canadian people, Canadian educated, Canadian orientated, then maybe we should be doing a little bit more about providing facilities so we can give our people the training they seem to desire and which a great number have to leave Canada in order to get. I think this is really an unfortunate state of affairs.

Those are the comments that I would make regarding part (a) of the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Then we have part (b) of which I have a little bit less to say. Again, this one assumes a problem I would say. Again, I'm not sure there is a problem in this area at all. We indicate that we want to educate out-of-province, out-of-country students, but at the same time, in the first of the motion, we are not too sure we want to hire them if they want to work here after being educated here. I think it is pretty fair to assume that some of those who have come here to be educated would want and expect to be employed here. I think this is a very fair observation and assessment to make. I, and I'm sure all Albertans, would be interested in knowing if the non-Canadian students are being refused now in the Province of Alberta, or if any Canadian students are not getting seats in our universities because of students from outside the province. As I say, I doubt very much if there is a problem.

I think what we as the Province of Alberta should do, where we have money for many things - almost everything - is to get busy in our Department of Advanced Education and provide more faculties where we know there is an absolute need. Let's get on the map, Mr. Minister, for optometry, chiropractic and these types of things. People will be pouring in here wanting to get in, even people within this province, and within western Canada. I think it is high time that we get on the ball, or get on the bus, one or the other, and get moving on some of these areas of providing more for education for those areas where there are no facilities at all, not only in Alberta but in western Canada. This is an absolute responsibility of a government. They have a right to tax, therefore, they have a right to provide for these types of needs in our society.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Ponoka.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to this particular resolution, I generally support it, but I think there are two questions that have to be asked before one reaches the conclusion that it is a good resolution and it merits support.

The first question, is what effect would this have on institutional autonomy. The second question is what effect would a resolution like this have on the concept of a cosmopolitan university.

Dealing with the first question, it seems to me that passing a general guideline by the Government of Alberta is not in fact dealing with the nitty-gritty of institutional autonomy. I think that the universities have to operate within the general guidelines of public policy and that it is not inconsistent with the proposition of institutional autonomy that the emphasis and preference should be given to Canadian teachers and Canadian students.

The second question, how does this affect the concept of a cosmopolitan university, is perhaps a little more difficult to answer. Many of the speakers this afternoon have made reference to the value which arises from having many people at a university from different cultural backgrounds and what have you, and the fact that this broadens the education a person gains at that kind of university. I think generally that is true, but the caveat I would register is that before you can really talk about a cosmopolitan university, you must have some vantage point, and that vantage point must be an identity which is rooted within the community and within the country. In other words, there must be a national identity and once this is established then the cross-fertilization, the broadening, that arises by having other inputs, strengthens and creates a genuine cosmopolitan atmosphere. Where we put the cart before the horse, I think in some respects, Mr. Speaker, we are in danger of losing the very cosmopolitan atmosphere which many people claim is so important.

Mr. Speaker, is there a problem? The Moir Commission has compiled a number of statistics, and without going over them all, I think that some of them are worth repeating in the House. For example, at the University of Alberta, according to the Moir Report, 40 per cent of the academic staff were non-Canadian. At the University of Calgary 55 per cent were non-Canadian, and at the University of Lethbridge, 43 per cent. That may not seem like a very serious problem, Mr. Speaker, until we begin to look at the faculties. Where do you find the concentration of non-Canadian staff? Obviously it does not make a great deal of difference in physical education, for example, whether the person comes from India, China, from the Soviet Union, Canada, the United States or wherever. It doesn't really make a great deal of difference in the physical sciences. But when one looks over the Moir Report, and you look at the statistics, you find in arts, for example, 60.9 per cent non-Canadian. That, in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, is a little more serious problem. We recently had a report carried in the University of Alberta Journal, December 17, 1973, in which the breakdown of non-Canadian academic staff in the Faculty of Arts and Science was given; in the Department of English, 55.6 per cent; the Department of Philosophy, 77.3 per cent; the Department of Psychology, 76 per cent. In the area of social sciences I think we do have a problem because here you deal with courses that really get right down

to cultural differences that deal with history and that deal with government mechanisms. It is in the social sciences where, in my judgment, the concentration on making sure that the majority of the academic staff are Canadian citizens has to be placed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the students. It appears that a very large number of the graduate students are non-Canadian. Now I'm sure that no one in this Assembly is advocating a closed university, either in terms of an academic staff or of the student body. Indeed, the resolution, as it reads, doesn't advocate a closed university.

But I think it must be a little disturbing to read on page 43, Mr. Speaker, of the Moir Report, "of these doctoral degrees awarded by the University of Alberta in the 1969-1970 academic year, 74 were granted to non-Canadians and 78 to Canadians". In the year 1970-1971, the number of degrees granted to non-Canadians rose to 92, while the number awarded to Canadians was 88, which means that in the graduate studies program there is a large number of non-Canadians who are attending our universities and are taking advantage of the facilities which the taxpayers of this province in large measure are paying for.

Now that in itself is not a bad thing. Certainly, having additional students from other countries in the post-graduate program is a broadening experience, but when it gets to the point where in many post-graduate studies, Canadian candidates are being overlooked and candidates from another country are being accepted instead, then I think there is a cause for some concern.

The question of cosmopolitan again, I think, raises another point. Where do the staff who are non-Canadians, and where do the students who are non-Canadians come from? What is their country of origin? Well, the Moir Report points out that a very large percentage of the academic staff, for example, come from one country. They don't come from all over the world. In the case of arts, 64.2 per cent of the academic staff come from the United States; in the case of commerce, 77.4 per cent come from the United States; in the case of education, 71.4 per cent. So what you find, Mr. Speaker, at our universities - and this is the reason many Canadians at all our universities are a little concerned - is that rather than having the broad spectrum of people coming from all over the world, the concentration tends to be from one particular country.

Okay, is there really a problem in that? Well, some would say that there isn't. I think the hon. Member for Calgary McCall made an excellent presentation where he discussed the question not of the teachers so much as the textbook. But what do we find when we look at the publishing industry in Canada? We find in 1969 only 25 per cent of the books published in Canada were Canadian publications. This is from the Ontario royal Commission report, by the way, which I will be quoting from a little later, too.

So we really aren't dealing with textbooks in the main, Mr. Speaker, which are produced in Canada. When we talk about post-graduate studies; when we talk about studies in sociology or in history or in political science or what have you, to a large extent the course of studies is developed by the university professor himself or herself. I think we all know examples of students who've attended the University of Alberta or attended any of the universities in this province, who've taken courses in sociology. They've learned all about the problems of black people in Detroit - and it's a good thing, perhaps, to learn about the problems of black people in Detroit - but nothing about the problems of Natives in Alberta or Canada. And the reason they don't learn anything about the Natives in Alberta is because it isn't taught; because the instructors are so rooted. Because they have first of all come from the United States, they're interested in those problems and they build their course of studies around those problems.

Now I am not suggesting that it is a bad thing to have that kind of instruction at the university, but when you find that in a number of the departments in the Faculty of Arts these kinds of courses are taught and that students are not given an opportunity to deal with Canadian problems, then indeed, Mr. Speaker, we have to take a close look.

I have a good friend who has just received his doctorate in comparative literature. Now you would think that in any study of comparative literature there would be a heavy focus on literature in Canada because we have the French culture and we have the English culture. We have the contribution made, as the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway pointed out, by many, many other ethnic groups in this country. You would think that any course which was dealing with comparative literature would have a heavy focus on authors from Canada. But, you know, this particular student didn't take a single Canadian course until he had completed five years - not a single Canadian course until he had completed five years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the reasons why the Moir committee expressed a good deal of concern. I don't think anyone in this province wants to close the doors, or say "get out" to students from other countries, or say that we only want Canadians in our universities in the field of instruction. But I think that in the humanities we have to make sure that in broadening the horizons of students at the universities there is sufficient Canadian input. And frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think there is considerable

evidence to indicate that many of our faculties tend to be preoccupied with American problems.

I have other examples brought to my attention of graduate students who come up from the United States and are given preference over Canadian graduate students. We've all heard complaints - I'm sure we have - of students who've graduated with an MA or a PhD from a Canadian institution and haven't been able to find jobs because of the old boy network which makes it possible for a chairman of a particular department to recommend who will be taken on and who will be given preference, and this tends to further create the stranglehold of domination which these statistics show. Again, I say the answer is not to go roaring into the universities with rigid legislation, but I think the fact of the matter is that there is sufficient cause for concern.

Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Select Committee on Economic and Cultural Nationalism has recently made its report, and it's rather interesting because it was a unanimous report. The committee represented all three parties represented in the Ontario Legislature. It reported, and I would just like to underline some of the points made, if I may, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the members. It is reported that: after a three year period of grace, if the universities have not appointed substantial numbers of Canadians, then the government should impose quotas as follows: (a) 80 per cent of new appointments be on the basis of Canadian citizenship at the time of appointment; (b) 70 per cent of these must have taken 70 per cent or more of their graduate training at Canadian universities.

Now, on the question of quotas, there was no dissent in Ontario on this particular committee on the call for legislation to require all chancellors, boards of governors, presidents, vice-presidents, deans and chairmen of departments, et cetera to be Canadians within five years.

The report also recommended, (a) compulsory advance advertising of vacancies in Canada. Now I think this is important. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is vital that we insist that when vacancies occur in faculties within the universities of Alberta, there be sufficient advertising so that Canadian doctoral students who would be qualified have an opportunity to apply, and have an opportunity to apply in good time.

The second recommendation, the abolition of the two-year tax holiday for foreign teachers, I think we have probably discussed this before. This is one of the recommendations that hon. members will remember was in the Moir Report several years ago - at least the initial report of the Moir Commission. And (c), universities should be forced to reveal the citizenship of all academic ranks.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution that we have before us is not one which is rigid. It is one which emphasizes that the emphasis be placed on providing opportunities for Canadian academic personnel, that the emphasis be placed on training Canadian students first. It is not, in my judgment, inconsistent with the concept of a cosmopolitan university, but rather it recognizes that for us to really have a university which is broadly based, then it has to be, I think, first of all that that broad base has to be built on an identity which is clearly Canadian, and especially, Mr. Speaker, this is true when we deal with those particular departments of the Faculty of Arts which deal with social sciences. I think that if we keep in mind some of the recommendations made by the Ontario committee - I know that many of us here are not wont to be too enthusiastic about proposals from Ontario but I think that the recommendations of this committee are certainly worth noting and might well, indeed, become the basis of action in the Province of Alberta.

DR. PAPROSKI:

I wonder if you would permit a question, hon. member please?

MR. NOTLEY:

Certainly.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Would the hon. member please indicate whether he believes that Canadians have an identity now? When you are talking about identity, do you believe we have an identity?

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, with great respect to the hon. member, I think he missed the point of what I was saying. The point is not whether Canada as a country has an identity; the point is whether or not the institution, particularly in the fields of social science, has enough Canadian teachers so that institution is rooted in a Canadian identity.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Ponoka followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller, and then the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight.

DR. MCCRIMMON:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this debate. I'm basically in favour of the resolution because this same topic has come up in my own home many times over the past few years. I have had around my house university students for the last five years and this particular item has come up time and time again.

The figures that were quoted by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I just actually found them a little while ago. They were quite disturbing to me and I feel that some other departments in the university - and the figures I am quoting are from an article in The Edmonton Journal published on December 17 by a member of the faculty of the University of Alberta - it is that the non-Canadian departments of the University of Alberta include in faculty, Sociology, 86.5 per cent; English 55.6 per cent; Philosophy 77.3 per cent; Psychology 76 per cent; Botany 62.5 per cent; Mathematics, 62.5 per cent. The total non-Canadian faculty of the institution in Calgary is 55.2 per cent.

This is particularly disturbing to me because I feel that although these people may be highly qualified, excellent men and women, after all it's the faculty members of the university who have access to the minds of our young people. And although there is no question that a broadening of their education from professors and teachers from other countries, to a limited extent, is a good thing, when we get up to two-thirds of across-the-board teachers in our universities who are not Canadians, I think we have a tendency to stray from a Canadian background that I feel is so necessary to imprint on our young people.

The fact that two-thirds of our university teachers are from out of Canada makes us wonder, can Canada produce the necessary qualified personnel to fill these positions? In the number of doctoral degrees and percentages read out by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I don't think there is any question but that Canada can fill these positions, and I fail to see why it is so necessary to go abroad to get instructors for our seats of higher learning.

Regarding the numbers of foreign students in the under-graduate body, in 1967, 6.4 per cent of the university here were foreign students; in 1972, 11 per cent were foreign students. I have no objection to a reasonable number of foreign students being in our universities and I think the exchange and so on is an excellent program, but I wonder if we aren't letting the figures get too high.

What bothers me is the point brought up by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West. We are teaching a great many foreign students, and yet we are not looking after a lot of fields that are absolutely necessary in our own country. In that respect I speak of optometry. Western Canada has no faculty of optometry. There are two, one in the University of Montreal which is taught in French, and the other at the University of Waterloo which has been getting more and more restrictive as far as western students are concerned because it is required for their own purposes. I believe we only get one to two students per year out of Alberta who are accepted in Waterloo because the faculty is filled and there is a waiting list.

Now the next nearest place to go is Pacific University and, Mr. Speaker, the tuition in Pacific University is \$2,200 to \$2,400 per year. That is the tuition alone, not the additional cost. So if a young person wants to go and take optometry, the nearest place, and probably the only place he can get in unless he goes further afield, is Pacific University in Oregon, and it will cost the parent or the student an average of \$5,000 per year. It's a six-year course, so it's an almost prohibitive situation.

Last year in Alberta I believe there were 12 new optometrists came in; two of those were Albertans and ten were Americans. If the trend continues, and unless there is a faculty of optometry in western Canada, within the next 15 to 20 years 75 to 90 per cent of the optometrists in Alberta, and in fact in all of western Canada, will be Americans. I feel this is a real shame and a disgrace.

There has been representation made to the Minister of Advanced Education and other ministers of education in the four western provinces. It seems to me that this is the logical place, both geographically and in terms of population. I realize that one faculty in western Canada would probably service western Canada. There are ample students. The requirements are there, the need is there. I feel it is almost a responsibility of Western Canada, and particularly Alberta - because of its geographic location and in terms of its numbers, this is the central point for western Canada - that such a facility be made available in the reasonably near future.



MR. SPEAKER:

With great respect to the hon. member and the very important information he has given in the House, I have some misgiving as to the relevance of argument in favour of additional faculties in our universities in this particular debate on this resolution. I have in mind that it could possibly lead to a wide-open debate on adding all sorts of other faculties to the university and that the debate would then get away from the resolution. Perhaps the hon. member might wish to make his position the subject of a resolution in itself.

DR. MCCRIMMON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I had almost finished anyway. So really from the remarks I have made, I am in favour of the resolution and I feel that the other remarks I made are very pertinent as well.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to take part in this debate and I certainly agree with the general spirit of the objective of the resolution. I have some quarrel with some of the wording, as I think if it was read outside it might have a different meaning from what we may put upon it.

But I want to deal first of all with the basic premise upon which the resolution is built. The first one is that I think we want our universities and our colleges to be places of excellence, as mentioned by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West. If we are going to attract students from our own province, from our own country and from other countries, the university has to have a very high standing relative to other universities. This is very important because unless your university is recognized as a place of excellence from which students are proud to graduate, you have your own students as well as others applying elsewhere for admission.

Some say, if you get a degree it doesn't matter where you get it. You still put the degree behind your name. I don't entirely agree with that. If degrees are going to be granted in some inferior university, with inferior qualifications required of the student to enter and inferior qualifications when they graduate, then that degree doesn't mean very much. A degree is only meaningful if it permits people to do the job for which they are trained in a better and in a very capable way. There would be little use to us having a medical faculty at the University of Alberta if the doctors who graduated were unable to perform the operations and carry out the medical services required by the people of this province.

Over a great number of years now we have shown that men and women who graduate from the University of Alberta in medicine, dentistry and engineering and in many other faculties are able to stand equal to those who graduate from any university in the world. As a matter of fact, we have had outstanding people from our university here.

I believe that is one of the reasons why there is a demand from students in other parts of Canada and in other parts of the world wanting to come to the University of Alberta. As a matter of fact, I have said this to many students, 15 or 20 students from Hong Kong, and asked them, why did you choose the University of Alberta, or why did you choose Alberta College? Many do come to Alberta College to complete their entrance requirements to our university. Invariably they say, we hear the University of Alberta has a very high standing. Graduation means something in the University of Alberta.

I am always proud when I hear that when young men and young women leave Hong Kong they don't go to Taiwan University to graduate, their parents send them to the University of Alberta. If we have a higher percentage of students in this university from other countries of the world, from China, India and elsewhere in the world, then we should be proud of that fact. It simply tells me that our university is doing an excellent job. As long as we can accommodate these students, I think it is to our interest to do so.

Now I am not dealing with the matter of pay because that doesn't come in here. But I think basic to this resolution is that students who come from other countries of the world should pay the costs of their education here. I don't think they should expect to be subsidized, to any great degree at least, by the people of Alberta or the people of Canada, and they don't. They are prepared to come and they are prepared to work hard and they are prepared to pay for their education.

While the excellence of universities and colleges is an important item, unless we have that excellence then other things are not going to matter very much because people will choose other universities.

The next point I would like to mention is that the excellence of the university is based to a very large degree, in my view, on the quality of the instruction given, the experience and training of the professors and the teachers. Unless you have men and women

of high academic standing, of experience in life, of integrity in teaching, then the university will not long hold a high, honourable name among other universities.

We expect our university to be the apex of honour, of integrity, of excellence. The only way that is achieved, of course - not the only way, but a very important way - is through the instructors being of that calibre. The student body, too, has something to do with that. But largely it is based on the leadership provided in that university by the instructors.

I would like to use the University of Alberta and the colleges here as a base for any resolution that we pass, so that there will be no reflection on our university which is of a high excellence, which is recognized across Canada and the United States.

A few years ago I was invited to watch a heart operation at the University of Alberta, when the father of a little girl from British Columbia came here to have one of the valves closed and put in a proper place so that the blood could come to her lungs and circulate through her body. I watched that operation by a doctor in this province. The father said to me, this is my last hope for this little girl, for his little daughter. And it wasn't a vain hope. In two weeks the girl was sitting up and now she is skating, skiing, walking and running and dancing like other people, whereas prior to that, she had just a few months to live according to a B.C. doctor. They came to Alberta, to an Alberta doctor to have this work done.

When I was going through the medical faculty again I came across a student from Georgia. I was interested as I saw him operating on a dog, which was part of his training. From his accent I knew he came from the southern United States and when I asked him, he said he came from Georgia. I said, "How come you came way up here to Alberta?" He said, "Well, we heard that Alberta is a highly qualified university. My dad wants me to graduate and I want to graduate from a university of excellence, a university that will mean something, where the degree will mean something. I want to be able to make a contribution in the medical world."

Well, I think we have that now. Those are the things upon which I base my support for this resolution.

When I come to the particular clauses of the resolution, there have been some members who mention, "(a) grant a preference in favour of Canadians rather than non-Canadians in hiring academic staff." From the way that is written it would appear that you would hire a Canadian who might be of inferior qualifications, of inferior experience. You hire him simply because he is a Canadian. I don't think that is good enough for our university. I believe we have Canadians in almost every faculty who have high qualifications and, if given the chance, as some of the hon. members have mentioned in the hiring and recruiting of staff, they will meet the qualifications of applicants from the United States or any other country in the world in most cases. But I don't like the idea of choosing a Canadian simply because he happened to be born a Canadian.

In a university the major qualification, as again mentioned by the hon. Member for Lethbridge, is his ability, his qualifications, his experience. He is going to teach and he can't teach what he doesn't know himself. So it is most important that he be highly qualified, of high academic experience and training. The number one requirement is that he be fully qualified, that we have teachers of note, teachers of high qualifications. Consequently, I believe the wording there doesn't exactly express what is really behind the resolution.

When we come to item (b) the part that bothers me again is that we want to make sure non-Canadian students have access to universities providing that Canadian students occupy a very high percentage of the spaces available in each program. Well, I believe charity begins at home. I believe the universities in this province should cater to the people of this province first. I think every student in this province should have the opportunity to enrol in our colleges, technical schools and universities, providing he's qualified. But then, when you get to the place where there is still available space - maybe three-quarters of some faculties are still open - why would you leave those empty if you have people from other parts of the world or other parts of Canada who want to qualify. So I think the wording there, that you have to have a very high percentage of the spaces for Canadian students, leaves a little wrong impression.

I like the idea of making sure Canadians who are qualified have first opportunity. I don't see anything wrong with that. I don't think that's contrary to the Bill of Rights. I think that's just ordinary every-day sense. The people of this province have built the university, they've paid for it, perhaps with some help from other people in Canada, so they should have first chance to get their education in our institutions. But if there are spaces available, and there are and there have been, then I see nothing wrong with us going and saying, let's take all the students we can get to fill our university, all we can get from India, all we can get from Hong Kong, all we can get from Taiwan, all we can get from some European countries. Let's make sure that we don't have highly-trained professors teaching too few students. I think we should fill our quotas in these

universities. Consequently, when we say there must be a high percentage in all spaces in every faculty, then I think it's a little misleading. It could result in reduced enrolment and increased costs to the people of Alberta, because we surely expect these students to pay their way when they come to university.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to amend the resolution in the following way. I've sent a copy of the resolution to the mover, to Dr. Horner there, perhaps it should go to the Minister of Advanced Education and, of course, to Mr. Speaker.

I would move that the resolution be amended as follows: by striking out everything in (a) which reads, "grant a preference in favour of Canadians rather than non-Canadians in hiring academic staff, and" and replacing it with the words: "hire Canadian teachers providing they have equal or better qualifications."; by striking out all the words in (b) after "that", where it occurs on the second line; that is, the words "Canadian students occupy a very high percentage of the spaces available in each program." and replacing those words with "no qualified Canadian student is denied entrance".

The resolution will then read:

Be it resolved that our universities and public colleges be encouraged to

- (a) hire Canadian teachers providing they have equal or better qualifications
- (b) ensure that non-Canadian students have access to all programs of study provided that no qualified Canadian student is denied entrance.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution in (a) will indicate that the universities and colleges will not hire Canadians unless they're highly qualified. We want the best teachers we can secure. If some of them have to be secured from other countries in order to give our university a better name and higher credibility, then there should be no objections to doing that.

But certainly, and I believe it is so, there are Albertans and there are Canadians who will meet the qualifications of professors found anywhere else in the world. If they're given the opportunity, if there are equal or better qualifications, then the Canadian, of course, should be hired.

With reference to the second part, I think we want to make sure that qualified Canadian students who have academic qualifications, who have the university entrance, should have first place. Then after that, as far as I'm concerned, we should fill up all of the spaces with students from other parts of the world and they pay their way, of course.

In doing that, we're not only providing the best possible university training to our own students and to other Canadian students, but we're also playing our part in trying to make the world a better world. Because if we're going to make the world a better world, education is going to play a very important part in that process.

The amendments I have moved are seconded by the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no longer any requirement for a seconder under the rules for 1974. If the member who has already been recognized as the next speaker on the main motion wishes to speak strictly to the amendment, I would suggest that he be recognized, otherwise perhaps we should, in fact, hear the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to suggest that the amendment as moved is out of order, Mr. Speaker, in the sense that it is completely contrary to the spirit and intent of the resolution, Mr. Speaker. To adopt the resolution clause (a) is to imply that only Canadian teachers be hired, or Canadian professors. This resolution deals with non-Canadians. And, in (b) is to imply - in fact, specifically states - that Canadian students have access to all programs and no qualified Canadian student is denied entrance.

If that is carried, it therefore means that there will be no room in these programs in most cases for non-Canadians. The resolution in both cases speaks for non-Canadian academic staff and non-Canadian students. Therefore I think, with great respect, Mr. Speaker, the resolution is out of order.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. minister rather stretched the meaning of words when he made that statement. There is a proviso in the second part of the amendment. It is a very similar motion to the one that was made by the mover, except that the emphasis is not to the exclusion of anybody else but to give preference to Canadians where they have the

qualifications. It is a very minor amendment. It side-stepped a bit the main motion, but I think that the interpretation placed on the wording of the amendment by the hon. Minister of Advanced Education is stretching the meaning somewhat beyond what is intended.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order, I would respectfully suggest that the amendment is in order and in (a) it is not saying that only the Canadian teachers be hired, because the resolution reads: "Be it resolved that our universities and public colleges be encouraged to hire Canadian teachers providing they have equal or better qualifications."

If every applicant had equal or better qualifications then, of course, they would all be Canadians, but I could see nothing wrong with that if that happened to be the case. But it doesn't preclude other professors of higher qualifications from other countries applying and being accepted.

Secondly, providing we build the university for the people of Alberta and the people of Canada, and if there are enough to fill every faculty, then of course there would be no room. But that isn't the case. There is room for other students and that is where the other students come in. I don't think for one minute we want to accept the theory that we're going to exclude a qualified Albertan from attending university in order to take somebody from India.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there any other hon. members who would like to express themselves on the point of order?

If there are not, it would be my opinion, without having had a great deal of time to study the amendment, that the second part of the amendment which substitutes a new proviso would be in order.

With regard to the first part of the amendment, it seems to me that the text is somewhat incomplete. It says, standing by itself, "hire Canadian teachers providing they have equal or better qualifications" but it doesn't say equal to whom or better than whom. It seems to imply a continuation of the sense of the subclause that is being struck out, or purporting to be struck out by the amendment.

Since we are fairly close to adjournment time, possibly the hon. member might wish to just give some further consideration to the actual text of the amendment so that it might get around the difficulty which I have mentioned.

MR. TAYLOR:

In that case, Mr. Speaker, may I adjourn the debate?

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it the hon. member has leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I move we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it that the House also has unanimously agreed to the motion of the hon. Government House Leader and therefore the House stands adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:27 o'clock.]