

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Friday, May 10, 1974

[The House met at 10:00 o'clock.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 56 The Alberta Property Tax Reduction Amendment Act, 1974

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being Bill No. 56, The Alberta Property Tax Reduction Amendment Act, 1974. The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to completely remove the provincial education tax from all residential property in Alberta whether it is owned or rented, as well as all Alberta family farms.

It provides for the maintenance for continuing the minimum payments for low-assessed properties and for senior citizens' rental rebates. It is the third step, Mr. Speaker, in the government's ongoing program of property tax reduction for Alberta citizens.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 56 was introduced and read a first time.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce 60 young Grade 6 Albertans from the Terrace Heights School. They are sitting in the members gallery accompanied by their teachers. I request they stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, a group of high school students from the Ardrossan High School in my constituency. They are accompanied by Mr. Dixon and Mrs. Axelson. I would ask them to rise and be recognized by the House.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Department of Manpower and Labour

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that The Alberta Uniform Building Standards Act made provision for a council to advise and work with the government in the matter of uniform building standards.

I should like to announce this committee which adds to citizen participation in the affairs of government.

The council, it's important to note, is the first of its kind in Canada. We're pleased to announce as chairman, by his acceptance of our offer of this responsible position, Dr. Alfred O. Minsos, a prominent, indeed, a distinguished architect and town planner and a great citizen of this city and province. One example of his work is the Edmonton International Airport.

Other members of the council include Bruce B. Alexander, Vice-Chairman, Edmonton, Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists and Geophysicists; Peter B. Epp, Jr., Calgary, Urban Development Institute of Alberta; Rudy Scheibelhofer, Edmonton, Housing and Urban Development Association, Alberta Council; Ed Garritt, Edmonton, Alberta Construction Association; George Whitehead, Claresholm, Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties; William Turnbull, Camrose, Alberta Building Officials Association; Louis C. Day, Edmonton, Alberta Association of Fire Chiefs; Pai-Lin Li, Calgary, Alberta Urban Municipalities Association and Harold Collins, Meadowview.

In addition to its regular work of advising the government with respect to uniform building standards, the council will also work in close liaison with the associate committee on the National Building Code of the National Research Council.

The Alberta Uniform Building Standards Act, Mr. Speaker, enabling municipalities to enact administrative by-laws to enforce building standards in their communities, came into force January 1, 1974. The regulations supporting the new act were proclaimed on April 1 of this year.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Syncrude Contract - No-Strike Clause

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Manpower and Labour. At what stage are negotiations between Syncrude and the affected labour unions or labour organizations regarding the no-strike conditions of the Syncrude contract?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, it would be difficult - indeed impossible - to identify a particular stage. The nature of discussions and negotiations are such that they are a process and are certainly a continuous consideration of government and other parties which have a proper concern in the matter. That would be my report - that it is in the stage of constant and continuous work and progress.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question to the minister. Let me put it this way, have negotiations been completed between Syncrude and the affected labour organizations regarding the no-strike clause in the Syncrude go-ahead contract? Have they been completed?

DR. HOHOL:

No, they have not, sir. In fact, I would have to say that the nature of the work is in the area of feasibility of discussion, of seeking alternatives, of looking at all possible ways of gaining most - if not all - of the objectives of what is referred to as Condition A in the agreement.

But these discussions, extensive and numerous as they are, can't, in the literal sense of The Labour Act, be described as negotiations in terms of collective bargaining.

Syncrude - Native Employment

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question to the Minister of Manpower and Labour, Mr. Speaker. What assurances have been given by the Government of Alberta to the Native people in northeastern Alberta regarding employment opportunities on the Syncrude project?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, all reasonable, practical and sensible assurances have been made within the context of our capacity in order to effect the kinds of assurances we have made to the Native people and all other people in the area contiguous to the project.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Have these reasonable and practical assurances been reduced to writing, and given by the government to the Native people or the two provincial organizations in a written form?

DR. HOHOL:

No, Mr. Speaker. I would take the view that the nature of the kinds of assurances ...

MR. LUDWIG:

B.S.

DR. HOHOL:

... are shaken down by discussions with the Native Association of Alberta, the Metis Association of Alberta - by Native I was referring to both the Metis and the Indian Associations of Alberta - the federal government through its Manpower and Immigration Department and various departments of this government, including Industry and Commerce, Advanced Education and Manpower and Labour.

MR. LUDWIG:

You faked that one beautifully.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question to the minister. Have these assurances to the Native people been given by the Government of Alberta, in any concrete way, to the representatives of the Alberta Indian Association and the Alberta Metis Association?

DR. HOHOL:

I'm not quite clear on the question, Mr. Speaker, but I would recall to the Assembly an organization called the Northeastern Alberta Manpower Needs Development Committee that includes federal and provincial manpower departments and membership by the Indian and Metis associations of Alberta. It's in that particular committee that various departments have entry, as do the two associations in question, so that this committee is quite public. Its information is the same. Both associations have every opportunity and every capacity and are indeed welcomed in terms of ways that they could work on the project. Their own recommendations are very much a part of the resolutions of the work force as we anticipate it to be on that particular project.

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could just add a little bit to that. The good Minister of Manpower and Labour and the Minister of Advanced Education and yours truly have assisted the Native organizations to form an organization called the Alberta Native Development Corporation, a very unique organization. It's the first in Canada, Mr. Speaker ...

DR. BUCK:

Never mind the speech, just give the details.

MR. ADAIR:

... in which the two organizations have gotten together to work with industry, provincial government and federal government toward the development of projects which will ensure that the Native people not only of northeastern Alberta but all of Alberta will have job opportunities available for them.

Syncrude - Final Agreement

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Mines and Minerals. Has a final agreement been signed between Syncrude and the Government of Alberta regarding the proposed Syncrude plant?

MR. DICKIE:

No, Mr. Speaker. That's still being worked on. Certain phases of it have been completed but there are other phases that are awaiting final decision.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. What target date is the minister or the government looking at, regarding the signing of such an agreement?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, a target date hasn't been set.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Stony Plain followed by the hon. Member for Bow Valley.

Natural Gas Rebate Plan

MR. PURDY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Telephones and Utilities. Will the Natural Gas Rebate Plan affect the city power rates by 40 per cent, as stated by city aldermen?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. If the hon. member is asking, as I understood the question, for the hon. minister's opinion as to what way a certain plan or eventuality might affect city power rates, I would respectfully suggest that this is not the appropriate occasion for putting such a question.

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I'll rephrase my question then. Will the power rates be increased in the city of Edmonton because of the Natural Gas Rebate Plan?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member is still in the same difficulty and perhaps that question might be directed to the City of Edmonton.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. What effect has the Natural Gas Rebate Plan on the Alberta residents or Edmonton residents regarding the gas rates?

MR. SPEAKER:

Might I respectfully suggest and earnestly request the cooperation of all hon. members in referring to 171 to 181 of Beauchesne so that there might be 75-member unanimity in the application of the rules which we have all adopted for the question period. It's a matter in which I think the cooperation of the whole House is required and then perhaps we may circumvent some of these difficulties, with the possible exception of an occasional outburst of 'anti-semanticism' by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc.

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary then in regard to this. Has the Minister of Telephones and Utilities had an opportunity to respond to a comment made that the city's power rates will go up by 40 per cent?

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, first of all ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Here comes the speech now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member asking the minister to assess an opportunity given to the City of Edmonton?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Aw, leave him alone.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities take this opportunity to give us the latest urgent news about the Natural Gas Rebate Plan?

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. minister might prefer to do that with a ministerial announcement.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, has the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities any statistics - relating to this question?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Put it on the Order Paper.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yeah, he's got some statistics.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, can I attempt to answer this multitude of questions which are out of order?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No! No!

MR. SPEAKER:

I regret that I didn't hear the question.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Answer it, answer it.

MR. FARRAN:

The answer to the question is, yes.

DR. PAPROSKI:

One final supplementary then. What is the natural gas rate for Alberta residents relative to other provinces?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Put it on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Telephone Operators - Relocation

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Speaker, I want to try a new question to the Minister of Telephones and Utilities. My question is, what is the policy of the minister or his office when moving telephone operators out of small towns when they change their system to direct distance dialing?

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. member is referring to the town of Brooks, or perhaps Hanna where automated, direct distance dialing is to be introduced in September. This unfortunately does result in a decline in employment in that particular capacity, in Brooks, by some 25 full-time or part-time jobs. The change-over in Brooks is coupled with the expensive facility in Medicine Hat. It is an advance in technology - a more modern system of telephoning which will benefit the people of Brooks.

In point of fact, Brooks is one of the prosperous towns in the province where ...

DR. BUCK:

Answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. minister would wish to revert to the subject of the question.

MR. LUDWIG:

A good try, but a poor policy.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You have no policy.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Does the hon. member wish to ask a supplementary?

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister consider leaving enough traffic operators in Brooks to handle the personal calls, the collect calls and the credit card calls?

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, the plan for Brooks is to turn it over to direct distance dialing. The cut-in is for September, and some 28 employees are affected. They have all been offered other jobs within the system.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Provincial Court Judges - Salaries

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Attorney General. Can the hon. Attorney General advise the Assembly whether it is the government's intention to substantially increase the salaries and benefits of magistrates and provincial court judges in the immediate or foreseeable future?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all call attention to the fact that in Alberta we no longer have magistrates. [The people who were] formerly called magistrates are now called

provincial judges. The answer to the question is, yes. I would suggest that the hon. member leave the details of the question until my estimates are before the House.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, is it the government's intention to eliminate the differences between provincial court judges who have university or legal training and those who don't?

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps the hon. member might avail himself of the invitation of the hon. minister to deal with the topic further when the estimates are up for debate.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I have just one final supplementary question which I think would be in order now. I would ask the hon. Attorney General whether or not the government intends to continue the sabbatical program which permits provincial court judges who don't have legal training to take a year off and attend The University of Alberta law school?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member appears to be pursuing a line of questioning, the entirety of which might be appropriate in the discussion of the estimates.

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

Fort McMurray-Churchill Rail Line

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. It's a follow-up to the question I asked earlier in the week.

I would like to know if the minister has had the opportunity to check with his department to find out if the department has had any proposals presented to it on a proposed rail line between Fort McMurray and Churchill that would carry oil from the tar sands?

MR. PEACOCK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have. Our department has had no ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Directions?

MR. PEACOCK:

... submissions.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Farm Machinery Prices

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Does the Department of Consumer Affairs monitor the changes in the price of farm machinery?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, we do not. We have had some communication with some of the farm dealers who have made complaints relative to some parts of the farm machinery industry. We have checked out those matters thoroughly for them in contact with the Department of Agriculture indicating what has in fact caused any escalation in price or shortages, for example, in tires. But we do not monitor farm machinery prices per se. The Department of Agriculture may have something further to add.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, we do monitor input costs in agriculture and have just recently signed an agreement with the farm organization, Unifarm, to assist us in that monitoring job. In addition to that, in the question of farm machinery per se, the Farm Machinery Appeal Board does have a look at not only the pricing of repairs but the availability.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that farm inputs are no different than other inputs in the province today. They are in short supply. We have to learn to live with that and try as best we can to get those inputs for agriculture.

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you. A supplementary to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Is the escalation on the price of farm machinery out of line with the apparent shortage and out of line with that being charged in eastern Canada?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is clearly asking a question which requires the minister's opinion.

MR. TAYLOR:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. All I want to know is: in the monitoring being done by his department, has that monitoring indicated an increase in the price of farm machinery greater than that of eastern Canada? It's really not an opinion I am requesting.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, so far the answer to that question is no. I would point out to the hon. member, and indeed to the House, that the price of scrap metal has now gone up to \$60 a ton which is a tripling of scrap prices.

MR. STROM:

A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Does the hon. minister have a contract with Unifarm for the monitoring of the prices?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STROM:

A supplementary. Can the hon. minister tell us how much this contract is, what the payment is for the contract?

DR. HORNER:

I can't right offhand, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member would like to put a question on the Order Paper I would indeed be willing to table the contract.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary to the hon. minister. Would the hon. minister also let us have the terms of the contract?

DR. HORNER:

I have offered, Mr. Speaker, to table the entire contract in response to an order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

River Bank Stabilization - N. Saskatchewan

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Premier in light of the fact that the Minister of the Environment is not the House. Have any studies been conducted to determine the effect of raising the level of the North Saskatchewan River on the stability of the banks of the river in relation to the park as proposed in the city of Edmonton?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take the question as notice and refer it to the Minister of the Environment when he returns. He's at a conference in Toronto today, I believe. When he is back next week I'll have him provide the hon. member with an answer.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Musk-Ox Farming

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. A great number of farmers in Alberta have shown an interest in musk-ox farming. In fact, they have formed their own organization. Would the hon. minister consider making strong representations to federal authorities or the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories asking him to reconsider his decision not to export musk-oxen?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is providing information and making a representation, but perhaps the hon. minister might wish to deal with the matter briefly.

DR. HORNER:

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, the decision has been made by the Council of the Northwest Territories. Indeed, I wouldn't want to take issue with their decision. We have had some initial discussions with the council in regard to that. I think the best way we could help would be to offer them our assistance in technology and otherwise to establish their own ranching in their area to provide jobs for their people and to work from there. That's the approach that we've used with the council and the Commissioner in the Northwest Territories.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Motor Vehicle Repair Costs

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and ask him whether or not his department or the Alberta Automobile Insurance Board has had an opportunity to monitor the rather rapidly escalating motor vehicle repair costs and the impact that this is going to have on automobile insurance rates?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, the Insurance Bureau of Canada does the monitoring of insurance cost-per-accident statistics and they present annually what they call a 'green book' with all the statistics in it.

There is an indication of some major escalations in car repair costs. Those statistics have been made available to the Alberta Automobile Insurance Board. They are in the process now of studying them. The Alberta Automobile Insurance Board had a meeting yesterday with members of the industry to get a feel for what would happen to insurance rates over the next period of time. The matter is, as I say, under study at the moment.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the hon. minister any preliminary information at this stage as to anticipated rate increases as a result of the higher repair costs?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to make a forecast relative to increased insurance costs. If there are, in fact, some in the offing, as I say, we are in the process of

having the Alberta Automobile Insurance Board examine the 'green book' along with the industry and there will be some information forthcoming within the next while.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise whether it's true from the monitoring done that Alberta repair costs are rising substantially more quickly than repair costs in the rest of Canada, and further, from the monitoring has the minister any information as to why this has been the case?

MR. SPEAKER:

In view of the hon. minister's answer it would appear that the information which the hon. member seeks might be obtained from the material which is, apparently, fairly generally available.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I was asking the hon. minister whether or not his department had had an opportunity beyond the report itself to look into it and assess the implications of it.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, the document I referred to as the 'green book' is probably the best source of information available to anyone interested or involved in the insurance industry whether in the form of government involvement or otherwise. I have no indication except what I've read in the newspapers. Whether, in fact, those reports are true, I'm not in a position to say. I do know that we have, since I have some responsibility for the Alberta Automobile Insurance Board, taken some steps relative to this. One was a 15 per cent reduction for ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary to the hon. minister. Since the 'green book' is prepared by the board companies of Canada would it include the costs of repairs which are obtained by the three publicly-owned insurance companies in Saskatchewan, British Columbia and Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER:

I respectfully suggest that the hon. member might refer to the 'green book'.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, just for a point of clarification. Did the hon. minister say that the insurance industry has indicated to his department that there will be a lowering of rates for the under-25 male driver?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, what I had indicated was that some time ago there was a lowering of 15 per cent in the rates for that compulsory portion of the Alberta insurance package for those under-age drivers or young drivers, as we prefer to call them, who have, in fact, taken a driver's training course.

MR. TAYLOR:

On a point of order. The 'green book' is not made available to those not in the insurance industry. Since the hon. minister's department is studying this, it would indicate whether it was a complete picture or an incomplete picture if the matter that I raised could be studied by his group at the same time he's studying the other matters.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question under advisement. I'm not sure, but the first indication would be that it would deal with those provinces which, in fact, have not a publicly-owned insurance organization.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question for clarification. Did I take the minister correctly that once the insurance board reviews the 'green book', they themselves will be doing an independent review of auto repair costs in the province of Alberta?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, very recently we appointed a gentleman to examine those things relative to insurance which the Alberta Automobile Insurance Board and the department feel are necessary to be examined. This could, in fact, be one of them. I'm not committing myself to that being one of them, but there are any number of items which require some further study. Obviously, they'll be taking this into consideration.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Soft Drugs - High Schools

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Education. Has the hon. minister had an opportunity to pursue the matter of the intrusion of soft drugs, marijuana and LSD, into the smaller high schools of the province?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, the honourable gentleman did ask that question the other day, Mr. Speaker. I am now following that up and am securing information on the subject. I hope to have it for him next week.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Bill No. 43 The Nursing Homes Amendment Act

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Premier or the hon. House Leader. Is it the government's intention to proceed with Bill No. 43 at this session, that is, The Nursing Homes Amendment Act, or is the plan to hold it over till the fall session?

MR. HYNDMAN:

It's our present intention to proceed at the spring session with that bill, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Why not?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

CLERK:

Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER:

I suppose strictly speaking I'm not here, but I was overlooking that the hon. Member for Drumheller would like to revert to Introduction of Visitors.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS (CONT.)

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you hon. members. I would like to introduce 36 members of the Carbon High School, together with their teachers, Mr. Roy Hansen and Mrs. Susan Howard and two of the finest bus drivers in the province, Doug Prowse and his wife, Mary Prowse. I'm sure we're happy to have this fine group of young people in the Legislature today.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of Supply will come to order.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I will outline the estimates we plan on covering ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order in the Assembly, please.

MR. HYNDMAN:

... for the balance of the morning. Due to the absence of the Minister of Consumer Affairs responsible for tourism during most of next week at a conference, I would like to proceed now just to complete Vote No. 1415 which is the Alberta RCMP Century Celebrations under Executive Council.

We started that last night and if we could simply complete that one, we would not proceed further with Executive Council but continue with completion of Advanced Education which has already been started, and then move into Industry and Commerce.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Executive Council (Cont.)

Tourism (Cont.)

Appropriation 1415 Alberta RCMP Century Celebrations

MR. BENOIT:

Yes, I think the question was raised last night. I'd like to raise it again this morning. Then I'd also like to ask some questions, Mr. Chairman, on the capital expenditures of this particular vote.

Does the federal government give any support to the Alberta RCMP Century Celebrations?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Chairman, they do. Not in a direct money way, but what has been done is that we have, through the RCMP, and obviously through the federal government, managed to arrange for the RCMP musical ride and the RCMP band to be here over the course of the summer. They recently had their show in London, England and they received great response.

The people are made aware that the RCMP Century Celebrations year is in Alberta this year. We receive that support. The responsible people in the federal department and the RCMP themselves make the decision where the RCMP musical ride and band will appear. We have funnelled all the applications to be entertained by the ride to that group. They made their decisions and all members have received notice of where the ride will appear.

In addition to that, we will have the Sunset Ceremony normally held in Regina. It will be appearing in Alberta and I believe, if I'm not mistaken, Mr. Chairman, that's the first time the Sunset Ceremony has appeared outside Regina. We just received confirmation from Commissioner Nadon that they would agree to bring it into Alberta for this year.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister if he could give us a breakdown on Vote 1414, Fees and Commissions. It's \$273,500 - more than doubled from last year ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Strom, you've reverted to 1414 now?

MR. STROM:

Aren't we on 1414?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

No, 1415. We've had 1414 approved.

MR. STROM:

The same question applies to 1415. If possible, I would like to have it from the minister for the other one as well.

MR. DOWLING:

Fees and Commissions under 1415?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

In both appropriations.

MR. DOWLING:

In both appropriations, yes. Relative to 1414, which I dealt with at length last night, a portion of that is for an educational requirement study for tourism. We're now talking of Tourism. That's \$4,000.

For developing an advertising program for this coming year, the cost to that agency is \$27,900. It includes, as I mentioned, four agency presentations which cost us \$2,000 each in order that we can stimulate the development of not only a proper advertising program, but also stimulate the development of agencies in Alberta. All this work will be done by Alberta agencies, as has been done over the past little while.

The next portion of it is a research program relative to the Kananaskis area which I mentioned last night. That is a \$40,000 amount. In all cases where there is a research study, the amount of money we put into it is matched on a 50-50 basis with the federal government office of travel.

There is a \$20,000 amount for the development of a summer film; a \$2,000 amount for a four seasons poster production; a \$5,000 amount for the Canada Winter Games. Foreign language translation is \$38,100. As I mentioned there are three languages we will proceed with: French, German and Japanese.

There is a campground study of \$30,000 which we dealt with, which also will be matched by federal moneys; and a travel agents manual which is a gathering together of all the information on all points of Alberta on everything of interest over 245,000 square miles of Alberta.

There are brokerage and customs fees for brochures and displays of \$4,000, design for uniforms for the people who man our travel information centres, and highway signing equalling \$97,500. That will develop 50 signs for this year as an initial start-up program. They will be signs of some consequence, strategically located throughout the province to indicate what particular features can be seen in that area. Then, when they reach the end of that area there will be another sign saying, these are the features in this area. So, obviously they will be erected at the confluence of two major roads, at the border points and places like this where people stop.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. It's really difficult to understand what the minister is saying, and I suppose you could do something about it.

MR. STROM:

I take it that this was Appropriation 1414 that the minister ...

MR. DOWLING:

Those fees and commissions are for the Vickers & Benson organization in developing the total program for the RCMP Centennial celebrations. It started out, as you can see, in the previous year, with a fairly major amount to develop the entire program this year. It was used for things such as the development of the advertising campaign, the artwork on each of the ads that was done, the TV production, the showing of the Birds in Winter film, where they were to be shown and the expenses involved in these kinds of things.

I should mention too, Mr. Chairman, that Vickers & Benson was the successful candidate of three advertising agencies who bid on the job. All of those agencies were Alberta based. That was part of the requirement in order that they bid. Their presence in Alberta - that particular company - has expanded considerably since they received this contract.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, would it also include contract work - that is, where individuals were hired to do a specific job - for that particular event, the RCMP? I'm thinking in terms of individuals who are on a contract basis with the government.

MR. DOWLING:

It might include such things as photographic work for a particular thing. As I indicated in the Travel Alberta portion, we did recruit a young lady from an eastern school, who was involved in the hospitality industry in an educational field, to do our study. It cost us \$4,000 on our educational requirement. She is not a civil servant, she is on a contractual arrangement. We find it's working extremely well because we can bring out of the private sector some people from whom the government can gain a great deal at little cost.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I take it that we could count on individuals being on the payroll of government through contract under Fees and Commissions in both Appropriation 1414 and 1415? I realize that in Appropriation 1414 there are a number of projects that may not directly place individuals on contract but there could be individuals on contract working for the government.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Chairman, I think I should just indicate at this time that it is my view that if we are to develop the travel industry, we must surely inject into the travel industry organization some people from the private sector. Our initial position on who those people should be was that they should be people such as the Travel Alberta Executive Director, Mr. Hayes, who, in fact, came from the private sector on contract. Another gentleman, by the name of Peter Walls, was recruited from the City of Edmonton; a gentleman from Japan Air Lines - a former staff member from Japan Air Lines - and that kind of thing. I really rather favour this position, otherwise how are we going to get that expertise into government?

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I don't have any disagreement with the minister in the explanation he has given. I think it is valid. I am merely trying to determine the number of bodies who are in the employ of the government. When I read that it suggests there are 41 and 39 - 41 on salaried man-year basis; 39 on wages - it may not be the complete picture. All I'm wanting the minister to tell me is if I am correct in that assumption. I think he has

already made that statement. So now, when I look at Fees and Commissions under any appropriation, it may well entail ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Give him hell, Miniely. Tell him, tell him, Miniely.

MR. STROM:

... a number of individuals who are working under contract rather than on a salaried basis.

MR. DOWLING:

Just so there is no confusion under Fees and Commissions on contract, those man-years and bodies are included. They are actually included. They are included in any - for example, all those people whom I mentioned are included in our salaried man-years and that kind of thing. They are there. All our bodies - I listed them last night in Administration and so on under Travel Alberta. The only person whom the RCMP organization recruits and pays is the coordinator and he is the only one we actually pay for.

The rest of the people are volunteers. I should just mention who they are. I can't say that the three ministers are volunteers, but there are three responsible; the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation and the Minister of Lands and Forests are members of the ministerial committee along with me. Dr. MacGregor is the chairman. He's a volunteer. Mr. Pleth was replaced by Mr. MacKell from the Chateau Lacombe. Mr. Craig from Port Macleod, Mr. Dempsey from the Glenbow Foundation, Mr. Drinkwater from the parks department, Superintendent Harrison from K Division, Don Hayes from Travel Alberta, Mr. Johnston from the Historical Society of Alberta, Mr. Keown from the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation and Mr. MacDonald from the Bureau of Public Affairs - those people are appointed. You'll notice that the ones I mentioned from the private sector are not salaried employees. The ones from the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation and so on, of course, are employed by the department; Travel Alberta are paid by Travel Alberta and so on. But those people are definitely ...

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I accept the minister's explanation on this particular vote. But I must say that I am a little confused by the explanation, in that when I raised the question last night on another appropriation it was pointed out to me that there were four bodies who were, in fact, being paid under Fees and Commissions who are not listed in that manner. So I suggest that the government had better determine whether or not they are following the practice as stated by the minister of tourism, or whether it is in the manner in which I was given a reply last night.

MR. MINIELY:

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I should comment on this. I don't recall the answer that was given to the hon. member the other evening, but if employees are on contract to the government, on an employment contract or wage contract for a specified period of time as opposed to being in the salaried employment of the public service, they are included in the figures under Wages (Equivalent Man-Years). In other words, all people on contract to the government are included in all appropriations.

Now if you are talking about the situation where we might give a grant to a travel association and the travel association employs someone out of that grant on contract, that of course is not included. But all people on contract to the government, on an employment contract to the government, who are included in any item in here, whether it's in Fees and Commissions, Contracts and Agreements or Salaries or Advertising, are included in Salaried Man-Years or Wages (Equivalent Man-Years) right across-the-board.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a point or two to the minister on the practically total disregard for an area in my constituency which has great historical significance and that is the town of Fort Saskatchewan. This does bother me, because in the RCMP celebrations - with deference to my honourable colleague from Fort Macleod - the town of Fort Saskatchewan, with its historic value, has been completely disregarded merely by an accident of history, in that the northern section of the RCMP trek got here shortly after the southern trek did, but they wintered in Fort Edmonton, then moved back out to Fort Saskatchewan. So their centenary is in a different year by about two months, only by an accident of history.

The people in my area have certainly been just a little unhappy to find out that they are playing practically no role in the celebrations of the RCMP because of this problem.

MR. DOWLING:

I really thank the hon. member for his representation, and I have some considerable respect for the RCMP contribution to the Fort Saskatchewan area and to Fort Macleod. I congratulate those people from those two areas in particular who have made just absolutely fantastic presentations. I'm not going to tell you what has been approved because that notice will come in due course and presentations will be made. But there have now been nine proposals approved for Fort Saskatchewan and eight for Fort Macleod.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, this is not my beef. The beef is in the publicity that is going out. All we hear about is Fort Macleod. As I say, the southern trek of the North West Mounted Police got to Fort Macleod earlier than the trek that went to Fort Saskatchewan only because the heroes of the real piece were the northern section. They got the poor horses. They got the men who were not in as good physical condition as the southern section, plus the poor animals. In spite of those disadvantages, they got to their destination within only a month of the time the southern section got there.

This is my complaint, Mr. Chairman. There has been a disregard of this historical aspect, not the dollars and cents. I'm used to the hon. government members having their pictures taken with cheques in front of them making presentations to the people in communities throughout the province.

AN HON. MEMBER:

All tired out from handing out cheques.

DR. BUCK:

Yes, they get pretty tired from handing out cheques. But, you know, there is one thing about politics, Mr. Chairman, it is really quite difficult to buy people with their own tax dollars.

I sincerely bring this to the attention of the hon. members. The northern section of the North West Mounted Police that came to the Fort Saskatchewan area, wintered in Fort Edmonton, went back to Fort Saskatchewan in the spring and set up their detachment there, is almost totally ignored in the historical aspect of the presentations going on in the celebration. It is not the grants, hon. minister, it is the historical aspect that bothers me.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to congratulate my honourable friend from Fort Macleod for doing such a tremendous job. I don't say that with any degree of facetiousness. I would suggest to the hon. member from Fort Saskatchewan that he perhaps take a little lesson from my honourable friend from Fort Macleod on how, in fact, to handle his constituency.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Dr. Buck, I wonder if we would let Mr. Buckwell ...

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, I don't like the inference left by the hon. minister. I am reiterating to him once again, it was an accident of history. Otherwise, the two areas would have celebrated the centenary in the same year ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

So was your last election.

DR. BUCK:

The northern trek go here in that same year, but because there were no facilities in Fort Saskatchewan at that time, they came to Fort Edmonton in that very same fall as they got to Fort Macleod. Then they went out there in the spring. But the two events happen to fall in different calendar years. I think that the celebration of the two treks and the two outposts should have been celebrated, and I still contend that the Fort Saskatchewan post was completely ignored in history. That is my contention.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks. Maybe the hon. member from Fort Saskatchewan sort of ignores history to the extent that the first commissioner who brought

the Mounted Police to the southern Alberta area was Commissioner French and nothing more was heard of Commissioner French from that time on. Yet it was through his efforts that they got here.

As far as the publicity for Fort Saskatchewan, it doesn't come in 1974 anyway. It comes in 1975 along with Fort Calgary. It might also be noted that in the trek north to Fort Edmonton, they went to Fort Saskatchewan. When they were in Fort Edmonton, the first insurrection that the Mounted Police had was in Fort Edmonton. So the experience of the Mounted Police if you read history, is that the recruits of those days seem to have fallen into the ways of the people of Fort Edmonton.

I might also say that we have been working on our centennial in Fort Macleod since 1967. I think the hon. minister will agree that as soon as these grants came out we could have spent all the money. We had plans for every cent of it. If Fort Saskatchewan feels its nose is a little out of joint, this is again going to be a quirk in history. All I can say is that you should have worked on it a little earlier.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, all I want to say is ...

[Interjections]

... well, if the hon. government members don't want to listen they can all go out and have coffee, because they're not contributing anything to the happenings in the Legislature most of the time.

[Interjections]

AN HON. MEMBER:

We're contributing a few bucks.

DR. BUCK:

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, they're finding that the democratic process is just so much of an obstacle to their doing other things that I don't really know why they even bother showing up. But, Mr. Chairman, that's beside the point.

[Interjections]

We just about got the Deputy Premier up, Mr. Chairman.

All kidding aside, Mr. Chairman, the original group that divided in Saskatchewan was the same troupe that came out to the west. They started at the same time, and it's just an accident of being in two different calendar years. But the event should have been celebrated in the same calendar year and both outposts given practically the same amount of recognition. Nobody can debate the fact that they have received the same recognition because they have not. All we hear about is Fort Macleod. I realize they have such an excellent member down in Fort Macleod that that's probably the reason. But I've got history against me. It's not the qualifications of the man, it's history that's giving me the problem. Mr. Chairman, all we want is due recognition that we are part of that original trek which came across the prairies and settled. And I can understand them wanting to leave Fort Edmonton to get out to Fort Saskatchewan, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to get into this private fight.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Do you want to rewrite the history?

MR. TAYLOR:

No, I'm not dealing with the history, except a different type of history. It comes under the Grants item - \$328,000 in Grants being provided for this year.

In connection with the history, I suppose the RCMP have a line of history in every community in the province. I think it's all a pretty glorious history. I think the big time in the Drumheller area was when we had the western front in the early '20s [and just before]. It was probably the roughest part of Alberta at that time. The sergeant of the RCMP was challenged to come into the western front. There was a chap there by the name of Sgt. Taylor - no relation - who said that in no way would he refuse to go to the western front. He would carry out his duties.

I remember as a small boy watching Sgt. Taylor and two other Mounties in their red coats come up on their horses and ride right through the western front which is now the Newcastle district, the district in which I was raised, incidentally. They rode up, crowds on both sides. As they rode along someone took a shot at Sgt. Taylor; the bullet went through his hat. I was amazed that he hardly quivered. He continued his ride through and then rode back. Later they apprehended the man. There were some tremendous happenings there.

The people in the Drumheller area are anxious to try to commemorate what the RCMP have done in that area, not only Drumheller but Carbon, East Coulee, Rosebud and so on. I understand that these grants are for the creation of memorials that will pay tribute to the work the Mounties have done. One of the things that worries me a little is, if there are communities that have not yet worked out a project, is it now too late for communities to do that in order to secure some of this grant? Perhaps my question might be: is this entire amount of grants already committed?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Chairman, the program was designed in this manner. It was a three-phase program - actually more than that. The first phase was to create an awareness of the RCMP and their contribution to the history of Alberta and Canada with an advertising program, by notifying every single municipal government of any kind - county, municipality, town council, village council and so on, that there would be as a follow-up, as a second step, a community involvement portion, at which time we would entertain proposals for grants which would be limited to a maximum of \$20,000. They had to commemorate the coming of the RCMP and their contribution, as I said, to our history. The third portion of that total program would be an involvement of the private sector.

We gave the people from each of the communities of Alberta something close to a year to make their submissions. We extended that period of time because, as is usual, there is always some delay in some areas. We extended it almost three months. I think it was almost a year when we finally finished, but we extended it three months, and that is the final date. We just had to have a cut-off date. We now have some 20 to 30 proposals that are yet to be considered. There have been 136 approved and 62 rejected. We would hope that by the end of May the final decisions on all the proposals will have been made.

We have done it strictly on a blank map, putting pins in to make sure that every area of the province is looked at. We look at it in terms of our zones rather than in other terms. That is the only way that Travel Alberta can do it. Rather than counties, municipalities and so on, it's on a zone basis.

We have had, with very few exceptions, extremely fine response from the private sector and from the communities. The private sector is just now getting on stream things like the Bank of Montreal contribution to Fort Edmonton, and the pictures and posters, which you all have a copy of, by the Horseman's Hall of Fame. Labatt's Breweries are donating their bus. It's painted in the RCMP colours and will probably be on display this coming Monday on the Legislature Grounds. It's going to accompany the RCMP Musical Ride - this kind of thing.

So from the standpoint of community involvement, we've had to have a cut-off date which was extended. We expect that the final decisions on all the proposals will be by the end of May.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Chairman, may I just add something here for the enlightenment of the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

First of all, of course, I really do have to commend the MLA and the town of Fort MacLeod for their excellent contribution toward the planning and execution of their festival commemorating the anniversary of the RCMP arrival. Every time I go there the whole community is just full of enthusiasm.

I understand that when the RCMP came to Edmonton - when they divided and arrived in Fort Edmonton - it was chief factor Hardisty who tried to have them settle across the river, in the area which is now The University of Alberta. However, Inspector Jarvis felt at the time that he should not really be under the influence of any single group of people. He then settled downriver in Fort Saskatchewan the following spring.

Also, of course, it may have had something to do with the first credit given by the factor of the Hudson's Bay Company. I think it was an amount of about \$9,000. The money was coming in slowly and maybe Inspector Jarvis just wanted to remove his people from the free credit that was then available to his force from the Hudson's Bay Company.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I wonder if the members of the committee would consent to introduction of some guests by the hon. Member for Camrose?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. STROMBERG:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. May I revert to Introduction of Visitors?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS (CONT.)

MR. STROMBERG:

I have the agreement of the House. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, for the third year in a row that I know of, Mrs. Ilnicki from Round Hill has brought her class to visit this Assembly. She has 32 students with her today. I offer my congratulations to Round Hill for the interest they show in our doings of government. May I ask them to stand and be recognized by this Assembly.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (CONT.)

Executive Council (Cont.)

Tourism

Appropriation 1415 Alberta RCMP Century Celebrations (Cont.)

MR. TAYLOR:

If I could have one further question it will finish the line I was on.

I would like to ask the hon. minister, were the contacts that you refer to made through the municipal governments?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, all the governments of Alberta, of a municipal nature, had notice that we would entertain applications for funds.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, one or two things. Although, before I ask my three questions, I wonder if the government isn't going to give some consideration to stopping this malarkey about Salaried Man-Years and all this. This is not layman's language. The ordinary individual doesn't know what you are talking about. I think we should try to keep government as simple as possible. I think we should have a statement that there are so many people employed by the Government of Alberta; this number is under contract, this number is regular employees. All this man-hour years - it just seems to me that we're going around the mulberry bush on that one.

Mr. Chairman, there are three questions I'd like to ask. Number one is: who employed Leslie Nielsen? What is the amount paid to Mr. Nielsen? And is Mr. Nielsen still a Canadian citizen?

While I'm on my feet, maybe the hon. minister could also answer this question: I've had the odd person come up to me - not too many, but a few - who has asked me why we are featuring Chief Crowfoot. Now, I want to make it clear that I have every respect for Chief Crowfoot and what he did. But people are concerned about why other Indian people aren't - there must have been others besides Chief Crowfoot, but he seems to be the one who's getting star billing. I wonder if the minister, maybe, could enlighten the House on the reason for picking out just Chief Crowfoot?

MR. DOWLING:

Right. Well, in answer to the first question, if I recall the figure, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Nielsen's contract was for \$20,000. I believe him to be a Canadian, at least he certainly has indicated that. I haven't his birth certificate here or any certificate to indicate he's changed his citizenship. He was recruited because he was a Canadian and is recognized as such in the entertainment world. The recruitment was done by the firm of Vickers & Benson Ltd. which, as I indicated, had the task of presenting the whole program of advertising and coordinating that portion of it.

With regard to Chief Crowfoot; Chief Crowfoot played a very significant role in the history of Alberta, bringing about peace and a solution to some of the major problems of the whiskey trade in those days, along with the RCMP. I think it would have been sheer folly to have celebrated the coming of the RCMP to Alberta and their contribution to the force without recognizing, in fact, what that group of people did. There are some people who will say that they don't want to be associated with the RCMP. Those are few in number, as I understand it, because the matter was checked out beforehand.

MR. MINIELY:

I can't let the comment of the hon. Member for Calgary Millican go without some comment. When we took office, basically there was, in budgetary terms, a growing - it had been growing for some years prior to 1971 - use of wages as opposed to full-time civil service positions. I felt, with my responsibility to the government and also to the Legislature, that if we were to adequately determine the actual utilization of manpower by government, we had to get some control on wages, whether these were full-time wages or part-time wages. Certainly the former practice was that while the growth of the civil service appeared to be much smaller than was the case, many people on wages were not included in the figures. In order to provide full disclosure of the use of manpower by this government, which is my desire, we picked up people on wages and started to show them - whether they were full-time or part-time - in terms of the equivalent full-time utilization of manpower.

Now I appreciate the sensitivity of the hon. Member for Calgary Millican because they have attempted for two years to use and distort this in terms of the growth of manpower by this government. Nevertheless, I stand firm that, in terms of full disclosure of the utilization of manpower in modern government, it's not really that complicated. The hon. Member for Calgary Millican just needs to think in terms that the numbers below the appropriation are the equivalent full-time, whether they are on wages or whether they are on salaries.

MR. LUDWIG:

On contracts?

MR. MINIELY:

Salaried people are included in their numbers, and people on wages are included. If they are working three days a week, they are transposed as though they were a full-time equivalent.

Certainly, for the hon. Member for Calgary Millican to stand up and say that we should not be keeping track of these large numbers of people in modern government who are working on a part-time basis on wages, is to say to me that we shouldn't really be attempting to control these numbers. Unless we are going to disclose them, what are we going to have?

I appreciate his frustration but this is the way it should be done, and should be done adequately and properly. I certainly appreciate that his attempts to distort the numbers have not been successful and that's one of the reasons for his frustration.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, I've distorted nothing. I asked a simple question, and now I'm distorting things. Mr. Chairman, I think we, on this side of the House - and if I'm going to take responsibility, I will - but the Premier of this province went right across this province in 1971, misleading the people of this province that we had the largest civil service in Canada in Alberta and that it was a terrible thing. Now we have the largest in the world, so it must be that much worse.

[Interjections]

So all I'm trying to do is find out. Now you can't tell me, or nobody on that other side of the House has been able to successfully prove to me that we haven't increased our civil service, either by way of wages or by some kind of contract. Now, I'm talking to people every day of the week who are regular civil servants ...

DR. WARRACK:

Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. DIXON:

Just a minute, Mr. Minister. I may get to you in a few minutes.

If the hon. minister or the hon. Provincial Treasurer say I am concerned, I am. I believe we want honesty in government and the simpler it is the better. That's what people are interested in and that's what I'm interested in. And if this government tries to tell me that it hasn't increased the civil service, which it has been trying to put across here since it got into office, I just don't believe it and neither do the people of Alberta.

So the sooner the government on the other side of the House decides to come clean and tell the people what's going on instead of all of this gobbledygook about man-hours and everything else you want to throw in - there are a lot of lay people in this province and they are interested in the truth.

If I'm going to be accused of distorting things, I'm distorting nothing. I'm asking for the facts.

DR. WARRACK:

A question. Would you permit a question?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Chairman, regarding Alberta and the RCMP Century Celebrations. As I indicated last night - and I'm sorry if I didn't make myself clear - I indicated the number of people ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Point of order. On a point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sit down.

MR. LUDWIG:

We're juggling between two issues. We're dealing with the hon. Provincial Treasurer on the question of wages, fees and commissions, contracts and perhaps hidden employees, and we want to finish that thing. Now let's not juggle back and forth between three ministers. The honourable Warrack wants to get into the act desperately ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order. Order, Mr. Ludwig.

MR. LUDWIG:

... he'll have his turn. So why don't we finish this issue, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

That's what I trust the minister is doing.

MR. DOWLING:

I really am trying to explain the matter, Mr. Chairman, from the standpoint of Travel Alberta and the RCMP Century Celebrations.

I do have a full and comprehensive list of the names and people involved in this. As it indicates in the appropriation, we do have exactly that number of people employed either by contract or otherwise in Travel Alberta. That includes the RCMP Century Celebrations. As I indicated there is only Dr. Walker, who is the coordinator, and his

secretary - I neglected to mention that - who are, in fact, employed as a part of the appropriation.

So truly, there are 43 people employed in those two appropriations.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I want to make just one comment. It's very simple - I apply again to the hon. Member for Calgary Millican. I would compare the manner in which manpower is disclosed in the current budget as full disclosure compared to the way the former government did as partial disclosure.

MR. LUDWIG:

I don't believe it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order. Will the members of the Assembly give unanimous consent for Mr. Anderson to introduce some guests in the gallery.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS (CONT.)

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly some 30 Grade 9 students from the Gilbert Paterson Junior High School in Lethbridge. They arose early this morning to make this trip. They have two full days of activities before leaving for their homes in Lethbridge at 3:00 o'clock tomorrow.

They are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Blanche Russell and Mr. John Hunter. They are seated in the public gallery and I would ask them to rise and be recognized by the House.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (CONT.)

Executive Council (Cont.)

Tourism (Cont.)

Appropriation 1415 Alberta RCMP Century Celebrations (Cont.)

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, with reference to the remarks of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, he did very well as far as he went, but I don't think he went far enough. I think when we look at the total Executive Council budget with \$1,336,000 of Fees and Commissions, that we on this side have a right to ask where it's going. We asked the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs to tell us whether there are any people who are going to be hired under that \$1,336,000. He indicated there were. The hon. Provincial Treasurer got up and gave him the word to say that maybe you really don't know what you are talking about. Then he gets up, walks out and gets a little bit of information himself, comes back here and says that we shouldn't be asking embarrassing questions. It's the way he says and we have got to take his word for it.

The people want to know exactly how many people, how many employees the government has, and they are not concerned whether they are salaried, whether they are on wages. He has technicalities of saying, well, they are not civil servants. We're not really

concerned what they are. We want to know how many are being paid, contracts, part-time, full-time and whatever. \$1,336,000 Fees and Commissions - it's a good item.

Of course, the Conservatives like to deal in big figures. They feel the bigger they are the less we should ask about them. But I think that from now on since they've got a few new wrinkles in their budget - they've got a few new things - we have the right to even ask whether there are any slush funds in this \$1,336,000 of people's money. Is this something contingent, not provided for and unforeseen? Is that what it is? We are entitled to ask for specifics and that is what we are doing. All the haranguing and trying to throw us off the scent and pretending that we perhaps are pushing things too far will not stop this. We are entitled to, and we are going to demand, details. Now maybe it isn't proper for an average back-bencher to ask a minister for details of where the public money is going. But the more they resist this kind of thing, the more we know we're on the right track.

So from now on, as far as I'm concerned - and I believe a lot of the hon. members on this side - Fees and Commissions have to be spelled out in some detail to see if there is any hidden spending in there, and to see if there are any people getting on contracts or see if these are things that perhaps should be spelled out in detail.

I'm not at all interested that this was a practice in the past. We're dealing with the situation now and I'm not quite prepared to have the implicit faith in the minister that he says we ought to. The Opposition has no business relying on the government to do the right thing. We have no business accusing them of doing something wrong, but we have no business relying on them. We have to question them.

So let the minister come and put his hands on the table rather voluntarily and give us the whole truth and nothing but the whole truth, not half the truth. We want the details and if you give us half the picture, we're not satisfied from now on, Mr. Chairman.

DR. MCCRIMMON:

Aw sit down.

MR. LUDWIG:

This business of one minister telling us one thing, the hon. Premier telling us the other half and the Provincial Treasurer telling us something else - we're not satisfied with it. So they should not blame us for it.

We simply do not buy their story that they've cut out the fat from the civil service with the amount of civil service they have in this government. We don't believe it. They are making the figures look good. We don't believe that we're getting the whole picture and it is my privilege to stand up here and challenge the minister to give us all the details. Just telling us that's the way it is, we're not buying it, at least I'm not. The minister should not expect me to.

When I say that there is \$1,336,000 in Fees and Commissions under Executive Council, let the minister go down and give us a breakdown of the details. Is it wrong to ask where \$1,336,000 is going to go? We have some explanation under Vote 1415 or Vote 1414. When you look at it ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Ludwig ...

MR. LUDWIG:

... \$273 ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Ludwig, that total could be discussed before we conclude the complete Executive Council. This is quite proper ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, but the hon. Provincial Treasurer has raised an issue and I want to ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I appreciate it but this has got continued. Can we try to conclude Appropriation 1415, Fees and Commissions?

MR. LUDWIG:

The issue was raised, Mr. Chairman, and [the time] for you to have stopped it was at the beginning and not when I'm on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Ludwig, please continue the discussion ...

MR. LUDWIG:

This always happens. If you can't stop the debate at the beginning ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, Mr. Ludwig. Order. Please continue with Appropriation 1415.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, we went far beyond Appropriation 1414 in the Provincial Treasurer's remarks. For you now to start setting new rules because somebody isn't happy, I don't appreciate it. If you let a debate get out of hand and you can't stop it at the beginning, then let it come a conclusion on the issue that was raised, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well. Can we then complete our debate on Appropriation 1415. Let's conclude that.

MR. LUDWIG:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to get back to discuss the exchange between the hon. Provincial Treasurer and the hon. Member for Calgary Millican as to what we're after when we raised the question of fees and commissions. Because we got an answer from the Minister of Consumer Affairs that was promptly contradicted ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nonsense.

MR. LUDWIG:

... it was contradicted. He went over there, gave him the word and tried to recover the fumble. As far as I can determine from what I heard, the hon. Provincial Treasurer was most disappointed with the hon. minister, Mr. Dowling's answer.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Nonsense.

MR. LUDWIG:

He went out there scowling at him, slightly red in the face and said that's a 'no-no'. Watch what you say, because I'm the boss in this area.

So now you'd like to cut it off so they can have a pow-wow, a caucus to determine who is right.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Ludwig, the Chair is not attempting to cut anything off. Please!

MR. LUDWIG:

Thank you very much. Then I'll continue if that's the case, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your support in this whole issue.

Now that you're with me, Mr. Chairman, I'll proceed. Under Fees and Commissions, perhaps the Provincial Treasurer can give us an undertaking that he will give us some detailed breakdown of the \$1,336,000 so he doesn't have to do it piecemeal.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I'm sorry, Mr. Ludwig, I've asked that we continue our debate on Appropriation 1415 and Fees and Commissions under that sum is \$70,000.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to you, I was trying to make it easier for the hon. Provincial Treasurer to do his job properly. We're not satisfied with getting a piecemeal answer. In view of the fact that you reversed your decision just a minute ago, Mr. Chairman, I will deal with these issues as they come up, one by one. It doesn't really matter whether they're dealt with now or later. But I thought if you permit the hon. Provincial Treasurer to fire off here in rather an incomplete fashion, then we should pin him down to give us the whole truth and all the facts. Perhaps he should give us a breakdown of fees and commissions in every vote under Executive Council because that's what we're going to ask for. It's just being fair to him. We try to help him with the difficult situation he's in, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I appreciate that.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, I'm sure glad you are.

MR. BENOIT:

I would like to ask someone about the capital estimates on Appropriation 2682 and 2683.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Benoit, we usually deal with capital estimates after we approve ...

MR. BENOIT:

Well, we haven't been - right now while we're still on this. No, not on that one - under Alberta Travel in the Public Works book. We've been dealing with ...

MR. DOWLING:

You can if you wish, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I'm sorry, 26 which, Mr. Benoit?

MR. BENOIT:

2682 and 2683.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Those were approved May 8, I'm sorry.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, not the capital estimates for Travel Alberta and 1414 and 1415. Mr. Chairman, with regard to your ruling of not dealing with it now, how are we going to be able to deal with it if the minister is going to be away next week? That's the reason we're doing the estimates now.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I'm sorry, Mr. Clark. The Chair is at a loss as to exactly what Mr. Benoit is requesting. Appropriation 2682 and 2683 were approved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. BENOIT:

No, that's the capital estimates in each department. Go ahead, Mr. Minister.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Chairman, 2682 deals with the following items: Alberta Travel Information Centre at Canmore - it's a site development. It's a landscaping proposition at Canmore because of the difficulty relative to the national parks set-up. We felt that that site should be

chosen rather than one just on the outskirts of Calgary, or one further in to Banff, or on the other side.

The second one is Coutts. This is to clean up the site because it is closing down. We had some real difficulty in that because there was a lack of a proper area to set it in. We did correspond with the mayor and council and obviously they were a little bit upset that it had to move. However, we thought that our task was to do the best job for the tourists that we could. We had to move it in order that that could be achieved.

We are relocating that site to Milk River. There we believe it will be of considerably more value. The site has been chosen and it is slated for a 1974-75 budget of \$30,000. That's the only one that's on this appropriation thus far.

The site development at Alsask is part of that '74-75 program for \$2,000; and the site development to complete at Fort Walsh. That is that appropriation, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BENOIT:

Further, Mr. Chairman, will the provincial government be making any contributions to the proposed youth hostels along the Kananaskis road?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest the Department of Lands and Forests would obviously be involved with setting aside sites. From the standpoint of financial contribution I believe they do receive some grant now from the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation. With regard to the actual building, the youth hostels organization is pretty stable and does have its own funds.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Chairman, just a further question on that. Has the youth hostels association determined the actual site for each one of their proposed hostels? In the eastern slope hearings I understand that they suggested a number. Were they specific in their actual locations?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. This doesn't fall under this appropriation, but I do understand that they were very specific. As a matter of fact, I read their presentation and they were quite specific about where, in fact, they wanted them located.

Appropriation 1415 agreed to:

\$837,500

Department of Advanced Education (Cont.)

MR. NOTLEY:

Just to pick up where I left off the other day, Mr. Chairman, I would like the minister perhaps to take a few moments and give the committee some indication as to his particular philosophy in terms of operating the Department of Advanced Education.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I raised this is because as the minister well knows, we had quite a controversial speech at The University of Lethbridge about three months ago, made by the Deputy Minister of Education, Dr. Worth.

I think, in fairness to Dr. Worth, I would point out that he made it quite clear that this was not necessarily the policy of the government and he also made it clear that he was trying to stimulate discussion. I certainly have no objection to doing that because I think it is important occasionally that the boat be rocked. I see no major reason why senior civil servants or public officials shouldn't, on occasion, rock the boat.

But there were a number of comments that he made about which I would like the minister to advise us just where he personally stands. I'm a little concerned about some of the comments made by the deputy minister. For example, in his speech he talks about academic privilege, Mr. Chairman. I will just quote for the minister's benefit:

Academic privilege grew; and as Canadian university education came to reach monopolistic status among the options open to high school graduates, it has come to

exhibit monopolistic a spirit. And as someone once said about the monopoly that Oxford and Cambridge exerted over eighteenth-century English life: "The spirit of monopolists is narrow, lazy and oppressive."

Mr. Chairman, I don't disagree with that comment about the spirit of monopolists being narrow, lazy and oppressive, but I would take issue with the comment that our universities in Alberta have come to exhibit a monopolistic spirit. This may be true of the occasional academic, but, Mr. Chairman, I think that it is rather too sweeping a statement and a severe indictment which, unless I see some real evidence to back it up, just is not a credible statement with respect to the post-secondary education in general.

Then the deputy minister goes on, on page 9, to say:

In short, the opportunity for autonomy within higher education does not seem to produce new services or curricular change, despite its potential benefit for intellectual freedom of the faculty. Instead it seems to perpetuate ritualism and privilege. Accordingly, it is not inappropriate to twist Lord Acton's famous phrase to suggest that power tends to corrupt and academic power tends to corrupt academically.

Mr. Chairman, again it seems to me that it doesn't necessarily follow that institutional autonomy stifles change. I would believe, frankly, that the contrary would probably be true. I am a little concerned that if we centralize too much power in the Department of Advanced Education, that is probably going to have a much more stifling effect on improving the quality of university instruction in this province than the dangers the deputy minister cites when he talks about institutional autonomy.

Mr. Chairman, one other comment that the deputy minister made in his Lethbridge speech, when he was talking about the areas that a university should seek out:

Fourth, an institution must not seek direct political power - intellectual power, the power of knowledge, yes; but not legal power or the capacity to coerce. That is the instrument of those who govern. A college or university may influence, advise, consult, aid in policy making, serve as either agent or critic of government, and, above all, seek understanding; but when it seeks direct political power itself, it abandons its claim to immunity from partisan politics.

That may be well and true in a general sense, Mr. Chairman, but frankly it seems to me that as much as anything the government has set out new rules of the game where we have eliminated the Colleges Commission and the Universities Commission, where we have put, if you like, interinstitutional politicking on a new plain, that is, direct access from the institution through to the minister. Now the minister will say that we have these advisory committees, but when they meet two to six times a year, they are not really going to provide much of a buffer.

What I am saying is that we have changed the rules of the game from the kind of academic interinstitutional politicking that would take place under the Universities Commission to one where the minister is more directly involved. Under those circumstances, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we're going to find the inevitable consequence that university presidents are going to make comments, and are not only going to make comments about the war in Vietnam or whether President Nixon should be impeached or not, but far more relevant, they are going to make comments about the way in which the deputy minister is doing his job, the way in which the minister is doing his job, whether or not sufficient grants are available, whether or not funds are available to make it possible for the universities to do the job.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in a sense the institutions are going to be, not seeking political power in a partisan way, but certainly they are going to be exercising political power. That is inevitable as a result of the change in the structure where we have eliminated the Universities Commission and made the minister the place where, as Harry Truman used to say, "the buck stops here". And when the buck stops at the minister's desk, it seems to me that we are going to inevitably see our institutions playing a much more direct political role.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that there has to be coordination. No one in this Assembly suggests that we should write a blank cheque to our institutions or that we should encourage different institutions to duplicate programs. The Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc raised some valid points, quite frankly, with respect to the law school at The University of Calgary.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Careful.

MR. NOTLEY:

Yes, all right.

MR. CLARK:

Remember Foothills.

MR. NOTLEY:

Nevertheless, the fact of the matter remains that it seems to me that while there has to be a role of coordination, there is a very real danger in eroding institutional autonomy. I think that a proper university system, Mr. Chairman, really has two central guideposts. One is institutional autonomy within reasonable perimeters, and the second is academic freedom. This doesn't mean that there shouldn't be changes within the university structure to democratize the structure, but I would very much fear moving away from autonomy to a systems approach where what we are actually doing is centralizing all the major decision-making approaches in the office of the deputy and the minister.

Mr. Chairman, I want to move from there to deal with the Downey Report as it applies to northwestern Alberta post-secondary education. The minister asked whether or not we in the region have any comments on it. I'd just like to say that I have a few reservations about the major proposition made by the Downey Report that the Fairview College and the Grande Prairie College be placed under a common board of governors.

I certainly agree with the argument that we should be working very closely with the Province of British Columbia in planning the post-secondary education program for northwestern Alberta and northeastern British Columbia. As a matter of fact, the Peace River country in so many ways is one common area that the boundary has presented a lot of problems, not only in post-secondary education, but in other areas as well.

But getting back to the Fairview College itself, there are a number of specific problems that Fairview has faced, for example, in attracting federal Manpower students. The department has charged Manpower \$55 a day to go to Fairview compared with \$13.60 for NAIT, \$29 for Grouard, and \$5.98 per student per day for the Edmonton Vocational Centre.

Now Mr. Chairman, if the instructional costs at Fairview were much higher than Grouard or Grande Prairie, then of course one could say, well perhaps we have to take another look. But the major reason, as I'm sure the minister is aware, is that we have extremely high capital costs; the cost, for example, of the heating plant which was built to accommodate an institution much larger than Fairview College at the moment. When you compute all that into your charge for Manpower students, you get a much higher per pupil charge and the net result is that it is difficult to attract Manpower students to the college. I would suggest that since those overhead charges are constant costs anyway - they are there whether we have one Manpower student or ten or a hundred - in terms of allocating our costs we not include them.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest, and I know the principal of the college has made this observation - he's probably talked to the minister about it - that all provincially administered institutions should have a standard cost for Manpower students. That is, whether they go to the Alberta Vocational Institute, whether they go to the Vermilion School of Agriculture, whether it's the Vocational School of Agriculture in Fairview or Grouard or Grande Prairie, or what have you, there should be a common Manpower charge. In this way we would, I think, be able to allocate places where it's most practical, where we do have the particular academic staff to do the job and, for that matter, where the student might in fact choose to go. I think there are a lot of people taking Manpower courses who might otherwise, as things now stand, come to Edmonton but would prefer to stay in a rural setting if all other things were equal.

Mr. Chairman, in dealing with some of the additional problems, I am pleased to see there is going to be more advertising. I think it is important that we advertise the services of the colleges and the various post-secondary institutions, so that is one particular part of the budget that I don't quarrel with at all.

I think there perhaps has been a restriction in program expansion at Fairview over the last number of years. Again, the new principal, as the minister is probably aware, is the kind of man who has gone out and searched out other possible areas that we might develop at Fairview. We are quite excited about the work he is doing in the community and in the central and north Peace generally, and feel that if he can be backed up in the extension of some existing programs and the initiation of new programs, it will do a good deal to stabilize the institution.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me just come right down then to the options which are available for Fairview. One option, of course, as the Downey Report suggested, is the common board

of governors for the two Alberta institutions. I think it is fair to say that most people in the central and north Peace who are concerned with the Fairview College are not overwhelmed with enthusiasm at that prospect. I think there is a good deal of concern that what would end up happening, despite the best intentions to the contrary, is that Fairview would become a satellite campus of Grande Prairie.

There is, however, the suggestion - and I would like the minister to respond to it - that we might, in fact, try out our interprovincial cooperation by having an amalgamation between Fairview and Dawson Creek. Both institutions have similar programs in many respects. The suggestion has been made that it might, in fact, be a feasible proposition to have an interprovincial board which would operate the two institutions, one in British Columbia and the other in Alberta.

A second option which, of course, I know the minister has to consider, is setting Fairview up as a public college and running it with its own board of governors. That obviously has some advantages, and on the other hand, from the viewpoint of the region and the area, some real difficulties too.

Third, is to continue to run the college as a provincially administered institution, but to build it up. That is, to expand the services, to continue to help the principal improve the quality of the program, to provide additional staff in certain areas which are necessary to upgrade the facility.

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

Still a fourth would be perhaps to make it a satellite of a larger institution such as NAIT. I am not frankly very enthused with that possibility. I can see that at a time when education is in vogue, it might very well be that Fairview would prosper under those circumstances. But, if we ever get into a belt-tightening situation, the tightening would begin at the satellite level. I'm almost certain of that. Knowing just a little bit about how large institutions operate, I think the belt-tightening would begin at the satellite level. While this might help the problem in the next two or three years, I don't think it is going to solve the problem down the road.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, I think that one thing the Downey Report perhaps overlooked in their assessment of Fairview is the excellent service that the college provides to the community as a whole. I know just a short time ago at the annual seed fair the principal was outlining the number of people who had used the Fairview College during the month of March. I think well over 2,000 people had used it in a variety of community activities. We feel that it is an institution which is not only worth keeping, but in terms of the importance of the northwestern part of the province - when we consider, Mr. Minister, that we are looking at probably some significant industrial moves there in the Clear Hills in the years ahead - I think it would be a real tragedy to shift Fairview from its educational function to some other role. Our concern in the community is that we should consider these other options to upgrade the college and make sure that it not only continues to exist, but that, in fact, it becomes a more significant and better balanced institution.

I just want to conclude my remarks, Mr. Chairman, by saying that I think we were extremely fortunate in the choice of a principal. We have an excellent principal. That, of course, is pretty critical when you are dealing with a college like Fairview. I'm sure the same is probably generally true with respect to Vermilion as well. We have a first-rate man who has an understanding of what the college can do, and I think a real zeal in attempting to do it.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just make a few comments on the subject of Christian colleges. They were debated under the estimates the other day and I noticed with interest several of the comments. I would just like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that several groups and organizations over the years have promoted the concept of a non-denominational Christian college or equivalent with university affiliation in Alberta. Some hon. members may be interested in the 1967 report of the interdenominational university committee which was chaired by Dr. T. L. Leadbeater. That report was tabled with the Executive Council of the day. There is now information in the library of the Legislature on that subject that some hon. members may be interested in looking at.

After receiving that report, I understand the Universities Commission of the day agreed in principle with the concept of an interdenominational ecumenical university.

In recent years the concept of a Christian college or an interdenominational college on Christian principles, has been forwarded by the Christian College Association of Alberta, which has been the prime mover, I guess you could say, in the last three years. Recently I think all MLAs have received material from them and have received letters from their constituents furthering and urging the members to consider the merits of the

application. As a result I understand that members of the Legislature on both sides of the House have considerable interest and have expressed favour on the topic.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that we don't have a non-denominational Christian college with credit affiliations in Alberta. Consequently, many students have to go to university or college in the United States in order to get the type of education they desire. I understand that the credit granting colleges on Christian principles that are operating in Alberta today are denominational rather than a non-denominational.

Now, it seems that there has been some confusion as to the procedure to be followed in getting approval for a Christian college in Alberta. It seems that the Christian College Association was told that they should first secure university approval, but I guess in reality government approval is required before the university can give academic recognition.

Perhaps it would be most helpful if the hon. Minister of Advanced Education, for the benefit of all members in the Legislature, would outline, in a clear-cut statement, the approval process which is required with, if possible, dates or time spans between the various steps required in starting from scratch and ending up with a new, approved credit granting facility in one of the universities in Alberta.

It's my understanding, and I think it's obvious to all members, that the Christian College Association has spent considerable moneys on research in support of its application. There is certainly no doubt in my mind of its sincerity. I would doubt that anybody in the Legislature would doubt its sincerity and the obvious intense interest it has in achieving its goal. I understand it has worked in cooperation with various representatives of universities in Alberta and representatives of the Department of Advanced Education. The Christian College Association has supplied considerable information to all people in the province who have expressed any interest or who are concerned with the establishment of a Christian college in Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Advanced Education commented the other day that the March submission he received was a new submission. I think, on closer inspection, he may find that in reality it was not a new submission but additional information to the August, 1973 submission that was made to the minister.

Mr. Chairman, another thing that we should keep in mind; when the minister is outlining the timetable of decision-making, would he keep in mind that it is desirable to have this college operating in the fall of '75, if at all possible. In order to achieve that, the Christian College Association would require some indication of approval by December 1, I would think, of this year at the very, very latest.

The minister also mentioned, Mr. Chairman, at least I so understood, that he was not exactly sure what the Christian College Association really was and the concept it had in mind. It's my understanding, for what it's worth anyway, that the Christian College Association is desirous of establishing a non-denominational on campus, credit affiliated college. All subjects would be taught from a Christian perspective. Enrolment would certainly not be restricted in any way, shape or form to anyone of any faith, including an atheist for that matter.

MR. FOSTER:

We've already got three of those. They're all non-denominational.

MR. WILSON:

There is one other point I would like to bring up, Mr. Chairman, which was briefly touched on by some members. That is the comment from the minister that he cannot make a decision until after the debate of the resolution that's on the Order Paper. I just can't buy that. I think that is a delaying step on behalf of the minister. In fact, it tends to make one think that the only reason for making the statement is that there may be a decision not to allow the Christian college to proceed or not to approve it, and this is one way of sort of side-stepping. If he had decided to proceed I don't think he would be waiting. If he approved the Christian college concept, for example, before the resolution came up for debate, that time could be used in praising the minister and pouring accolades on his head, and so on, for taking such a decision.

One other point that we would like the minister to comment on is: could he give us the assurances that all members in the Legislature would have a free vote on this. I would think that we have had some precedents in this House where resolutions have been voted on on the basis of a free vote. But because the minister has taken the stand that he wants to find the results of this resolution before he makes any decision, perhaps he could also give us the assurance that when that resolution does come up, it would not be debated or voted upon upon party lines as far as the government side of the House is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, with those few comments I would invite the minister to respond to some of the questions. Our contribution this morning, hopefully, was accepted in the manner that it was given, and that was one of being helpful and not antagonistic or argumentative.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CLARK:

I had a number of comments I wanted to make. Unfortunately I have to catch a plane in about seven minutes - I mean to leave to catch the plane. So my remarks will be very abbreviated. I should say at the outset that they are not really meant to be personally directed at the minister. I would have a bit more time to perhaps soften the blow if I didn't have, now, less than six minutes.

Very quickly, I would like to ask the minister to comment either today or Monday - and I'll certainly read it in Hansard if I'm not here - in some detail on this paper From Autonomy To System which was given by the deputy minister at The University of Lethbridge. It's rather significant, I think, that in the third line on the front page, under the title of From Autonomy To System, the deputy minister quotes that it might be good to reread a writing by Owen Holmes entitled Come Hell or High Water.

I think, unfortunately, that is rather indicative of the way that speech was received at The University of Lethbridge; that come hell or high water, the Department of Advanced Education and, to a very great degree, the Deputy Minister of Advanced Education, were going to see the Department of Education coordinated, coerced, or whatever other term you want to use. The very least I can say about that speech is that it left just a terrible taste in the mouths of not only people at The University of Lethbridge, but in many other areas across the province.

I would hope in the future, when a major presentation like this is going to be made, that the Minister of Advanced Education himself would see it appropriate to make this kind of presentation, because it was seen by many people in the academic community as an indication of the direction the department is going to take. More than an indication [it was] virtually saying, this is what we are going to do come hell or high water, whether you like it or not, type of attitude. If that's the route it's going to go, then it's the minister's responsibility and not the deputy minister's responsibility to be making those kinds of indications.

The second point I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, deals with the question of the advisory committees as a buffer. I had the opportunity yesterday to speak to some of the faculty people in the colleges across the province and some of the minister's own officials from the department were there. I spent some time talking to people in the college system after. They have a very, very definite feeling that with the advisory committees as a buffer between themselves and the department, any form of independence or protection that they have in their actions or in their comments is very, very narrow and very shallow. That may not be the wish of the minister, but I think it would be appropriate in this Legislature for the minister to make some kind of statement with regard to critical comments coming from the universities and the colleges.

I recall very well, when I sat in the chair of the Minister of Education, the president of the university at that time, Dr. Wyman, didn't mind at all making rather blunt and, I would suspect, necessary comments about the actions of the government and the actions of the minister. Yet there seems to be an attitude prevailing now, in the academic community, that with the removal of an effective buffer, the universities and colleges feel, in fact, that they are pretty easy to get at. If that's right, and if that feeling isn't dispelled, this will have a very adverse effect upon the flavour of academic accomplishment in this province.

I would like to go on now to the question of tuition fees and say this: despite the minister's protestations, I would ask him to check The University of Alberta. At The University of Alberta until this year, the compulsory course in library services was included in tuition fees.

MR. FOSTER:

You mean ... [Inaudible] ...

MR. CLARK:

No, the compulsory course in library sciences was included in tuition fees as a compulsory course that all students had to take. It's my understanding, as a result of a decision the board of governors made not long ago, that now students are going to be charged \$60 for this compulsory course.

You can say there has been no increase in tuition fees but, in fact, if students are having to pay \$60 more for a compulsory course, cut it any way you want, the result is the same. It comes out of the breeches and the jeans of students. I have to say, frankly, that if the information I have is accurate - and I believe it to be so - the government had better reassess its situation in saying that there are not going to be changes in tuition fees. Because it does nothing to the government's credibility or the board of governor's credibility if they have to go around and make these kinds of changes.

There are two other quick comments that I'd like to make, Mr. Chairman. One is that on a number of occasions comments made once again by the deputy minister and the minister also when he's been on the campuses of the U of A and the U of C, have given the impression that some people on the campuses are overpaid and that in some areas the universities are overstaffed.

Now since the government has removed the commission - because I voted against removal of the commission and members on this side did - since the government has removed the commission, it seems to me that there is some onus on the minister if your department feels this way, to speak out and say where. To the best of my knowledge this hasn't been done.

The last point that I want to make in these rather abbreviated comments is - and who knows I may have a chance to expand on some of them on Monday - when the Department of Advanced Education gives a negative answer to requests from various universities as far as additions to programs are concerned, I believe the department has a responsibility to give some justification for those answers, some indication of what the rationale is for saying no. That certainly hasn't been done on all occasions. It has been done on very few occasions in my understanding.

Could I also add this postscript as far as the advisory committees are concerned. If the minister is serious about the advisory committees being the buffer between the universities and colleges and the government, then to think that an advisory committee which is going to meet three, four or five times a year - an advisory committee that has to rely upon staff from the Department of Education to do its research and be its secretariat - is simply not effective in any way, shape or form. The individuals who are on those advisory committees, as sincere and as genuine as they might be, are not going to be able to be familiar with the basic problems. They are not going to be nearly as knowledgeable as they'll need to be to give the kind of advice to the minister which will not only be in the best interests of the department or the minister, but in the best interests of the whole advanced education field in the province.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Chairman, what I'm going to say will have to be of the same nature as a lot of other speakers because I'm not going to try to relate it to specifics of this vote. But I am going to pose a few questions which I think the members of the House ought to be considering, and not necessarily just the minister.

The first of these is to review for you the growth of universities and what the term means. Most of you know what's meant by something which is universal. The universities got their name from that old Greek and Latin word. They would explore the whole field of knowledge. Any of you who want to read the histories will find that almost every treatise said that a university had only about three functions. It was a place called a community of scholars. Its whole purpose was to accumulate all the knowledge that had been set out by anybody else, to expose the students to it, to teach them to evaluate and hope that they would go out with these skills and serve the people.

We have got a long way from that. In that day the surgeons were not trained at the university nor were the lawyers. They had their own ways of training. We've got around now to the fact for most of the students who go to our university that the training to fit them to go out and earn a living, and of course, to get some prestige, is the main function of the university. I don't care how many people talk against it, that's why they go.

Now, of course, they have to do research. They have to help with the maturing process. They have to expose pupils - call them students if you like - and help them to evaluate. But what I want to know now is just how well are they performing these functions? In the science fields, in the preparations of physicists and chemists, engineers, doctors and dentists, certainly they are turning out a good product. But this is only one function. How are they doing in the others? Where does 'streaking' always break out? Where are the people first organized to defy the status quo and say, we don't agree with the establishment? Nowhere but at the universities.

Now if the universities are truly what they set out to be, if their purpose is not just to teach people to earn a living, but in fact, to prepare them for life - and I've

heard that term a thousand times - but I've never heard anybody define it, or anybody pinpoint what the university is doing to prepare people for life. So I want to talk for a minute about how do you evaluate.

Most of you know there are several ways of evaluating. One is to say, can you jump the hurdle? That's a pretty good test. I'm always telling my race horse friends that the idea that a horse has to be registered to race is a bunch of hooley. What we ought to want to know is which horse can run faster ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. HINMAN:

I think that's probably the way we have to start evaluating universities; and not, did they pass the hurdle that some professor set up. Those of you who have been to university know how very quickly one gets initiated in the art of determining how to please the professor to get a right grading. Many a child has discovered that you don't do it by reasoning. You do it by trying to figure out what he thinks and agreeing with him. That's one way of measuring.

Another one, of course, is to have some standard basic hurdles. The British have used that system where youngsters pass examinations to get into universities and they pass them to get out. Now maybe we could evaluate them in both ways.

The other thing is, what are the priorities going to be at a university? If the minister is going to take back the function of the commission, he has to take back the responsibility for guiding priorities. I think the worst exposure I ever had to the public was when the universities said I had no right to say that when the people of Alberta provide the money they are going to have the right to say something about what they get for their money. I think it's about time we did it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. HINMAN:

Now there are some other aspects of this too. I was very much upset to read that at the council of the ministers of health and welfare in Ottawa, some of them were saying we ought to limit the number of doctors. In the next breath they were saying we've got to get doctors out to the rural areas. Both of them defy what has always been a democratic practice to me. I don't think we have a right to limit the number of doctors. I think we have the responsibility of doubling if we need to, the facilities of our school of medicine. If somebody says to me, well you just can't handle that many, then I say you can devise a way of handling them. Certainly you can turn out a lot more medical people and that's our duty.

Very recently I had an occasion to review the high school records and the first two-year college records of a number of students who are told they cannot get into the college of medicine. These youngsters are of a quality which in some years would have been at the top of the class. Now it isn't so much that. So we have some responsibility. I think we have a responsibility to provide for every candidate who can pass the entrance examination and wants to qualify in any field if we're going to spend public money.

I've said something before about restrictive practices, washing kids out. Well, I'm going to treat it in a little different way. I'm going to say that I'm more concerned about the way of financing universities than I am the amounts. I'm going to put it like this. You can choose one of several systems. One would be the global system where you simply say, well, out of all this money the province has, we'll give this block to the university. That gives them academic freedom and economic freedom. They can spend it the best way they can. That's the global system.

Another, and one which I favour, is very much related to the voucher system. It is to say that we'll never get the best out of a university until the kids pay the whole bill. You know how much of the bill they pay now. In some colleges less than 10 per cent is in fees. But if dad knew what it cost, if he knew what his son or daughter were borrowing and how much he was putting into it, he would demand a lot better performance. A lot of youngsters would be out of university and in some field better suited to them long before they now are.

There isn't anything wrong with that system because it would accomplish something else. It would say to your university people, you have to develop a school which will attract these students, which will turn out the product which the public wants. I was very surprised to talk to oil people and have them tell me, oh, yes, we like to hire

geology graduates but we always have to retrain them. Something is wrong when they have to retrain them. It's admitted they have to give them experience. Something is definitely wrong.

Now, the other kinds of financing, of course, have to do with capital. Up to date, we in this Legislature never seem to have converted capital to per student cost. You find if you do, it almost doubles it. It will continue to do it.

Some of us were here after the first war and we watched this university handle 8,000 students when it had only been set up for 3,000. We used old army barracks, we used everything. And as near as I can tell, the graduates of that period have been just as satisfactory; their records are just as good as they have ever been before or after, which tells you pretty definitely that we overcapitalize, that we're sold, that we have to provide these things.

Now another study that was made - and it's available to you, and it was made under the direction of the president of the university - was space use. You'd be surprised how low it is. You'd be surprised how many desks we have for how many hours of structure. Now if money is important, these are areas we can look at.

The other thing I want to say is: [for] those 20 per cent whom God endowed with a little better intelligence, if you want to call it that, whose parents gave them encouragement and got them through high school, who were indoctrinated with the advantages of education, we ought not to accept any longer the responsibility of society to fund these people to the extent of \$20,000 and \$30,000 each when the best we can do for the others is a few loans to buy a family farm or get into a small business.

What I'm saying to you is that when we plan budgets for the university, we've got to get back to the idea: what is our responsibility? Our responsibility is pretty simple. We must have the facilities to train our students as far as they can be trained, if they want to be trained. That means we will supply the capital works. It means we will make money available. But how?

If you go into business, you find there's a pretty simple answer to how. You say, what am I getting for my money? So when you start to evaluate universities, what is one of the things you'd better look at? Do these students who go to university and are of a certain quality come out with a greater maturity than those who spent three years working somewhere? Are there fewer alcoholics among them? Are there fewer drug users among them? Are there fewer dishonest people among them? And if you've failed in that field, then half the university function has not given us our dollar's worth.

MR. STROM:

Are they more Christian?

MR. HINMAN:

Well, we could ask that question. That's why my friend is working on the Christian college. I was just going to say maybe we should also have a Communist college and expose them fully to this thing. At least we'd know what they were being taught.

Are we then going to finance a university and give it what they call academic freedom? Now, to me, academic freedom has got along to this. It's the right of the university professors or whoever you want to say, to assume things are true which have not been established as truth, to teach them as if they were true, to draw from them their personal conclusions and then to defend all that as academic freedom. It goes on all the time and I'm not sure we can do anything about it.

I'm going to just go back to some conclusions which I think are important. One is that it's time to clarify the function of the university. I don't mean by that, let them tell us what their function ought to be. We tell them if we're going to finance it. If, on the other hand, they want to take some money and attract the students, they can set up the functions. I have no objection. It's time to measure performance - and I mean measure it - in terms of how many students they handle in relation to the facilities they have, and the quality of the product they turn out. I think we have to establish a priority of function for these universities.

Any of you who want to take the time to dig into university research will come away feeling absolutely assured that at least half the money was wasted from the beginning. There wasn't a hope that that research could do anything except give some students some experience. I'm quite willing to take the responsibility for such accusations and I think I can establish them if I'm ever asked to.

I think we need a new orientation to accommodate the students, and that's what I'm saying. We've got to say, if we need more lawyers, we'll provide law schools; if we need more doctors, we'll provide medical schools. And when we have done that, we have to

relate it, of course, to some other fields. I was going to say in the House the other day - and maybe I'll risk it now - that professional fees have got a lot like the price of bulls. It's nothing to do with the time spent. And until you get some competition, it will never be that. Maybe it's time to do it.

What's the new approach? Well I submit that the new approach is for us to tell the university community, we will assign to you a responsibility. I've already said what the responsibility will be. It will be to offer training in any field to every student who can successfully pass some entrance examination. And then its responsibility will be to turn those students out so that after ten years, their record in the field will tell us that we were getting good service from our university. And the new approach has to be simply this: that if we believe in free enterprise, we have to admit that the university function is not necessarily the responsibility of the people. I agree we maybe should go through high school and pay the bills, recognizing that more than half the students will never get through high school. But maybe we have to draw the line there.

The other thing is that maybe if we do [it] the way I am talking about, you'll find that out in our larger towns and larger schools you have staff and facilities which could very readily give the first two years of training in arts, sciences, education and many fields. I'm talking about pre-law and things like that. These people are there. You'd be surprised how many [have] doctorates and how many [have] masters [degrees]. And if you say, well, there aren't enough, then tell me that most of the instruction at the university isn't given by people of lower qualifications. You have students teaching students all the time. And I don't object to it. Sometimes they are good teachers.

My approach then is simply this. We decide what shall be the function of the university. We tell the university community, these are your responsibilities. We say to them, we will provide the money for every student as a loan, and you get from him the full cost of university. When we're ready to do that, our universities will do a much better job. They'll conform with the wishes of the people. They'll know that their results are being measured. And half the time we spend arguing about estimates for universities can be spent evaluating what we really want of our schools.

Thank you.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few remarks about this department; first, to give my support to the view that we ought to give more help, more recognition to private schools. In the years past, we have always looked at these schools as being a financial liability, but when we look back now, we know that they do save the public money. To that extent, we should look at giving them a per pupil support equivalent to that which is happening in schools. I know that one can't measure these things all accurately and say that they benefit us equally, because we can't splinter the system too much. Nevertheless, the public demand for private schools, for denominational or non-denominational schools outside the public and separate school system, is growing. I want to stand on record that I support these things. It may cost us a little more, but we have a certain amount of freedom. Freedom of choice will certainly lead perhaps to a better system than we've had in the past.

I think, when we look back several years, that there has been tremendous progress made in the fields of university and college education, vocational colleges and agricultural colleges throughout the province - that the province was geared to pay, perhaps more than the public appreciated, to build and develop a system. It could be a reaction from the fact that for many years this province could not afford what it needed and what it wanted. Notwithstanding that we, in the government at that time, received a lot of criticism of overspending, I have never met anyone who told me the system was too good for any of their children. So people will grumble about spending, but in the final analysis they will endorse it.

I'm saying now that we have developed a very good system, we haven't stopped growing. We may have problems of adjusting figures of attendance from year to year; nevertheless we can't alter and just be right in everything all the time.

I'm in favour of perhaps providing more than some people feel we ought to, and I go along with the universities to protect their independence, not merely their independence of action in the academic field, not only in word, but in deed. It's easy to tell the university you have autonomy. We supported it, we built it, we fought for it. There was a tremendous fight in Calgary for freedom of action and not to be just a subservient assembly line type of institution for The University of Alberta. This turned out to be a good fight and it benefitted all the province. The University of Calgary is not merely for the Calgary residents or the residents who were there at the time, but for the whole province and the rest of Canada.

So that was a good move. There was resistance from here, do we need it? Do we need extra faculties? But I don't think on the overall picture we can show that we lost out.

I think we are geared to perhaps provide a standard of education, provide graduates in keeping with the need and the demands of this province and perhaps other parts of the country. It is our responsibility to provide these facilities.

I am interested in hearing discussions about: do we need more doctors, or fewer? Do we need more dentists? I don't think this province is suffering from too many professional people, and I'm never concerned when a group may not be able to find employment. If they feel they are hard done by they should look at those who have no education, who have no flexibility. If their education prevents them from taking other employment, let them learn a few things in the school of hard knocks. Because they have a degree and can't get a job does not mean that they could not take other employment.

I'm concerned, Mr. Chairman, to the minister, that we have bandied around the issue of the law faculty in Calgary long enough. We're now sure we're going to get one. That's a major step.

MR. LEE:

One more.

MR. LUDWIG:

I believe that if all the Calgary members and the ministers also, stood up and gave the minister the message that the decision has been made - let's take the next step and do the right thing. I don't want to be in the position that we're sort of booting the minister, prodding him, but that's what had to be done.

We finally, I believe, overcame some resistance to the idea. If there weren't any resistance we would have one by now. I'm not entirely faulting the minister. If the Calgary representatives stood up one by one and said, we want one and we've established the fact that we could certainly accommodate the great number of students who want to take law, we would have one.

It isn't the kind of move that will commit the government for tremendous spending in the plant and facilities. If it were ever proven that we couldn't use another faculty in this province, you could always use the space for something else. This isn't like an engineering faculty or the medical faculty where you are spending millions of dollars on plant. The books will never go to waste and the space can be utilized for something else.

So I'm urging the hon. minister not to hang back and wait for favourable winds to come up before he sets sail on this one. Get with it. The nicest thing that can happen today would be for the minister to stand up and assure all those students who are now planning to enter The University of Calgary as law students. There are some in every school and there are many schools. Don't keep them in doubt. A lot of them right now are wondering, what are we going to do next year? They are planning. They want to register. People meet me and say, I have a son who is finishing Grade 12. He wants to take law. What do I do? The best I can tell him is to take an arts course or a commerce course hoping to get in in this manner. But they want to get into law.

A lot of these parents cannot afford \$6,000 or \$7,000 to send their son or daughter to Dalhousie or to some other university. Getting courses close to home is important to a lot of people, to a lot of parents and their children because many cannot go, even to Edmonton. A father, who is a labourer, whose son wants to take law, cannot send him to Edmonton because he has to pay room and board. That is a factor. I think we have now progressed from the thinking we had when Calgary was 200,000. Now we are looking at two cities that have reached the half million mark or are about to reach the half million mark and are growing rapidly.

I know that someone may tell me that I'm being repetitive. I am, for the simple reason that the problem has not been solved. The minister has indicated, yes, we'll move. I would like something specific that can be announced, that I can have in writing, or from Hansard, to tell them you're definitely moving this way. You can plan your future accordingly. I know there will be a great disappointment in Calgary when we finally do get the law faculty, that it had so much coverage, so much publicity given to this thing that you will be overwhelmed with the number of students who want to go into law.

I'm not prepared to listen to the argument, well, what are they going to do when they graduate? They will find what to do. Some can go into law. Some can go and work for the government. Some can go into industry. Some can do anything they want to. Some can leave the province and practise elsewhere. For years and years we have been an attraction for lawyers from outside the province. Many came, many established here and did well because there was not a sufficient number of lawyers. Also many can go out into the country, into smaller areas where other people are making an excellent living and providing a service.

I don't think anyone can stand up and say that we have too many lawyers and, therefore, we don't need an extra law faculty. There are a lot of people moving from office to office in Calgary trying to get something done now. The greatest criticism of the legal profession is the backlog of work - and I don't necessarily mean court work - where they get passed off from week to week; yes, we're looking at it. Lawyers have almost the obligation now to stall clients as effectively as possible because they can't handle them quickly. This isn't the case always, but it is a problem. You talk to lay people who want to have something done as simple as handling a small estate. They are pushing the lawyer to get action. To them it's all-important.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge the hon. Minister of Advanced Education, now that a commitment has been made that we will have a law faculty in Calgary - and I made the explanation that it's not an irrevocable idea, that if we should be wrong in making this kind of demand, the space in universities is always capable of being utilized for some other need because all it would be is classroom space, library space. And as I stated before, library books will never become surplus in the system.

So would the minister then, Mr. Chairman, give some specific indication of when students, who either have arts degrees or other degrees which would make them eligible to go into law in this province, can actually commence. Would it be preferable if they went into combined courses, as they have at The University of Alberta, of arts and law so they can start and know they are accepted into the study of law in one of the universities, preferably the one in Calgary. The one in Edmonton, I know, cannot accommodate nearly the applicants they have for training in law.

So I once more appeal to the hon. minister to be specific, to make that decision and let it be known. Let the high school students know. Many of them are taking law in Grade 11 to see if they are interested in law, taking a commercial course. Many of them are stepping forward and want to proceed into law. And as I've stated, the argument from some hon. members that we'll have too many just simply doesn't hold water. That isn't our business. A person who has pre-law can move into other faculties if he wants to. They are not stuck, and that should not be our concern. I believe if it appeared that lawyers were having difficulty in being placed, many students would change their minds about going into law. This happens in other fields. We can't measure carefully what the demand will be four or five years from now. Nobody here can tell us. We might continue to expand in this manner and there will always be a demand for more and more.

Also, we're in the position now that since the membership is quite large in the profession, the matter of attrition will be a factor. Many will retire, perhaps early. Many will be elevated. Many will perhaps pass away. This happens. Now when you have a membership of over 2,000, as time goes by there is a constant demand for replacement in this profession. So I urge the minister once again to give us specifics now the decision to go ahead has been made.

I want to also mention, Mr. Chairman, that in this department, we have \$1,368,000 - these are rough figures - of fees and commissions. I think it is only fair to request that we be given specifics. Fees and commissions in the past used to have a particular meaning - fees paid for certain services we requested, and commissions for services performed.

This is not, in any way, criticizing the manner in which this is set up. We have the right to request what it is for, and in some detail. That is part of the responsibility to make sure that we haven't got \$1,360,000 hidden in every department, and there are 22. That makes a fairly formidable part of the whole budget. We have \$1,366,000 for fees and commissions. It has a very specific meaning. We're not saying that it has not a real and meaningful purpose, but we want to know what it is. We want to know that it isn't a sort of contingency fund so that the minister may do what he wishes with it.

Furthermore, I think the government ought to be forewarned that in the future we will be asking specifics, up to the dollar, where the money went. It's something that the accounting system allows for and something that we ought to be ready for and provide the information willingly so we don't have to keep badgering the government to keep pushing for more and more and hoping they'll come across when they feel like it.

I believe the minister has stated - and some hon. members have - that when we talk about financing the universities we have to look at the fact that we have provided a tremendous amount of money for the operation of this government because of inflation. We talk of having a \$1,900,000,000 budget. 20 per cent less two years ago would have bought exactly as much, if not more; 20 per cent less two years ago would have bought as much as \$1,900,000,000 does today. When we do that, Mr. Chairman, we should also remember that the same or worse prevails with the universities, school boards and municipalities. It's nice for us to talk about big figures but remember also that next year, a year from now, this money will buy 10 per cent less unless something changes to reverse the situation.

When you look at \$2 billion, for instance, and knock off \$600,000 that's about what the actual purchasing power of the budget will be if this budget were implemented a year from now. I'm pushing it one year ahead to stress the problem.

It's easier for this government to deal with inflation because they have the means of adjusting their budgets. The universities, school boards, college boards and municipalities are not quite in the same position. They have not the flexibility of this government to adjust to their needs. All they have to do is scream, come cap in hand and hope that they could get an adjustment.

With those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the minister can give us some good news, some specific news. Keeping people in doubt - and I'm talking about the many students and their parents - about the specific commencement date is wrong. We will not be discharging our responsibility unless we ask the minister to give us a date as soon as it is possible.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FOSTER:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm more than a little surprised and delighted with the participation by members of this House in this resolution ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Why? It's an important department.

MR. FOSTER:

It is, I agree. It's very important and there have been several very excellent points made. I hope I can deal with them between now and 1:00 o'clock. If not, I would be happy to carry on. I'm sure there may be other questions as well.

I would like to deal, first of all, with the comments made by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. He remarked last day on the activities of the advisory committees to the minister. I think what I should say at this point is that the committees were unfortunately set up a little late in the day. We thought we would have them done before Christmas. We couldn't get them going until the middle of winter.

They've had two organizational meetings. Some of them have created agendas of their own in terms of the major issues of post-secondary education and the sector of responsibility they want to deal with. In, I think, almost all cases I have requested of the committees that they review a certain policy matter and give me their advice and comment. If there are members in the House who are interested in the kinds of issues that these committees are considering and the kinds of opinions they deliver on their considerations, and I'm sure that the Member for Spirit River-Fairview is, I would be more than pleased to make that kind of information available to all members of the House.

The committee meetings are intended to be open to the public for public information. Therefore, their deliberations and conclusions should be public. If we don't agree with them then we should be prepared to say why. I will give as an undertaking to see that that information is available to any member of the House at any time.

MR. STROM:

Advisory committees?

MR. FOSTER:

Yes, the advisory committees.

With respect to the proposed program for Native American studies at The University of Lethbridge, I remarked to the member last night that that program has, in fact, been approved on a five-year basis. The five-year basis is no indication whatever that we have reservations about the worth of the program. It's simply that we want to be sure that the institutions and, in fact, Native peoples themselves have an opportunity of reviewing that program at that period of time with the hope that it can be improved or changed to meet the needs of those who are taking the course.

With respect to the philosophy of the department and the several points raised by the member concerning a speech by my deputy minister, I think two things can be said at the outset. I think the university community is very sensitive and probably some sectors of it slightly overreacted to some of the statements which were made. At the same time it may be that the deputy minister slightly overstated several items as well. So I think perhaps there is an overstatement in some respects and an overreaction in the other which has led to the very substantial debate in university affairs relative to those comments.

If I could just deal with them very briefly, and I appreciate that this is very much off the cuff. On the matter of academic privilege and the suggestion that that is of itself a monopoly, which of itself creates narrow, lazy and oppressive individuals, persons or circumstances as the case may be, I believe that absolute privilege or absolute academic privilege or absolute power will tend to create a situation where one may be isolated or otherwise not influenced by the pressures and concerns of those outside the monopoly situation or those outside the absolute power situation.

I don't believe you could characterize staff in the university community as narrow, lazy, oppressive or whatever, obviously. I don't believe there is, in fact, a monopoly. Clearly there is academic privilege in the institution. Clearly there is privilege in this House. Clearly there is privilege in any self-governing or quasi self-governing profession or organization. All the professions have their own privileges and develop their own rituals in their ways of dealing with the public or in the services they offer. I regret that some people in the academic community may have felt the deputy or the department was in some way suggesting that the universities are characterized by narrow, lazy and oppressive people. That is clearly not what was intended, nor is it true in the slightest degree whatsoever.

With respect to autonomy perpetuating ritualism and academic power tending to corrupt academically, as I've said, I think that in any absolute autonomy circumstance, like power it will tend to corrupt and reinforce or perpetuate the rituals of academia or the rituals of a profession.

I take my own profession as an example. I'm sure that many members of the public don't understand why the practice of law is carried on in certain ways, why a peculiar language is used, why peculiar procedures are used in court, why peculiar forms are used that seem to be outdated and antiquated and serve nothing more than the self-interest of the profession and the individuals who are its members. It may be said, I'm sure, of most self-governing professional or autonomous bodies, that we do develop, in fact, a ritual and that left to ourselves, we are quite happy with the status quo and we permit ritualism to be perpetuated.

I believe philosophically the statement that power tends to corrupt. I don't know that I could say that absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely. But clearly it follows and makes some sense, and no doubt there are examples in history where that is, in fact, true. Any time you vest in mortals the absolute right or privilege to do certain things, you vest in them the power to do it in whatever way they choose or will, and in such a manner that they are not responsible for the consequences, save to their own conscience. That, I suppose, creates a form of ritualism.

Now I don't think that the academic community is free of ritualism. In the same sense I don't believe that the legal community is free of ritualism or the clerical community is free of ritualism or, indeed, this House is free of its own ritualism. That ritualism may stifle change is probably a valid observation. I think rituals probably should be challenged from time to time to discover whether or not, in fact, they serve any useful purpose or whether they simply feed the egos and the desires of those who participate in the rituals. I'm not opposed to challenging ritual from time to time. I doubt that my colleagues are. I'm sure that the members of the academic community are concerned about having their ritual challenged from time to time.

The statement, of itself, I think is defensible. Some may regard it as an overstatement, or as a threat, or as a challenge. Perhaps that's fair. Perhaps it's fair that persons outside an institution or outside a profession should, from time to time, challenge the ritual of the profession or of the community. I think that's important for professions. I think it may be as important for the university community. But that is not to say that there is not a need, and a very valid need, for autonomy, for a degree of ritualism and a degree of freedom - a monopoly circumstance if you want - in many areas of the academic community.

With respect to how the universities must relate or should relate to government, and whether or not they should, in fact, seek direct political power, I'm really not clear, Mr. Chairman, on what is meant by direct political power. I had a very interesting discussion with the Senate of The University of Lethbridge on this question, the matter of how a university should, now that the commission is gone, relate to government, relate to the office of minister. How should it make its views known. How might it best persuade government that its interests and priorities are thus and so and should be recognized. Or will the university, being a small institution way off in southern Alberta, be ignored by a big powerful government. My response to that is that the universities are free to approach or to deal with government in absolutely any way they choose and there are many ways.

One of those ways I might characterize as a confrontation style. That is, before you make a request to government you go out and you beat the bushes, you marshal public opinion in support of your interest or claim, you get everybody writing letters to the minister's office, you involve your MLAs, you create as much political pressure, in a

partisan sense if you like, as possible to convince the narrow-minded minister that he may be wrong, that he, in fact, should listen and if he doesn't the 'or else' will take place in four years.

MR. BARTON:

First successful words.

MR. PCSTER:

There are various degrees of confrontation politics in university affairs.

Another way, among others, is to communicate forthrightly and directly as intelligent men and women and, hopefully, intelligently discuss the issues and concerns of university affairs and try to arrive at decisions within a reasonable period of time. In my position, I obviously am not prepared to say how I think universities should deal with government. They are free to deal with government in any way they want and I try to make that clear. If I am asked for my preference as to how universities should deal with government, obviously my preference is to sit down with other men and women responsible for university affairs and talk about the issues and the problems and the concerns and try to resolve the matter in a reasonable and intelligent way.

Once in a while my biases prevail or show and people decide that they have to convince me, as my colleague opposite has been endeavouring to do for some time on this law school. That's constant hammering, and I guess I'll break down one of these days and tell you the secret. But I'll get to you in a moment.

However, what may be meant by direct political power, I just don't know. But I don't want to put any constraints on the university community in how they deal with me.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I am absolutely delighted with the leadership in the university community in this province. When I see the new presidents who are now beginning to come to office because of the changes taking place in Alberta and Calgary, and Dr. Beckel staying on in Lethbridge and Tim Byrne with Athabasca, I am absolutely delighted. I thought, for example, that Harry Gunning made an excellent speech a while ago on the matter of relations between university and government and the need for the university to understand the community's concerns and be a little closer to them, to discuss issues and matters reasonably and intelligently with government in the hope that government would respond and reciprocate. I hope that we will, too. I don't feel challenged or threatened by the leadership of that community. I am, indeed, very proud to have the opportunity of working with them and I hope that they respond with me in that way.

If the universities find themselves in a position where they simply can't get the ear of government and they want to take to the bricks, as it were, then of course they are entitled to do so. I have no doubt that one of their legitimate functions is to operate as a critic of our society, of government, of agencies in society. That's a legitimate function of the university. I respect that and I will do what I can to protect it because I think it's extremely important.

On the matter of autonomy - and I see I'm not going to conclude, but I can't get this across in just a few words - so many people in the university community feel that universities should have absolute autonomy. That's true. They really do. When I say to them there is no such thing as absolute autonomy in university affairs or government affairs or professional affairs or anything else in our society, I'm at once challenged and the anxieties and concerns surface. The fact of the matter is that there is a degree of autonomy. It's a very high degree of autonomy. I recognize the need for it. I recognize the need to preserve it. But it is a relative autonomy and I have no doubt that I'll find myself, probably sometime in the future, debating again with some members of the academic community, that by relative autonomy I mean something less than autonomy and we're back into the discussion.

But I've had these kinds of discussions for long periods of time with senates in Alberta, Calgary and Lethbridge and I find that some members of the academic community become extremely upset when you suggest that there is anything less than full autonomy available to universities. Well, there is something less than full autonomy. As the Member for Spirit River-Fairview suggested, it is a question of reasonable limits, of reasonable parameters, of recognizing the need for autonomy, of preserving it, and yet recognizing that the universities are part of a post-secondary community in this province, a very significant and major part. Some of their functions are quite different from the other institutions, but indeed, they are a part of a 20-institution community of advanced education and they have responsibilities to each other that go beyond simply their own institutional self-interests or points of view. We have to learn to live together as a community of some 20 institutions.

So there is no such thing as absolute autonomy, or full autonomy, or complete autonomy in a community. There simply can't be, by definition. But there is a high degree of autonomy, and that must be respected and preserved.

Whether or not academic freedom, as such, which is quite different, is challenged by the concept of a system of advanced education, my hope is that no, it is not. I don't believe autonomy, in the relative sense, is seriously challenged by a community of advanced education or a system. I don't believe academic freedom is challenged by it either, although I'm a little concerned by the remarks of the member, Mr. Hinman, whose opinions I always value and respect and enjoy, on the matter of academic freedom, sort of telling the universities what their function should be and telling them what to do. However, I will respond to that in a moment.

With respect to the Downey Report and before I leave this question of the philosophy of the department, and particularly the deputy's remarks, the matter of autonomy and academic freedom, I would like a forum with a little longer time perhaps to discuss this with any members of the House who are interested because I'm interested in your views.

With respect to the Downey Report in northeastern Alberta, I appreciate the member's comments that there should, in fact, be a greater interprovincial cooperation, greater regional cooperation, in fact greater institutional cooperation. It was for those reasons, among others, that we initiated this study. The point he makes on the Manpower cost of Fairview is extremely valid. We appreciate that and I am well aware of the concern. In fact, we are having discussions now on this matter of whether or not we can convince Manpower people not to accept the lowest costs, not bring people from northeastern Alberta into NAIT simply because on paper the cost is a little cheaper. In fact, the institution is there, the people are there, the costs are there - that's true. Whether they are paid by Manpower or somebody else doesn't really matter, because we are paying for them in any event. So the comments of the principal of Fairview are, indeed, our direction and we are working in that way.

With respect to new programs in Fairview, perhaps the member realizes there are three proposed this year and one more that we are continuing some review on. The three are pre-employment automotives, animal health and clerical administration. We have, in fact, been almost in a holding pattern on Vermilion and Fairview from a capital development point of view and partially from a program approval point of view in the last two years simply because we have been trying to come to grips with the future of the college region surrounding Vermilion, Lloydminster, Bonnyville, St. Paul, and Saskatchewan and the college region in northeastern Alberta of Grande Prairie, Grouard, Fairview and the implications for British Columbia.

The alternatives are the four which have been suggested - or five - amalgamation with Dawson Creek; making it a public college; continuing the status quo; making it a satellite of NAIT; or creating an entirely new college in the northeastern region of this province and giving it two campuses for the moment.

If that alternative of the report is accepted, implicit in that is that we change the name of Grande Prairie College to something else. Maybe we call it Peace Country College, but it is no longer geographically identified solely with the city of Grande Prairie. But we create a college region of this province, call it Peace Country College if you will or anything else, it will have two campuses - Grande Prairie and Fairview. It may in time have services offered in a capital sense in Peace River or other areas. In any event, the thrust of the report is that we approach this as a region, we treat it as a region, we govern it as a region and we draw people from throughout that region, not simply from Grande Prairie.

I will be interested in the response from others. My personal view is that I believe that Fairview College has much to gain by becoming part of a region, of an institution governed in the region. But that is something I have to discuss with the staff in Fairview and other people. I very much appreciated the member's remarks.

Mr. Wilson referred to the Christian College Association. The only correction I would like to suggest on his observations and I will welcome the debate, is that the Christian College Association of Alberta is not in fact an interdenominational association. It is in scope and concept. But the people who form that association are members of a specific religious denomination. It is not interdenominational. Now we have private colleges in the province at the moment. Camrose Lutheran is an example. That college is open not simply to Lutheran people. It is not a denominational college. It is an interdenominational college and people from all religious backgrounds are welcome to come there, indeed they do. The suggestion that the Christian College Association of Alberta is the first interdenominational Christian college in this province is simply not correct.

As far as procedures are concerned, most program initiatives come from the institutions themselves and not from the department. This association was encouraged by myself sometime ago to have talks with the university to try to come to grips with whatever requirements they have for programs and courses, physical plant, et cetera.

The observation I made to the universities at that time was, we are in the process of reviewing our private college policy, but I would like to know what universities have to say. I'm not sure. The initiative is primarily with the institution, or whichever group wants it, to go to the university and work out an affiliation arrangement which is subject to my approval, that's true. But the initiative should be there. How long that might take I don't know. Some people have been going for months and perhaps even years to try to get programs going in universities. They are turned down and they come to me. If they have been turned down by a university we will look at it, indeed, but, of course, if the course is to be offered it must be done with the consent of the university.

I did not make the comment that I cannot make any decision on this matter until after the debate except that I am interested in knowing what the people in this House think and feel about it. It isn't something I can make by April 15. It isn't something we can make between now and the time that the resolution comes to the floor of the House. I am simply happy to hear what people in the House have to say.

If the member is suggesting that we should, in fact, have another private Christian college in this province, then I would be interested in hearing why and on what bases and what are the factors upon which that kind of commitment is made, other than simply political pressure or emotionalism or anything else. I would like to know how many Christian colleges we should have, if anybody should decide.

Would you come back to the comments of your colleague opposite, Mr. Chairman, to the member I am now speaking to. If we should simply provide all the facilities that are asked for and pay the bill so that students can go to any number of private schools or colleges, as Mr. Ludwig suggests, then we can do that. My job is very simple. All we do is just keep handing out the money and we can have colleges and courses and programs all over the place. We will have 600 students in medicine tomorrow and 700 students in law tomorrow. If that's your philosophy, if that's your approach, fine. I suggest to you that you can well afford to have that philosophy or approach on that side of the House. I'm not sure I can, however.

There were several questions raised by Mr. Clark, Mr. Hinman and Mr. Ludwig. I think, Mr. Chairman, that I cannot possibly deal with the important substance of those remarks in the course of the next three minutes although I wouldn't mind trying.

Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

DR. HORNER:

I move we rise and report.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Chairman, before we adjourn I wonder if I could have leave of the House to introduce a very important group.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS (CONT.)

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Chairman, it's a real privilege for me to introduce, at long last, a group from my constituency. They are some very important young ladies and gentlemen from the constituency of Edson and they come from Jasper High School. They are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Johnson and Mrs. Cox. They are 27 in number. They are seated in the members gallery and I would ask that they rise and be recognized by the House.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (CONT.)

Department of Advanced Education (Cont.)

MR. CHAIFMAN:

Is it agreed that we now report?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Diachuk left the Chair.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain estimates, reports progress and begs leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, by way of notice to the House for business on Monday, we will be moving to second reading of bills on the Order Paper on Monday afternoon and Monday evening, beginning with Bill No. 37.

Mr. Speaker, I move this House do now adjourn until Monday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the motion by the hon. Acting Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until Monday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 1:00 o'clock.]

