

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Friday, April 1, 1977 10:00 a.m.

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, with your permission I wish to rise on the point of privilege which was raised yesterday in this House by the Member for Bow Valley. I realize that debate is limited in this area, but I believe a member is entitled, in a limited sense, to enter into the debate. Considering I had no notice of the comments that were to be made by the Member for Bow Valley yesterday, I would request your permission to make a few comments on the suggestions made by the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker, although I certainly at no time would [impute] to a member in this House comments he did not make, may I suggest at the outset that the hon. Member for Bow Valley was never mentioned in my remarks. In fact with respect to the remarks made, I was referring more to the remarks made in this House by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from the hon. Member for Little Bow, then bring into relationship the comments I made. I'll do it very briefly, Mr. Speaker. Dealing with The Temporary Rent Regulation Measures Act in this House on December 12, 1975, the hon. Member for Little Bow stated, and I quote from *Hansard*:

First, I sense that some might interpret this legislation as a cure for a bad situation. To me this is unholy and certainly unquestionably false; in other words, untrue. Mr. Speaker, rent controls can only be regarded as a means of buying time.

Later he states:

In the long run, prospects for rent control legislation are disastrous. It will be those in whose names this legislation is presented — the poor, and those on fixed incomes — who will suffer the most.

Lastly the hon. member stated:

I feel this Alberta Legislature will have misled the people of Alberta if it extends the rent control program beyond the 18-month period.

Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on Wednesday I stated to the House:

I well remember my learned colleagues on the other side of the House leaping to their feet and pleading the dangers of rent controls, all of which is true; pleading their great concerns that once we got into rent controls we would never get out of them and it would be very difficult to do, all of which is true. But now [they are] coming forward question period after question period, pressuring the government, arguing with the government, suggesting to the government, you must stay in rent controls, you have to stay in rent controls. And I think, my how things have changed. When just a year ago we were hearing the opposite and

how the pressures have turned, now our Social Credit friends are on their feet encouraging us, pushing us further and deeper in.

Mr. Speaker, the reference to "hearing the opposite" was on the basis that when we were debating this matter before, the "opposite" was the dangers of rent controls and that it would be a fraud on the people of Alberta if we stayed in beyond 18 months. Now it seems they are encouraging us to stay in.

That was what was meant at the time. If it was misinterpreted, Mr. Speaker, I apologize. But certainly I think it is appropriate that we now have clarification from the hon. members on the other side that they too recognize the dangers of rent controls, a position which up to this point in time was severely misunderstood by all of us.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of privilege, for clarification I'd like to say I certainly agree with the hon. member with regard to the concern about the effects of rent controls. In my speech of December 12, 1975, I outlined the concerns I had. Those concerns are still valid, as far as I'm concerned, and I still hold that point of view. But I do wish to support my honorable colleague in his remarks yesterday, and clarify our position. On December 12, 1975, I also said:

I can and I certainly intend to support passage of the legislation, with the following reservations and concerns. First, I repeat, the House must recognize that this legislation simply buys time.

At that point in time I did indicate I supported it with reservations and certain concerns, and I went on to outline those concerns. At this point we still hold that position, Mr. Speaker.

## Speaker's Ruling

MR. SPEAKER: Yesterday, as hon. members will recall, the hon. Member for Bow Valley, having given notice, raised a question of privilege.

Ostensibly it was raised on behalf of the Social Credit caucus. While a caucus, as such, has no privileges in the ordinary parliamentary sense, this is not true of its individual members. To be practical, the allegation of a breach of privilege must be assumed to have been made on behalf of the members of the caucus, including the hon. Member for Bow Valley.

The substance of the alleged question of privilege is that in the speech of the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo on Wednesday afternoon, he is said to have stated that the position taken by the Social Credit members of the Assembly one year ago is the opposite to the position taken at the present time with regard to rent controls.

In referring to the said hon. members, the Member for Calgary Buffalo included in his remarks the words:

... just a year ago we were hearing the opposite and how the pressures have turned, now our Social Credit friends are on their feet encouraging us, pushing us further and deeper in.

However, farther on in his remarks the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo indicates that the positions of all hon. members in regard to rent control were the same a year ago and that, with regard to the present circumstances, they are the same now.

It is, of course, well recognized that a difference between two members as to a matter of fact may not

constitute a point of privilege or even a valid point of order. However, that is quite different from the situation in which a member alleges, contrary to the records of the Assembly, that something occurred or did not occur when those records say otherwise.

One of the citations in *Beauchesne* which deals with matters of privilege, 111 (I) on page 101, says: "Wilful misrepresentation of the proceedings of members is an offence of the same character as a libel." It may well be that this refers to statements made outside the House, but of necessity it would seem that insofar as privilege is concerned, it must refer also to statements made within the House.

The nineteenth edition of Sir Erskine May, *Parliamentary Practice*, puts the matter more clearly in saying, at page 142: "The House may treat the making of a deliberately misleading statement as a contempt."

While it is true that hon. members are fully responsible for all representations or statements of fact made in the Assembly, I cannot assume that in this instance, if there was any misrepresentation, it was in any way wilful. Furthermore there is some substantial doubt, on the basis of the relevant texts, whether there is here any misrepresentation which is clear enough to be really misleading.

I am therefore of the opinion that there is not a *prima facie* case of privilege, and that the matter has been dealt with adequately by the explanation given yesterday by the hon. Member for Bow Valley.

#### head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the report of the Northern Alberta Transportation Seminar held in Grande Prairie December 8 to 10, 1976. Copies will be made available to each member of the House.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file two signed copies of an agreement between the government of Canada and the government of Alberta, dated March 30, which extends Alberta participation in the national anti-inflation program for a limited time. In the agreement, the conditions which I said were essential for Alberta have been fulfilled.

#### head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, may I introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 20 young adult students from the Sucker Creek Indian Reserve. They are accompanied by their teacher Evelyn Gardner. They are seated in the members gallery. I would ask that they rise and receive the customary welcome of the Assembly.

#### head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

##### **Unemployment**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Provincial Treasurer. It flows from the federal budget that came down last night and from comments made by the Provincial Treasurer with

regard to the unemployment situation in light of, shall we say, major action by the federal government. My question to the Provincial Treasurer is basically this: what action does the province plan to take in the course of this year with regard to those areas in Alberta where unemployment is high now, [with] every indication that it will be higher during the summer months? What kind of initiative or action does the province plan in those areas?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I should make a general response to the hon. leader's question by pointing out that my comments last night on the federal budget and unemployment were with respect to Canada unemployment figures and not Alberta unemployment figures.

With respect to specific provincial programs dealing with unemployment in Alberta, I would suggest that those questions be directed to the ministers who administer STEP. Perhaps rather than having them dealt with during the question period, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition would find it more fruitful to pursue that line of questioning during the estimates on those departments when those programs are before the Committee of Supply.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. I'd like to ask the minister what steps his department will be taking specifically with regard to the question of lack of employment opportunities for students during the summer months.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member seems to be asking a question dealing with a part of the subject with respect to which he previously asked a question. It would seem there will be an opportunity to go into this matter more fully than the question period would allow when the hon. minister's estimates are before the Committee of Supply.

MR. CLARK: If I may speak to the point, Mr. Speaker, it has been the practice of this government in the past to bring in a special warrant rather than to include money in the operating budget of the province for such programs. It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I raise the matter now rather than during the estimates because in the estimates the money technically isn't there because the special warrant isn't passed.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, it would seem that in connection with any estimate, the question of the estimate being supplemented by a special warrant could also be raised in discussion of the estimates.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then we will put the question to the minister responsible for native affairs. What initiative will the minister be undertaking in the course of this summer with regard to the unemployment problems in northeastern Alberta?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, approximately three years ago the province responded to a request by the Indian Association and the Metis Association to fund a joint organization sponsored by the two native organizations, namely ANDCO, the Alberta Native Develop-

ment Corporation. The hon. Leader of the Opposition may be aware of the current position of ANDCO and that I have stated both to the presidents of the two native organizations and the president of ANDCO — and have made public those statements — that upon satisfactory documentation being received by the Department of Business Development and Tourism as to the past activities of ANDCO, I'm prepared to recommend to the cabinet various funding measures for the current fiscal year, the new fiscal year, that would be for extension for either two to three years. Through ANDCO we hope to assist native people to assist themselves.

MR. CLARK: A supplementary question to the minister. Does the minister have any contingency plans other than working with ANDCO that will directly relate to the unemployment problems in northeastern Alberta as far as this summer is concerned?

MR. BOGLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to work very closely with Native Outreach, an organization which is working primarily in the Syncrude area with Canadian Bechtel, and we will continue to see that a large number of native people is working on the Syncrude site. It's my understanding that at the present time approximately 650 native people are working on the Syncrude site representing about 11 per cent of the total work force.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Business Development and Tourism. Is the minister in a position to indicate any contingency plans as far as the entire Lesser Slave Lake area is concerned, from the standpoint of either government initiative or employment opportunities in the upcoming summer?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, we consider that we should be dealing with all of Alberta, rather than earmarking a particular area of the province for special consideration. However, we do try to stimulate local initiative through economic development committees. Lesser Slave Lake and the areas around there do have that type of committee.

We have appointed a staff member to handle economic development in the Lesser Slave Lake area, as well as in the Peace area, Grande Prairie area, and seven others throughout the province. We look very much to the private sector to undertake any developments, but our department is there as a stimulus, as a supportive organization, to provide the means to acquire infrastructure. That is our role.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one last question to the minister. What special initiative or special stimulus is the minister's department prepared to give primarily to the area around Slave Lake and other areas where the employment situation is becoming increasingly tighter?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, we have in our budget proposal for this year two or three initiatives, which I would sooner discuss at that time, in that area particularly and in other areas in northern Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Have there been any specific

discussions dealing with the three plants forced to close in the Slave Lake region over the last several years, to get them going again?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister has indicated that he is prepared to go into the topic fully in the discussion of his estimates, and it would therefore seem that we might devote the time of the question period to other matters.

MR. SHABEN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Does the minister intend to continue with the opportunity core program in the Lesser Slave Lake area?

MR. SPEAKER: It would appear that the hon. member's question falls within the comments that have just been made, and perhaps it could also be dealt with in Committee of the Whole.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister of native affairs. Has the minister made representation to the federal minister regarding the work incentive portion of the federal budget, where the work incentive program allocation is much less than that they had set up for welfare?

MR. BOGLE: I assume, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Member for Stony Plain is referring to the budget just brought down. I have not yet had a chance to look at that budget in any detail. I will do so, and will be pleased to discuss items relative to native affairs in the province when our estimates are up.

#### **Premier's Travel Plans**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to either the Premier or the Government House Leader. The question is basically: at what stage are the plans for the Premier's announced visit to the Soviet Union?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, we're still in ongoing discussions with the Department of External Affairs on a number of countries, and there's nothing I can usefully advise the House at the present time.

#### **Heavy Oil — Cold Lake**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources concerning the — I won't say proposed — discussion of an Imperial Oil heavy oil plant in the Cold Lake area. Has the government yet obtained any assessment or statistics on the amount of the production that will be consumed in the energy required by the process itself as far as this proposed extraction plant is concerned?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, that's exactly the role the Energy Resources Conservation Board would carry out in the course of considering an application, should one go ahead to the board in developing the project.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. However, have any statistics yet

been compiled as to the percentage of the oil in place that the process will recover?

MR. GETTY: I could almost repeat my last answer, Mr. Speaker. That's exactly what the Energy Resources Conservation Board is supposed to determine when the full proposal goes to them as an application, should they go that far.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Have there been any preliminary discussions as to royalty or taxation proposals by the principals of this particular project?

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker, there haven't.

MR. NOTLEY: Supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the government made any preliminary plans or any surveys as to what steps might be necessary to stop advance speculation in the event of such a plant?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the hon. member's question, of course it's in a permit stage only. We're not too sure, as the hon. Minister of Energy has reported, just what procedure will take place there.

#### Time Out of Joint

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Transportation. In light of the fact that we're converting to kilometres per hour in the fall, I'd like to ask the hon. minister about metric time. I'd like to give you a short preamble, Mr. Speaker.

You've probably seen, Mr. Minister, that from midnight on January 3, 1977 the whole of Canada except Ottawa will be converting to metric time. From that day you'll be using 10 seconds to the minute, 10 minutes to the hour, 10 hours to the day, and so on, Mr. Minister. I'd like to know if the minister can indicate if the department's giving consideration to using metric time when converting to kilometres per hour starting September, even though this doesn't take effect till January 1977.

AN HON. MEMBER: Bottom of your file, eh Walter?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should remind all hon. members that today is April 1 and suggest to my honorable friend from Clover Bar that the proper use of time is a very important factor, and commend that to him and his group.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Education a supplementary question. In light of the fact that curriculum is up for revamping, has the minister given consideration to implementing this on the first of September, that we convert to metric time?

MR. SPEAKER: May I draw to the hon. member's attention that the question period is calculated according to standard time. [laughter]

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, then for the enlightenment of the members I'd like to table the new metric clock.

#### Nordegg Forestry Camp

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Solicitor General. Have there been any escapes of prisoners from the Nordegg Forestry Camp?

MR. FARRAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there've been a small number. I haven't got the exact figure to give the hon. member today. But Nordegg is a minimum security type of facility, and we have had two or three runaways. I'd be happy to supply the hon. member with the exact figures when I have them.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. What is included in the content of the courses taught at the Nordegg Forestry Camp on caving and bush survival?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I see what the hon. member is driving at, that bush survival might be training for escape.

Let me try to explain the philosophy of the Nordegg wilderness challenge project. Certainly the project there can do no harm in that it provides healthy outdoor exercise, a certain amount of sweat and challenge, good food, and a healthy environment. The objective is to try to rebuild character. Many of these minor offenders and first offenders are victims of the permissive society in the postwar period in the western world. They haven't been told the proper rules of right and wrong, and they lack self-respect. They feel in their own hearts that they're losers. The philosophies of Victor Frankl, Dr. Hahn, and Carl Froelich are worth trying. Those philosophies are that you can build character by challenge, that you can't love your neighbor unless you first respect yourself. There is the second part to the golden rule. I'm sure the hon. member . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. minister, but we seem to have travelled a long way from caving and bush survival.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, in short, bush survival is an attempt to build character by adventurous challenge.

MR. TAYLOR: One final supplementary to the hon. minister. In the course on caving, is there any actual construction in the coal mines, or are they using the old rooms in the coal mines for the purpose of caving? What is the content of that course?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe the word caving is used in connection with mountain experience. They go into potholes and caves in the mountains, climbing, and that sort of thing.

#### Land Speculation

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works. In October 1976 the minister indicated the subject of land speculation was being studied by the government. Could the minister indicate when this study will be completed and when the results will be made public?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I think I made reference very specifically to an in-house analysis, an in-house examination rather than a study which might or might not be tabled. The in-house examination has been carried on and is continually being carried on.

Three specific areas were examined. One was the possibility of taxation of foreign purchases of urban land. The second was the whole area of taxation of land speculation. The third area, a land use transfer tax, was suggested by the Land Use Forum. Some tentative decisions have been made in some of these areas, but others are still under consideration.

#### **Building Access Standards**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Labour is with regard to the building code and handicapped people. Under one of the sections of the act, a public building exceeding 6,000 square feet must have one principal entrance for the use of handicapped people. Exceptions are by the permission of the minister. I'd like to ask the minister if he or his department has given special permission to any restaurants, motels, or churches not to meet this particular requirement.

MR. CRAWFORD: The answer is no, Mr. Speaker. The regulations the hon. member is referring to are the new regulations that were based on some nationally recommended standards, and were the subject of much consultation with handicapped groups in Alberta prior to being brought into force. We have hopes of course that they'll work out extremely well and will be of very great benefit to the handicapped people in the province.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. What steps would the minister take if certain public buildings that violated this particular code were brought to his attention?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the normal result of the passing of any building standard, of course, is that it applies to new construction. The only time it applies to existing construction is if major renovations are undertaken to the extent that a new permit has to be applied for. If there are cases that fall into that class that would have to be dealt with in the exceptional way the hon. member mentioned, then really the hon. member is asking: what are the criteria for that? I would have to say that individual cases — because he has asked about individual cases — would be looked at on their merits.

#### **Vehicle Insurance — Saskatchewan**

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I understand that the Saskatchewan government is implementing no-fault insurance. Has the minister had any discussions with the Saskatchewan government on what effects it would have should an Albertan get into an accident in Saskatchewan? Would their recovery be limited?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, that's a very important question for all Albertans. I have had meetings with the insurance agents of Alberta on that particular

matter. I will be watching the developments in Saskatchewan and, if necessary, will make a presentation to the minister responsible there.

#### **Alcoholism — Public Service**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, once again my question is to the Provincial Treasurer. It deals with his responsibilities for the public service and the concerns raised by the Alberta Union of Public Employees with regard to alcoholism and programs in that area. My initial question is: is the minister in a position to give us an assessment of the effectiveness of the diagnostic referral unit, which deals with the management side of the public service? How successful has the program been to date?

MR. SPEAKER: Strictly speaking, whether something is a success or failure or what kind of success it might be is a matter of opinion. Possibly the hon. leader could rephrase the question.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then I'll ask the Provincial Treasurer: is it the intention of the government to continue with the operation of the diagnostic referral unit?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is yes. But I want to go on to correct the impression left in the question that it was a management program. It is not. The program is applicable and available to all members of the public service.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Provincial Treasurer. At what stage are discussions of the government's policy paper with regard to dealing with this whole area and the concerns that have been raised by the Alberta Union of Public Employees with regard to the confidentiality question?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, the question of confidentiality is one that I and my colleagues from the cabinet have given very close attention to. We have prepared a policy with respect to confidentiality which is being followed by the diagnostic referral unit. The essence of that policy is: anyone can go to that unit and be totally satisfied that such confidential information as the employee may give to the members of the unit will remain with the members of the unit, unless the employee gives permission for other uses of the information.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Provincial Treasurer. At what position are the discussions between the Alberta Union of Public Employees and the minister with regard to the draft policy statement that I believe was developed in December — it has been sent to the Union of Public Employees now — with regard to the accessibility of the entire diagnostic referral unit to all members of the Alberta Union of Public Employees?

MR. LEITCH: As I indicated in my earlier answer, Mr. Speaker, all members of the public service have access to that unit, so that has never been in issue.

#### **Drugs for Released Patients**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this ques-

tion to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Is the minister in a position to advise the House whether there has been a policy change whereby patients released from mental institutions will no longer have drugs provided free of charge from the hospital after their release?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, that's correct, Mr. Speaker. The policy change was initiated following a good deal of discussion with the Canadian Mental Health Association, the Alberta group in particular. Numerous other groups felt that if we were really to treat mental illness the same as any other illness, the same principles should follow. When people are required to take drugs after leaving an ordinary hospital, they are required to provide their own. We feel the same policy should apply to mental illness.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Have there been any studies or assessment regarding whether the cost of purchasing drugs, in many cases rather expensive drugs, may discourage patients who have been released from purchasing needed medication?

MISS HUNLEY: I can't advise the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, [of] specific studies, if you want to think of a study as it is often referred to in this House. I do know a great deal of consideration was given to the matter.

But there are two sides to that, Mr. Speaker. If a person just receives a series of drugs in the ordinary course of events, sent out to them, we have no way of knowing if they are perhaps accumulating a dangerous dosage availability. That can be a matter of concern as well. So I think it's important that we keep it in perspective and not treat it too much differently from people who are ordinarily ill and require drugs.

DR. WALKER: A supplementary to the minister. Is the minister considering applying the same principle to drugs for people suffering from venereal disease?

MISS HUNLEY: I don't have the same background information on that, Mr. Speaker. I'll have to check with the department and advise the hon. member.

#### **Native Housing — Faust**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. It's a follow-up to the question [on which] the hon. minister said he'd bring information. It is to do with the native housing project at Faust, specifically the houses that the native people would not purchase that were built on their land.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, the department has provided me with that information. I'm prepared to provide the information to the House during the course of either the study of the department's estimates in subcommittee or in the committee itself. If the member prefers it in the House I can certainly bring it.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point the minister brought up, we would like the information in

the House so we can use it in the estimates. Maybe the minister found it.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, it's about this long. I'm prepared to read it.

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the hon. minister could table it and the hon. member for Clover Bar could get a copy.

#### **Employment for the Handicapped**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Labour. Has the minister, his department, or any department of government carried out any studies aimed at evaluating the employment rate among employable handicapped?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I believe the answer to the question is either no or not recently. The only thing I could suggest is that my honorable colleague responsible for Manpower might have knowledge that would go beyond that. I will, however, check and see if the department has studies that relate to the matter.

AN HON. MEMBER: Thompson fell out of his chair!

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I . . . [laughter]

AN HON. MEMBER: I think it was your answer.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary to the hon. minister. Has any consideration been given to legislation that would require large companies to hire a minimum percentage of employees as employable handicapped, as has been done in Japan I believe?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to look around and see what the risks are in my answering the question and hope that all will be well.

The answer to the hon. member is that that isn't the course the government has chosen so far. Many discussions have been had, certainly through the social services department, in the many, many occasions that consultation has been held with the representatives of handicapped associations in the province. Ways have been looked at to expand the employment horizons for handicapped people. For example, the extent to which the government itself has encouraged that within government service I believe and hope has increased in recent years.

The idea of legislating in that respect, though, we haven't pursued. The real key to it seems to be in the training of the individual and the type of consulting that can be provided on sort of a joint basis to both the employer and employee, because employers who have the proper type of counselling in regard to the capabilities of handicapped people are often quite willing to proceed to employ them.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I thought I might just add to the answer given by the hon. Minister of Labour by drawing to the attention of the House the program to which he referred, that in the public service as a matter of policy we endeavor to find positions for handicapped people. As I've said earlier this is not a program where we're just simply putting handicapped

people to work. They are able to do the job; that's the first qualification.

But we have a program that actively seeks out by contact with departmental managers positions where they might be employed.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. Since incentives would appear to be more palatable in our way of life than compulsion, are any incentives being provided to employers to employ handicapped people when they can do the job?

May I also express the hope that the recent incident won't add to the handicapped in the province.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the items raised by the hon. member in his question are ones I would like to discuss with my colleagues and certainly give consideration to. I am aware that as I respond in regard to handicapped Albertans in a time like this, it's really in connection with the question of human rights perhaps that the hon. member is directing his questions. I think the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower might be in a position to remark upon the ways manpower services can also help in having handicapped people employed.

DR. PAPROSKI: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether he intends to embark on an intense public relation program directly especially toward the private sector to encourage employers to hire employable handicapped.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I believe the question of the government's relationships with the private sector and the employment of handicapped is already a matter of policy that we wouldn't have to adopt. By that I mean, having already adopted it we wouldn't have to adopt it. The hon. member's suggestion that a vigorous advertising campaign is in order is just one suggestion.

#### **Rental Accommodation**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is a follow-up to yesterday's question. Could the minister advise whether he is able to supply information with regard to the supply of rental accommodation and buildings having four suites or less, or the vacancy rate in Lethbridge?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I've had the opportunity to look at the [unofficial] Hansard record of the question. The question asked today is slightly different. Perhaps the answer should be that the government has some information on the subject of vacancy rates and various types of accommodation.

I would suggest the hon. member place a question on the Order Paper. Then a decision can be made as to whether or not that information can be tabled.

#### **Rural Gas Co-ops**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones. Will the minister be meeting with the Federation of Alberta

Gas Co-ops to discuss future increases in natural gas prices to rural gas co-ops?

DR. WARRACK: As I mentioned in [response to] a similar question posed to me recently, we did have a meeting in the month of March just concluded. Much more recently, I have also had some discussions in other circumstances with the chairman of the Federation of Alberta Gas Co-ops. Certainly if the federation would wish to meet and make that indication to me, I would be pleased to do so.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question. Does the minister have any information on the number of members who have been hooked on to gas co-ops as a result of high-priced gas?

DR. WARRACK: Not specifically, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as those items are mentioned from time to time in discussions I have. It's probably appropriate to point out that the rural gas program does involve providing gas to the rural gas system franchise areas, and for distribution within those franchise areas to the farmyard. That's the completion of the rural gas systems commitment in terms of the financial assistance and so forth that's provided. From there, for various reasons, people might make their own decisions one way or another.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister given consideration to letting gas co-ops do their own billing instead of billing through Gas Alberta?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, they do that. I guess the hon. member is not familiar with how it works. The individual rural gas co-op can have the customer billing done by Gas Alberta at the option of the co-op. If they ask Gas Alberta to do so, Gas Alberta does it for a charge of 1.1 cents per MCF. If on the other hand they want to do the billing themselves, as many co-ops are presently doing, that's up to them.

#### **Propane and Ethane Prices**

MR. COOKSON: I wonder if I could ask the minister a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate the progress that the propane companies are making with regard to rate increases before the Utilities Board?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, I understand there are applications before the Public Utilities Board in this regard. I'm not sure of my memory on this, but it seems to me the Public Utilities Board recently indicated they would be scheduling some hearings on the question of propane pricing.

MR. KIDD: A supplementary. Is it within the minister's responsibilities to assure that during those hearings the people concerned realize that ethane and propane are the prime fuels for petrochemical industries?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, I guess the short answer is no, it's not the government's responsibility to do that. But I think it's an important area of public information for people to understand as they develop

their anticipations about the future prices of both propane and ethane.

#### **Wage and Price Controls**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Perhaps it could also be directed to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. In light of the Provincial Treasurer's concern last night about the federal government's inability to come out with a date for the termination of wage and price controls, is it the government's intention to make representation to the federal government now as to a termination date for wage and price controls?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the appropriate timing would be, but certainly we did not find anywhere near sufficient precision in the statements last night as to the plans of the federal government for a decontrol date or decontrol plans. I think it's very difficult with that high degree of uncertainty for labor, business, individuals, and governments to do any planning. So in appropriate ways over the course of the weeks ahead, I think we would be making representations, saying that all of Canada needs some definite information from the federal government so plans can be made, so investment and collective bargaining will proceed under known conditions. We will be making representations of that general kind.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Have any meetings been set by the federal government to assess steps for decontrol with the provinces? I raise this question, Mr. Speaker, in light of the meeting a few days ago between top business and labor leaders and the federal government. My question really relates to whether any series of meetings have been scheduled between the provinces and the federal government specifically to consider decontrol steps.

MR. HYNDMAN: We have no specific information on that now, Mr. Speaker, although, if memory serves me, in the budget speech from Ottawa last night there were indications that the federal government would be attempting to set up those kinds of meetings. Certainly we have said all along that in-depth consultation as to what the federal government is going to do in future, so there won't be any surprise dropped on the country, is something that we would want to explore. So we hope meetings of that kind will occur in the months ahead to provide more details.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the government of Alberta itself concluded a position in terms of recommendation to Ottawa for a termination date? Would, for example, December 31 be the date that the Alberta government feels appropriate for the program to begin to wind down?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well I think it should be borne in mind, Mr. Speaker, that this program was initiated by the federal government. We have had concerns about it from the very beginning. We went to the

Supreme Court of Canada; the court said the federal government had jurisdiction in the private sector. So our main objective at this time is to secure some certainty and precision within the extended act which was passed by the resolution of this Assembly last week.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Assembly agree that the hon. Solicitor General might furnish some additional information which he did not previously have on hand, in answer to a question?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### **Nordegg Forestry Camp** (continued)

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. Member for Drumheller, there were eight escapes during the last 12 months from the Nordegg area: three from the camp proper and five from forest work crews and saw mills. All were recaptured. There are 120 inmates as a running total in the facility, serving an average of three to six months.

---

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 29, I ask leave to move that this Assembly adjourn immediately to discuss a matter of urgent importance, namely the absence of an announcement as to whether The Temporary Rent Regulation Measures Act will be extended and the consequent uncertainty as to the validity of notices of rent increases which are intended to come into effect as of July 1, 1977. Mr. Speaker, I have copies of this resolution for members of the Legislature and can make them available.

Mr. Speaker, the urgency of the matter relates to the provisions of two provincial statutes, The Temporary Rent Regulation Measures Act and The Landlord and Tenant Act. According to Section 7 of The Temporary Rent Regulation Measures Act, rent increases are limited only until June 30, 1977. Secondly, notification of rent increases must conform to Section 21(1) of The Landlord and Tenant Act from which, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote: "A landlord shall not increase the rent payable ..."

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the hon. member could, for the sake of brevity and saving time, assume that members are reasonably familiar with this statute, which they themselves have approved.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Referring to this particular section, 90 days from today the rent control provisions of The Temporary Rent Regulation Measures Act will no longer apply. According to the law then, landlords who have sent out notices of increases on or before today are fully justified in expecting such increases to be accepted.

To maintain the continuity of legislation, Mr. Speaker, the government must make an announcement today. We fully expected the government to make an announcement before today, and raised the matter under various situations. We cannot understand their failure to do so. This refusal to act, Mr. Speaker, is the main . . .



MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member is now debating an alleged refusal by the government. I doubt that has anything to do with the question of urgency of debate.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate your ruling with regard to that matter.

Mr. Speaker, it is our opinion that the decision with regard to this matter is urgent, and that the 90 days that are left following this day require a decision to be made. On that basis we feel the urgency of the debate is significant, that the debate should proceed today, and that we can call upon the government to make an announcement one way or the other as to how they will proceed with regard to this particular matter.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you are able to rule favorably on the urgency of this debate, and that we may proceed to make a decision and inform Albertans as to the ground rules with regard to rent controls.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, as in all cases involving this standing order, the question is the urgency of debate. I suggest the hon. member has in no way satisfied the Assembly as to the need for immediate and urgent consideration to set aside all the rules of the Assembly.

He's essentially been asking for legislation. He referred to two particular acts. In just a moment I'll indicate how that is not the purpose of using this rule.

I first wonder, Mr. Speaker, just what the hon. member is trying to accomplish. As hon. members know, in using this procedure there's no vote, no decision, and no conclusion. Simply to have a debate is apparently all that the honorable gentleman is talking about. He appears to have forgotten that nothing is going to be accomplished in the way of a vote, decision, or conclusion.

As to the question of opportunities for debate, Mr. Speaker, there's no mystery about the fact of this bill. When the bill was passed and made into an act many months ago, an expiry date was in that act. In the throne speech of six, eight weeks ago a statement was made to the effect that there would be a decision this spring by the government as to what would happen with regard to that piece of legislation. It's been on notice. There's no surprise, no secret about it. Members of the opposition had a full opportunity to debate it in the throne speech and, if memory serves me, they said very little about it at that time. On the budget speech, I believe there are still members in the official opposition who haven't spoken.

But the real mystery, of course, is the designated motion procedure and the fact the opposition hasn't used it. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, March 31, there was an opportunity under the rules for the opposition to have a designated motion specifically suggesting something in this area. They apparently, either deliberately or for other reasons, overlooked it. They said nothing. They missed the boat. They didn't do it. What are the motives for proposing this motion today?

Perhaps a very major reason for not agreeing with the request for leave, Mr. Speaker, relates to Citation 100(8), on page 91 of *Beauchesne*, which suggests it is improper to use this procedure when in effect the

request is for legislation. And that's what the honorable gentleman is proposing.

If I could read just part of that, a speaker in the United Kingdom House of Commons says:

But I do not think it was contemplated . . . that a question of very wide scope, which would demand legislation to deal with it in any effective manner, should be the subject of discussion on a motion for the adjournment of the House, because, if that was so, we might have repeated motions made by the Opposition of the day, not so much in the direction of censuring the Government for action which had been taken or not taken, for bringing to notice some grievance demanding instant remedy, as in the direction of wishing to introduce legislation on some particular subject.

For that reason I submit again, Mr. Speaker, that the submission by the hon. member really to propose amendments to legislation is inappropriate.

Bearing in mind that the government and the minister have stated a decision will be made in April, there is no requirement in law — by laws, by regulations, by tradition, or by resolution of this Assembly — for any decision to be made for three months. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the request for leave to adjourn is inappropriate, unnecessary, and superfluous.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the motion before the House, let me say at the outset that we fully recognize there would be no vote and no conclusion by an emergency debate today. But it does provide an opportunity for the minister to get up and give the people of this province a clear assurance as to the government's intentions, keeping in mind that this is the last day this government can get up and make a clear indication to the people of this province having regard for the 90 days needed to give notice.

Mr. Speaker, what we're really doing in moving this is once again providing an opportunity for the people of this province to get some assurance as to what the government is going to do. It can't be done tomorrow; it can't be done Sunday or next week. Unless there is some clear indication by the government as to its plans by midnight today, then in fact both landlord and tenants are clearly left up in the air. Mr. Speaker, that's why we've left this motion until this very last almost eleventh hour.

DR. HORNER: Well, Mr. Speaker, on the point the hon. Leader of the Opposition has raised, of course that isn't the fact. The fact is that we are operating under legislation until June 30. If he wants to take the point of view that he should support the landlords in this province, that's fine. My understanding is that a 9 per cent increase has already been allowed them in this particular calendar year. Therefore there's absolutely no need to suggest there's some urgency in rushing out notices of further increases.

MR. CLARK: Notices are going out right now.

DR. HORNER: They're not in effect.

MR. GETTY: So what. They could have gone out . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Little Bow has given ample notice of his intention to ask for leave to introduce the motion for emergency debate, and copies of that notice have been duly circulated. So I am sure all hon. members were duly aware of his intention. As has been said on this and previous occasions, two of the main criteria under Standing Order 29 and similar standing orders in other parliaments of the Commonwealth are the importance and urgency of the matter — the urgency of debate — and the opportunity for debate.

Now it is true that as the calendar moves along the situation changes somewhat. But as has been pointed out the legislation is in fact in place for a further fixed period, and the purport of the motion seems to be to procure the passing of legislation. That is only partly a government responsibility insofar as the introduction of the legislation may be concerned. But insofar as the passing of it is concerned, that is very much a responsibility of this House.

I would not agree, though, that because a motion under Standing Order 29 leads only to debate and not to a vote or necessarily to action, that in itself is a reason for declining to accept such a motion in a preliminary way, insofar as the limited function of the Speaker is concerned in a matter of this kind.

It is true there has been opportunity for debate. I have a compilation of the times during which the topic has already been raised in the House this session. It is also true, of course, that there is the device of the designated motion, which is open to the opposition. However, I doubt that I am entitled to assume that that is necessarily the purpose for which the hon. member who moves a motion — I can't assume that he is going to be successful in persuading the Leader of the Opposition to accept his representations in that regard, even if they happen to belong to the same caucus.

But it does seem, on balance, that the matter runs counter to well-established precedent as cited in *Beauchesne*. I would say that in this instance it does not meet the requirements of Standing Order 29.

Just before finishing I should refer to the argument made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, in which he seems to indicate that one of the main purposes of the request is to give the government an opportunity to make an announcement. It would appear that such an opportunity is available and that it isn't necessary to resort to setting aside the business of the House in the manner contemplated by Standing Order 29 in order to provide further opportunity.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, we'd like to move to Bill No. 3, The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, for third reading at this time.

## head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS** (Third Reading)

### Bill 3 The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1977

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 3, The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1977.

[Motion carried; Bill 3 read a third time]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor will now attend upon the Assembly.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair]

## head: **ROYAL ASSENT**

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order! His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

[His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor took his place upon the Throne]

HIS HONOUR: Please be seated.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly has, at its present session, passed a certain bill to which, and in the name of the Legislative Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

CLERK: The following is the title of the bill to which Your Honour's assent is prayed: Bill No. 3, The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1977.

[The Lieutenant-Governor indicated his assent]

CLERK: In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to this bill.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order!

[The Lieutenant-Governor left the House]

## head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS** head: (Committee of Supply)

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will now come to order.

### Department of Advanced Education and Manpower

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you have any opening remarks?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, only that I'm pleased to present the estimates of the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower to the Committee of Supply and to indicate the obvious: that before us is the work

of many people, those in the 25 institutions plus other service areas in the province over which we have responsibility and, finally, worked thoroughly and carefully in a very committed way on behalf of the government by members of the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower. To those in the field and to those in the department, I want to publicly give credit for excellent work on this and other matters.

I'll be prepared to discuss and answer questions at your discretion, Mr. Chairman. For my part, I would hope we could do it in related areas rather than after every particular one, or entirely at the very end. There are some other comments I would make, but I know they will come up in the discussion. Should that not be the case, I will include them in my summary statements.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to raise a question that I know will probably be the most controversial section of this particular set of estimates. That of course is the government's two-tier system for fees at advanced education institutions.

Mr. Chairman, in beginning my remarks on this particular subject, I would have to quite frankly confess that a year ago when the matter was first raised I was rather sympathetic to the idea of a two-tier system. However, in the last 12 months the discussions I've had at the level of meeting students and looking at the question as carefully as I could, I've come to the conclusion that such a move would be a mistake. Let me outline the reasons why I feel that moving toward a two-tier system would be a serious error for the province of Alberta. Because this is a very sensitive subject, I hope we can carry on the debate in an equally sensitive way.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, we have to look at the question of how serious a problem the foreign student question is at our postsecondary institutions in Alberta. When one looks over the most recent statistics I at least have been able to gather, the problem does not seem very serious: an average of only 5.8 per cent of the student enrolment in postsecondary institutions in the province. That ranges from a low of 1.3 per cent at NAIT to a high of 19 per cent at Red Deer College. So, Mr. Chairman, is an enrolment of 5.8 per cent of our student body in Alberta a financial problem? In my judgment, in a province with the wealth of Alberta, I say very emphatically no, it isn't a problem.

The second question I would move to, Mr. Chairman, is the argument I've often heard by many people that somehow foreign students keep Alberta students out of the quota faculties. Well the most recent statistics I've been able to obtain from the University of Alberta as to the 1975-76 ratio in the quota faculties shows that this concern is not really valid either. For example, in dentistry only one of the 188 students enrolled is a foreign student; in engineering, 64 of 1,469, or about 4 per cent; in law, zero out of 484; medicine, 27 of 752; pharmacy, zero out of 386. So, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to those faculties where there are problems for students getting in at this point in time, I just don't think there is any reasonable evidence to justify the argument that somehow foreign students are keeping Alberta students out of these faculties.

Let me move on then to examine one of the arguments I've heard for the two-tier system: that it would in fact raise some revenue in the sense that taxpayers who live in the province of Alberta are bearing a large part of the cost of operating our postsecondary institutions, that students who come from other countries in the world should at least have to pay a slightly higher fee. Well, Mr. Chairman, will the two-tier system raise significant revenue? Again, when one looks at the cost of administration, certainly in the first year the administrative costs — if the University of Alberta calculations are correct — would eat up any total in the two-tier revenue. But beyond that, even assuming that over the long time there will be an increase in revenue, it is very small indeed. The total amount of revenue we can expect, using the figures the minister announced, would be approximately \$670,000 of a total budget of \$341 million, or about .2 per cent of the Advanced Education budget. So I really question, Mr. Chairman, whether or not we can justify a two-tier system from the viewpoint of the revenue that is obtained.

Now, Mr. Chairman, moving on to still other questions one hears as this matter is debated, will foreign students take Canadian jobs? The suggestion has been made by all too many people that somehow foreign students come over to Canada and then stay. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that this just isn't true. The students in Canada are on temporary student visas. They must leave this country when their studies are completed. If they wish to come to Canada and eventually become Canadian citizens, they must return to their country of origin and apply for landed immigrant status. Mr. Chairman, that is something easier said than done these days.

I've heard another argument on this issue: that somehow only the offspring of the wealthy from the underdeveloped countries come to Canadian universities and, that being the case, it's not unreasonable to expect them to pay a higher fee. Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't really believe that is correct either. In many underdeveloped countries of the world families pool their resources to send one student to study abroad. But as I see it, the subsidized fee structure can be an important form of foreign aid and one that I suggest we as a province, particularly with our wealth, should consider very carefully.

Mr. Chairman, I want to move on to the question of foreign students on one hand and foreign university professors on the other. The suggestion has often been made by many people, well why is there such a fuss over the foreign student question, the two-tier system at university? Then on the other hand the same people who are concerned about this issue are saying, well let's put quotas on the number of non-Canadian professors at our institutions.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that part of the answer for that difference lies in the magnitude of the problem. If you take the overall number of foreign students at Alberta institutions, as I mentioned, 5.8 per cent are in that category. On the other hand when you look at the number of foreign professors at Alberta institutions, the Moir report, the most recent statistics I've seen, shows that 40 per cent of the academic staff at the U of A are non-Canadian; at the University of Calgary, 55 per cent; and at the University of Lethbridge, 43 per cent. In other words the

magnitude of the problem is totally different.

One can argue that if 40 or 50 per cent of the students at our institutions came from other than Canada, we might very well have to look at the problem. But, Mr. Chairman, that is not the situation. With 5.8 per cent of enrolment, we are a long way from seriously facing an overpopulation problem at our postsecondary institutions.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, those who have argued some sort of effort to control the non-Canadian input among our staff at the universities have always argued quotas, not pocketbook rationing. I think there's an important difference. If we get to the point where we have to say, all right, we can't have any more, it seems to me that a quota system is a better approach than a differential fee structure. Mr. Chairman, I don't believe in pocketbook rationing at whatever level one finds it.

Mr. Chairman, we have to look at this policy in Alberta not only from the viewpoint of the province of Alberta but from the viewpoint of the impact on other institutions in Canada if Alberta and Ontario proceed with a two-tier system. It may very well be that if we embark upon a two-tier system, other provinces who may not favor that approach will have to follow suit because there may well be an imbalance of students going to their universities. Mr. Chairman, if you like, almost a domino effect in Canada. I suggest this is not an area I would like Alberta to lead the rest of Canada.

I would also express concern about reciprocal fee increases for Canadians who study abroad. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we should be keeping that very clearly in mind, particularly with all the emphasis we hear today from this government about expanding our horizons beyond the borders of Alberta, new trade relations, the GATT talks, getting our products into world markets. I really question whether we earn the good will, particularly of people in the third world, if they see a policy in this province which from their standpoint is clearly discriminatory.

Mr. Chairman, I think there are probably two fundamentally important issues we have to look at beyond the more statistical analysis I've given you to date. The first is what we see in a postsecondary institution itself. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that one of the most important components of a university is the challenge that comes from broadening one's experience, the challenge that arises from cultural diversity if you like. The late John F. Kennedy, speaking at an American university a few months before he was assassinated in 1973, took the old Woodrow Wilson phrase. In World War I, Wilson said, we must make the world safe for democracy. Kennedy rephrased that and said, we must make the world safe for diversity. Mr. Chairman, if there is any place in our entire society where diversity must flourish, surely it must be our postsecondary institutions. And surely it must be among our young, who are learning, who are broadening their experience, who are going to be the leaders tomorrow.

So one of my concerns is that the foreign student differential fee will not destroy that diversity but will reduce its effectiveness. I think there's also the question of the calibre and reputation of Alberta graduate faculties being dependent on the presence of foreign students.

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with perhaps the most

difficult part of this entire issue. Certain people have argued that the two-tier system is basically a racist policy. I say that's not true. However, Mr. Chairman, let me just follow that up by saying I find it a little difficult to agree with the leader of the Liberal Party, who argues that it's a racist policy and that somehow this is part of the government's move to national socialism. I don't think too much of you Tories, but I don't believe you are Nazis yet. Let me make that point clear.

Mr. Chairman, no one seriously arguing this case would in my judgment suggest either the policy itself or the people proposing it are racist. But, Mr. Minister, the more serious question we all have to ask ourselves is simply this: do policies that are not racist in themselves but which, however inadvertently, contribute to the release of strong feelings among some people, not violate the spirit of good will and tolerance we must strive to build if we are to be responsible public leaders? I put that question very strongly to you, Mr. Minister, because I think that is a rather more profoundly important question than those who say this is a racist policy. We have to look at the result, the impact of our decisions.

The reason I raise this is that several months ago I had what was perhaps the most disconcerting experience of my almost 20 years in political life. Travelling around the province you somehow become pretty hard-nosed. It takes an awful lot to shock you. Sitting in a legislature with 69 Tories, it takes a lot to shock you. I had occasion to speak to a number of students at a junior college. I won't say which one, because I don't want to label the college unfairly. I suspect the same attitudes prevail elsewhere.

Mr. Minister, we got into a discussion of the two-tier system. For the first 10 or 15 minutes the arguments presented were very plausible. They were arguments of students who would make the case for a differential fee on completely defensible grounds. I may disagree with the arguments, but they would be perfectly defensible grounds. What disturbed me, and disturbs me today, is that after about 15 minutes we got quite a large number of students participating in this debate and attitudes came out that frankly shocked me. [It] shocked me that those kinds of attitudes would exist among the young people of our province who are going to be the leaders of tomorrow.

You know, Mr. Chairman, that is the far more subtle but profoundly important question we have to ask ourselves about this two-tier system: does it, however inadvertently, release emotions and feelings which would be better left so that time would erode the prejudice away?

I raise this deliberately and in as unprovocative a way as I can, because I believe that what's at stake here is more than just the issues we've talked about publicly, but in many ways the kind of postsecondary institutions we will develop in Alberta, and in many ways the kind of society and the outlook we will take in the years ahead to other people, particularly people of different colors and religions. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that it may well be that the two-tier system, while it has not captured the limelight of this Legislature, will say more about how we as Albertans will face the future than anything else we do in this Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words on this matter of foreign fees, because I feel I have a direct mandate from the people who sent me here to speak on their behalf. I think the fact that this matter was discussed at some 21 meetings in my constituency, followed by an objective discussion where all sides were voiced and the people gave their direction of the way they wanted the government to go, indicates to me that we are practising democracy. I'm not suggesting something I think particularly, and I'm wondering who those who are voicing opposition to this plan are speaking for. Unless they have a mandate from the people who sent them here, they are not carrying out the spirit of democracy when they advocate something that I'm satisfied the people want.

Certainly the people who sent me here want this particular thing. They want an increased fee for foreign students. What better example can we give those in other countries who are studying democracy than that government carries out the thinking of the people. In my view that's democracy. In many instances in this country we are getting too far away from that principle in municipal, provincial and federal government.

Probably the most notable example was in the debate in Ottawa on capital punishment, where members from several parties stood up and said that although their people wanted capital punishment they were voting against capital punishment. If that's democracy, I don't know what the meaning of democracy is. Right from the origin of the Mother Parliament, people are sent to parliament to voice the views of the people who sent them — the voice of the people — not to express their own views.

If a member has his own views on certain items, he should make those known to the electorate before he is elected. Then of course they can well understand he will voice that view. They elect him knowing he is going to do that. In every election in which I stood as a candidate, I've made very clear my stand that I believe in the separate school system as we have in the Alberta charter; that minorities have a right to their school system. I've been elected with the people knowing that that was my stand. So I have never had people come to me and say, change your views on having The School Act changed so we don't have a public and a separate system of schools. If members want to go against the thinking of the people who sent them there, I think that is the way to do it in a democracy.

Of all the people in 21 meetings — a cross section of business, farm, labor, unemployed, and professional people — 68 per cent stood up and were counted as wanting higher fees for university students who come from foreign countries. Ten per cent stood up and said they wanted foreign students to have the same fees as Albertans, and the balance of 22 per cent abstained. I always tell the people that they abstain in the United Nations, so they can abstain if they wish to do so, but that in abstaining they don't give us any indication of what they wish. When 68 per cent of the people stand up and say, we want higher fees, it leads me to believe that a vote in other parts of the province would be somewhat comparable. Perhaps the only way to find out is for each member to find out. Certainly as far as I'm concerned, there is no doubt in my mind in supporting

the hon. minister's stand on foreign fees.

Since the meetings, I thought it would be interesting to find out what some other universities are doing. So the researcher in my office sent a number of letters to various universities, and we have replies from some. The others I expect will be coming, because the original letter went out just over a month ago. I want to indicate what some other universities on this continent and elsewhere are doing in regard to foreign fees. Not that this should change our views, if we think we are representing what the people of Alberta want, but I think it's an exercise that indicates what's going on elsewhere and what Alberta students are up against when they go to other universities.

The Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland is a recognized school and many people — doctors and students from Canada — go to the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland. The accountant there says that the Canadian student entering medical school last October would have paid £1300 in tuition fees. The comparable fees charged to an Irish student were £480 — so it's almost three times as much to go to the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland. I don't think that indicates any intolerance on the part of the people of Ireland. They are simply asking people who come in to pay a fair share of the costs.

George Washington University in Washington, D.C., is the only university that does not charge foreign students higher fees. Fees for all students are the same at George Washington University in Washington, D.C.

Hawaii answered our letter, and there is quite a marked difference between students from Hawaii and students from out of Hawaii. In the medical school, a resident student pays \$350 for a semester. A non-resident pays \$875. In law, a resident student pays \$312.50 and a non-resident, \$780 — a very marked difference in the fees that goes through each of their faculties.

The University of California at Berkeley — a number of Alberta students go to Berkeley for postgraduate work and, I suppose, for their university work prior to graduation. It's recognized as one of the top universities in the United States. This is what their administrative analysis has said, sending their whole course of fees: the total fee in the school of law for a resident is \$389.75, and \$1,342.25 for a non-resident. Quite a difference between the two. For graduate students the total is \$256.50 for a resident and \$891.50 for a non-resident. For undergraduate students it is \$236.50 for a resident and \$871.50 for a non-resident. I don't think Berkeley is showing intolerance. They are asking a student to pay a reasonable share of his cost of getting educated on that campus.

At the Boulder campus of the University of Colorado, tuition for resident students carrying a full course load is currently \$289 per semester. For non-resident students it's \$1,155 per semester. The difference in Alberta sounds almost like peanuts compared to some of the figures we are seeing in other places Alberta students go for one reason or another. Idaho State University, which has a lot of Alberta students, \$205 per semester for a resident. For a non-resident it's \$475 per semester, more than double that for a resident.

So, Mr. Chairman, in my view some people in

Alberta and some hon. members, with respect, are reading too much into this matter of increasing fees for people who come from outside the province of Alberta, and from foreign countries. In my view we are teaching them one of the fundamental things of democracy; namely, that government carries out the thinking of the people, and doesn't simply tell the people what's good for them. I think it is most essential for people who are studying democracy to realize that.

At the Rosebud meeting, a graduate of the University of Alberta said something that impressed me very much. She was discussing this item before the 25 to 30 people at that meeting — it was held in the morning. She said she favored increased fees for foreign students because she questioned whether or not we were doing a service to these people from the third world who came to universities here.

She said one of the students who came from a third world country, a personal friend of hers, told her that when she went home she was ostracized by the people of her own country for not going to her own university, for not going to a university closer than in a country as far away as Canada. That girl said she was sorry she had come to a university that didn't meet with the approval of her countrymen and the people among whom she wanted to work, and that when she went home her work was ineffective because of that very fact.

So I support the minister. I think it's very sad indeed, when he's carrying out what I consider to be the thinking of the people, that he has taken so much abuse from some quarters in this province. Of course, that is democracy. People have a right to their own views. But again I question the right of MLAs to voice something that is not in accordance with the people who sent them here.

I support the stand taken by the minister. In my view the universities should be carrying out that policy, and carrying it out promptly.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I too would like to make some comments not specifically regarding the differential fee system or the two-tier system the Member for Spirit River-Fairview talks about but indeed much deeper than that. I think it's very easy for a member to stand up in this Assembly, throw statistics around, and mix those with principles.

All members of the Assembly are probably aware that only two provinces in Canada have a two-tier system, the province of Ontario and now the province of Alberta. I think the new fiscal arrangements with Ottawa are very timely with regard to Alberta finally being able to run its own advanced education system. As of April 1, which is today — I don't know whether it's symbolic that it's April Fools' Day — we're severing ties in many areas with the central government.

The Member for Spirit River-Fairview raises some good points. I note he's very careful to get racial overtones into *Hansard*. He makes a special point of saying it's not a matter of racial overtones, but I detect his innate ability to get that into the record as though it were indeed a subject including racial overtones. The Member for Drumheller mentioned comparisons. He went as far as Ireland, which I think is very important. He also mentioned the state of Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to represent a constituency that has a university in it. If I were politically wise, I would probably avoid even discussing the issue because they're having a big meeting next week. They're trying to get a move afoot to get the public involved in overturning the government's policy. And more power to them. If I were politically wise, I suppose I would be silent on the subject. However, I think it goes too deep for me to do that.

We in southern Alberta have a university that acts as a catch basin not only for southern Alberta but for the northern States. Insofar as the Member for Drumheller was quoting figures, I think it's pertinent to mention three states that in a very real way affect the University of Lethbridge. For the record, I'd simply say that in the states of Montana, North Dakota, Oregon, and Washington, which affect the University of Lethbridge in terms of student input, it's interesting to note that there's a tripling of fees for non-residents who come from outside the country. Without getting into the exact details, I think the statement that there's a tripling of fees in many cases should remind members that I see nothing wrong with recognition of the fact that those in Alberta who are Albertans — whose parents have played a very meaningful role in building the institutions and contributing in a meaningful way, through taxation, to the very institution that's there — should certainly have some right in ability to get into the institution, and a bit of a break in the cost.

Mr. Chairman, I get a little short with people who say education is everyone's right, and that they shouldn't work for it. We in Alberta spend more per capita on health delivery systems, and a year ago introduced an 11 per cent guideline which results in a tightening up procedure within the hospitals. How do I as the Member for Lethbridge West explain to a 72-year-old constituent that she has to wait nine months for a gall bladder operation because of restraints and, at the same time, allow somebody from abroad to go to our institution for \$400; it's now \$500. It's costing Lethbridge \$5,400 of their \$9.5 million budget. Where is the equity, fairness, and justification? Mr. Chairman, surely the minister is only reflecting the feelings of Albertans in saying there has to be a differential; there has to be recognition of the people of this province who provided the institutions.

The Member for Spirit River-Fairview gets on these figures on the significant difference in revenues to the province. I agree it's not significant. I quarrel with his argument that it's eaten up in administrative costs. If I played a role in the area that hired the people who implemented that and were collecting the fees, and it was going to cost all that, I'd get rid of them. What's the difference in giving a statement for \$500 or for \$800? If we're going to raise \$80,000 or \$90,000, surely it's not going to be eaten up in administration costs.

But I'd like to go a little further, Mr. Chairman. I read recently of a study carried out by the Senate at the U of A — a very meaningful group consisting not only of faculty and students but lay people. They pointed out that rural Alberta has perhaps one of the poorest records of dental treatment. I've said before that we who pride ourselves on such a great health system should recognize that Alberta, as part of Canada, has gone from fourth or so in infant mortality

to fifteenth in the world. I sometimes wonder, should we hold our heads so high when it comes to the health delivery system? But the U of A Senate report goes on in some detail as to the problems of dental treatment in rural Alberta.

As a commissioner for health care, I'm quite familiar with the problems we have in delivery of doctor services in rural Alberta. We now have an oversupply of physicians in this province, yet we can't supply dental and medical treatment in the rural areas. I would first of all have to point to the dentists, Mr. Chairman. Obviously they haven't heeded the message, because they prefer high-rises and plush carpets to doing the job they were trained to do. Mr. Chairman, who's going to do it if they're not?

I suggest that the success of the New Democratic Party in parts of Canada has come as a result of the failure of the private sector in certain areas. Is it any wonder government has to step in? Here we have government stepping in in a meaningful way in our educational institutions because of a failure within those institutions. I have no quarrel with the principle or the policy. I have a little quarrel with the method, and I think that's my right.

Mr. Chairman, why don't we charge \$5,400 at the University of Lethbridge, where the cost is \$5,400 per student, and then work out a grant system for those *bona fide* Canadians, and Albertans, and landed immigrants, and whatever other term we want to use to make it meaningful, so we get the message across to the public that education is a costly business.

In these estimates we're dealing with almost \$350 million in Advanced Education, which incorporates the colleges and universities. It's one hell of a lot of money. I have no qualms at all as a member of this Assembly, this party, and this government about saying it's time we took a stand. Tell the people of Alberta what it's costing, and don't hide under the cloak of those people from central Canada who insist on telling us they are paying such a fair share. If \$50 million is a fair share of \$350 million, obviously I took the wrong economics course.

I note we have dentists in training at the U of A. The cost is about \$15,000 a year. The incomes of dentists in Alberta are no secret. Yet we can't provide dental services in rural Alberta. Why not? Mr. Chairman, I suspect in some way it's the role of the professional groups to deliver this service, and it's not being done. I look at the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the licensing authority for a physician to practise in this province: are they pulling their weight? Are they doing their job? If they're doing their job why don't we have sufficient physicians at Fort Chip and the rest of rural Alberta? Why not? I know, and you know. Because it's difficult to get the plush carpets. It's difficult to recognize that many native people need medical treatment. And if a man had his druthers, Mr. Chairman, he would druther work from 8 or 9 to 4 in the cities of Edmonton, Calgary, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Red Deer, Grande Prairie, and what have you, rather than go where the missionaries historically went, where people needed them.

So when I look at the estimates, Mr. Chairman, when I see it's costing \$15,000 a year to train a dentist, and if a course is four years — I don't know what it is; my knowledge of dentistry is the bills I get — why don't we work out a system whereby a man

prepared to take dentistry . . . And I would quarrel a little bit with a native Albertan's not being able to practise dentistry because he can't get into the school. I would question that. And I'm not being racist when I talk about the preponderance of Hong Kong students there. I don't think I'm being racial or slanderous or anything else. I get a little up tight when we introduce a grading system . . .

AN HON MEMBER: Just misinformed.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I've got to pause for a minute. I may tend to get a little excited, but there are modifying forces within this House that sort of bring me back to reality. The hon. Member for Clover Bar reminds me of this. I can't help reflect, Mr. Chairman, if I might be permitted to. [interjections] I was raised on a farm. I recall we didn't have electricity on that farm, Mr. Chairman, but we had horses and jackasses. One jackass had a habit of nipping me in the behind. I recall one day we were putting in fence posts and this jackass nipped me. I said to myself, you ever do that again and I'm going to hit you over the head with a fence post. But you know, the jackass didn't understand. He nipped me again and I took a fence post and hit him over the head and killed him.

And I recall the words of my father. He said, son, you shouldn't have done that because one day that jackass will come back to haunt you. And I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that that jackass is in the House today. [laughter]

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, is he making the speech? [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. GOGO: I have other stories, Mr. Chairman, so I would advise other people not to continue the heckling.

Seriously, Mr. Chairman, I think that to justify the stand it has taken, this government has to follow through. I think the only way we can prove meaningful to the people of Alberta is to ensure that those groups who are self-governing, self-disciplining, and dedicated to the delivery of services to mankind in this province, those people who came to this Assembly and got put into the statute books — I'm referring to the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and the Dental Association . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Lawyers.

MR. GOGO: . . . two very important groups. They have to carry out their responsibilities. If they fail to do so, it's up to the government to see they do. And the only way I suggest this can be done and is going to be done within advanced education — if we continue year after year after year to pay amounts like \$15,000 for dental students — is insist that their self-governing groups who have accepted the responsibility of delivery get off [their] you-know-whats and ensure that these people practise in rural Alberta. The only way I think the Department of Advanced Education can do this, because they are the funding arm, is to say, okay, it's \$15,000 per year. If you spend your three months between semesters out in

the field, we will consider a grant of \$8,000, \$10,000, \$12,000, \$13,000, even \$15,000. Mr. Chairman, that way we can get to the people of Alberta who need these services.

I don't mean to pick on the dentists particularly. You know, I tend to pick on those with the highest income levels. But surely within the medical and dental faculties of our institutions we the government have a primary responsibility. It's just that I've been turned on by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview talking about undergraduate programs and the two-tier system, which is only that small tip of the iceberg.

Let me conclude by saying, Mr. Chairman, I would urge the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, if he can persuade his colleagues on Executive Council, that perhaps it's time we reviewed the terms of reference of the institutions of advanced learning and those professional groups who profess to be self-governing and self-disciplined. It's time we answered the needs of the people in this province. That's what we as legislators were elected to do.

Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I plan to make my remarks quite brief, because unfortunately I have to leave to go to a funeral.

But I would say I hope there would be an opportunity when I can more properly respond to the remarks of the Member for Lethbridge. As far as I'm concerned, to say they were ill-informed . . . They remind me of some speeches I heard in this Legislature in the early 1960s with regard to universities and the professions in this province. I wasn't very proud to hear them at that time, and I didn't expect we'd hear them in the middle of the 1970s.

On the question of foreign students, I simply want to say this: there's no question that the government has grass-roots support for moving to a two-tier, three-tier, or whatever kind of system they want. There's no question out at the grass roots. It isn't hard to whip up interest to talk about students from Hong Kong, China, and the African countries and point to students at the university whose color of skin or shape of eyes is different and say, yes that's part of the problem. There is no question that that kind of sentiment is viewed by a number of people.

Well, I guess I'm not surprised. But I think I have to say to the hon. members who talk about how they only vote for things in the Assembly that their constituents want them to vote for: how do you vote when we talk about a tax increase? You see, the job of the government isn't only to reflect the views of the people. As legislatures, on occasion we have responsibilities to give some kind of leadership too.

I say to members of this Assembly that until this matter was really raised a year ago, I don't think there was a real ground swell across the province. If you go back and check the number of students at the University of Alberta, you'll find there were more foreign students at the University of Alberta two and three years ago than there were last year. I suppose if I wanted to be unkind — which I would never want to be — I could say, where was the government two and three years ago when the numbers were higher at the University of Alberta than they are now?

The point I'm making is that in this case I think, frankly, the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower has been caught in a bind. I question very

much whether the minister and the officials of his department are nearly as enthusiastic about this move as many of his colleagues are. I commend the minister for having the intestinal fortitude to go to the University of Calgary and meet people head-on. And it wasn't a very pleasant morning or afternoon, as I recall. I give the minister full credit for doing that.

But I say to the minister and to members of the Assembly that it's great to come here and say, we always reflect the views of our constituents. But I say to the members: how do you vote on the question of taxes having to be increased? The job, in addition to reflecting the view of our constituents here, is also the job of attempting to give some leadership. I simply say that in this case I think the government has been sorely neglectful in trying to put the facts before the people of the province.

I make the point again that there's no question that if you were to hold a plebiscite across Alberta, Albertans would be in favor of a two-tier system. But I make the same point too: we're the second province in Canada that's doing that. We're the only place in the world, the Premier tells us, that has a heritage savings trust fund. We're supposedly moving in the area of international trade initiatives and so on. It seems on one hand we're trying to expand Alberta's point of view and to look at the world; to say to the world, come and trade with Alberta.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Scholarships in the European . . .

MR. CLARK: And as my colleague says, scholarships to students in Europe. On one hand we're saying to the world, come to Alberta, here is where the opportunities are. On the other hand we're really saying, in the area of foreign students, despite the fact there are fewer at the University of Alberta now than there were two and three years ago, the government is moving in the other direction. This is where I think the government has really fallen down as far as some overall leadership is concerned in this particular area.

MR. McCRAE: Looking for a contribution to international aid?

MR. CLARK: The minister from Calgary — and we're not quite sure what he's responsible for — says, are we looking for a contribution as far as international aid? If I had to determine my priorities, I would place a much higher priority on educational opportunities for students from other parts of the world. I'd be in favor of saying, let's cut back on foreign aid, because I think very often that money doesn't get into the hands of the people who really need it most. I'm quite prepared to state my priorities in that area. As Canadians and Albertans, I think we're far wiser to make some educational positions available to students from underdeveloped countries of the world than we are to move in the foreign aid direction.

To me the real inconsistency of this whole thing is: on one hand, we're going to the world and saying, come to Alberta. It's possible the Premier is going to the Middle East this summer. The Premier has been to Europe, to Japan and those areas. Possibly the Premier is going to Russia. We're really saying to the world, come and look at Alberta seriously. Yet at the very same time, despite the fact the numbers are lower at the University of Alberta now than they were



two or three years ago, we're moving in the other direction, I find this inconsistent. Frankly, I just don't think that in the long run it's in the best interests of Albertans.

You know, the comments made by the Member for Lethbridge West basically were: how could he explain to individuals having to wait several months at the hospital when a foreign student can come to Alberta? That argument gets very, very tenuous. There'll be another occasion to debate that.

But I just say to the members: what kind of picture are we trying to present to the world? We say we've got to become more outward looking as a province. I think my colleagues and I generally agree with that. But I'd like the members of the Assembly to look seriously at that dichotomy as I see it.

I apologize to the minister for not being able to stay for all his remarks because of an unfortunate situation.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, my remarks are going to be very brief regarding the two-tier system.

Mr. Chairman, I support it unequivocally. I want to voice and place on record that the voters of Edmonton Kingsway support this type of system: one cost for Alberta students, and one cost for foreign students. I would like to make it clear to the members of the committee: they should note that even if the cost for foreign students [is], and it will be, slightly higher than the fees for Alberta students, this does not pay the entire cost of advanced education, which as the hon. members know is funded by the provincial and federal taxpayers to the degree of 85 per cent at least, or even up to 90 per cent. That means the taxpayers in Alberta and Canada are in fact funding the vast proportion of advanced education for all students, be they Alberta or foreign students.

Mr. Chairman, the foreign students in need can and do and will receive support via numerous other support agencies and systems. I am assured by the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower that their entry into advanced education in the province of Alberta will not be denied because of their position as foreign students.

Finally and clearly, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview speaks of emotions on this issue. I suggest he go door to door on the main street of Edmonton Kingsway or any constituency, including his own constituency, and ask the citizens whether they would support a two-tier system. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the hon. members and the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview will receive the answer: an unequivocal yes, do it, in an overwhelming way.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, in spite of the issues he raises there is no doubt by members in this Assembly that we have the best overall health care and social system in the world. I challenge anybody in this Assembly to draw me statistics to show otherwise. The best overall health care and social system in the whole world.

Mr. Chairman, I had the opportunity, very briefly, to visit European countries and study housing and I can assure you that we are even ahead of Sweden with respect to our social and health care systems. They may equal us in some areas, but in my opinion they do not pass us on an overall basis.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I believe the philosophy and the principle of the two-tier system is correct and

proper. Assistance for foreign students can be and is provided via many other support systems and foreign aid. Of all provinces, the Alberta government provides the highest per capita assistance for foreign aid. For the Leader of the Opposition to suggest for one minute cutting down the foreign assistance in lieu of educating students, when people are starving in fact, I think is a sham. I'm amazed at him. Because apart from education, that foreign assistance in fact feeds children who are now starving. I suggest that education, a very important part for foreign students, in the long run is the issue; but in the short run, when you're starving, it doesn't matter a damn.

So, Mr. Chairman, clearly I feel the minister and government are in fact acting very responsibly on the principle of the two-tier system. I ask the members of the Legislative Assembly to support it unequivocally.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. member a question? The trip to Sweden and other countries he was talking about — was that as a member of the Legislature, or was it just a private trip the individual made?

DR. PAPROSKI: I was asked by the Co-operative Housing Foundation of Canada to attend their particular conference and tour as a Member of the Legislative Assembly. It was funded by the Legislative Assembly, or the government.

MR. R. SPEAKER: To the hon. member. Will the hon. member be reporting back to the Assembly with regard to that trip? It related . . .

DR. PAPROSKI: Would the hon. member please repeat the question?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member intending to report to the Legislature with regard to the findings of that trip and the frame of reference he used in doing the fact-finding?

DR. PAPROSKI: I have reported to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. It was by way of his department.

DR. BUCK: You said the Legislature paid for it.

DR. PAPROSKI: I'm sorry. To be correct, it was by way of the Minister of Housing and Public Works, and I have reported to him.

MR. NOTLEY: The people of Alberta are paying for it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: To the minister. Will the member be making a public report to the Assembly with regard to those findings? I think they would be interesting with regard to housing needs and maybe other things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. members address the Chair when they speak.

MR. R. SPEAKER: My apology, Mr. Chairman.

MR. YURKO: The hon. member can put that on the Order Paper or ask me during the discussion of the

estimates of the Department of Housing and Public Works.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a couple of brief remarks about the foreign student fees or the two-tier fee structure. First of all I would like to go on record, as others have before me, in indicating my constituency's support for the two-tier structure. In talking to people in constituencies at different pre-session meetings, certainly there was overwhelming support for this move.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition seemed to be making fun or criticizing the fact that members should bring forth the views of their constituents. I feel that you have an obligation as an elected member to reflect the views of your constituents, even in cases where you don't agree with those views. And in those cases where you disagree with the views of your constituents, I think you have an obligation to put that forth as well.

But in this particular case I agree with the views of my constituents. This is one of the reasons why I respect the hon. Member for Drumheller, in that he does make an excellent effort and point in reflecting the views of his constituents in this Legislature.

Two years ago, Mr. Chairman, when our government brought in the restraint program, I think we saw a reaction from many of our postsecondary institutions, saying that with this restraint program in place we will have to put limits on enrolments. At that time I believe the foreign student enrolment was around 8 per cent. I think that as a result of some of the postsecondary institutions reacting that way, the parents in Alberta reacted as well. They were concerned that their children would not be able to get into some of the postsecondary institutions, even though they may be eligible, and at the same time they would be supporting foreign students at the same institutions. As a result of this, Mr. Chairman, I think many parents were asking themselves why in fact all foreign students were paying the same fees as Albertans or as Canadians.

It's already been pointed out that with the foreign aid program Alberta, per capita, leads the country. Also, Mr. Chairman, I think we in Canada have as many students leaving the country, attending universities in other countries, as foreign students coming in. Yet our students primarily go to countries where they do have to pay a higher fee than the residents of those countries.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would just simply like to indicate that I think Albertans have a valid reason for supporting the minister on this concept of a two-tier structure. I think they feel that in the past we built these institutions, first of all, for the future benefit of our children. I don't think they are saying that we don't want foreign students in this country. I think they realize it is important to have a certain number of foreign students in our universities in order that our students will see some of the cultural benefits they bring with them.

So I just wanted to make those two points, Mr. Chairman. I think it's important that we reflect the views of our constituents, and Albertans do have valid reasons for supporting the two-tier structure.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a word or two in relation to this matter. First of all, it's really quite interesting what you can do with polls, depending on what results you want to get from those polls. I would challenge the hon. government members to have a poll in this province on: should the Alberta heritage trust fund be controlled by the Legislature, or should it be controlled by the cabinet?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's not the issue.

DR. BUCK: Or, Mr. Chairman, we should have a poll on: should there be revenue sharing by the municipalities with the provincial government?

MR. NOTLEY: Hear, hear.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I think that if we looked at conducting a poll on whether foreign students should be paying a higher tuition fee than Alberta students, if the question were put in the context that you wanted to get the answer you wished to hear, you could get both sides of the fence covered quite nicely. But in the way this poll was conducted — it was conducted by the elite that belonged to the Progressive Conservative Party of this province at their convention two years ago.

MR. McCRAE: That's 1,700,000 people.

DR. BUCK: Now it's very, very interesting that when the government came back after that convention two years ago and the minister, without any consultation with the universities in this province, came to this Legislature and said, we are going to go with the two-tier system of tuition — Mr. Chairman, that's not what I say is consultation by the minister of the government. Certainly we expect more from this government. Because if we are at all concerned about the freedom of the universities, this is a very, very basic issue in this debate — the freedom of the universities.

When I hear the rednecked Member for Lethbridge East make a speech . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Lethbridge West.

DR. BUCK: Lethbridge West. My apologies to the Member for Lethbridge East.

MR. NOTLEY: He's too elusive to find out what kind of neck he's got.

DR. BUCK: I would just like to say to the hon. Member for Lethbridge East that he'd better find out what's really going on in the wide, wide, wonderful world.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's Lethbridge West you're talking about.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Gogo, whatever constituency he comes from, Mr. Chairman, so we don't have to hide behind his constituency name. Not only is the hon. member attacking minorities but he's also attacking some very honorable professions in this province.

MR. DIACHUK: Never do that.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, the role of government is to express the wishes of the majority; that is very true. But at the same time, Mr. Chairman, it's also incumbent upon them to look after the interests of the minority. That is just as big a role, Mr. Chairman. And this government doesn't seem to worry about minorities.

MR. SCHMID: The last government didn't do anything about them at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

DR. BUCK: And the hon. minister responsible for owls, I would like to say . . .

MR. SCHMID: April Fools' Day.

DR. BUCK: I hope, Mr. Chairman, for the minister's sake that he has \$16 million instead of \$6 million to hand out before the next election, because he may need it. He may need that \$16 million to hand out.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to enlighten the hon. member, Mr. Gogo, who's probably out writing a redneck release for the media.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member refer to whoever he's speaking about by his constituency . . .

DR. BUCK: What is his constituency then, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . which is Lethbridge West.

DR. BUCK: I'll write that down, Lethbridge West.

I would like to indicate to the hon. member that it is this government that he is accusing the professions . . . It is this government that is directly responsible as to how many lawyers we have, how many physiotherapists, chemists, doctors, how many dentists we graduate. It is the responsibility of this government to provide those facilities. If a young man or woman has the mental capacities and also, I would like to inform the hon. member, the financial means to assist him in getting a professional education, then the doors are open to him. The doors are closed only in that the universities can take only so many applicants.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to enlighten the hon. Member for Lethbridge West on some of the incentive programs that have been initiated in good old Tory Ontario — if there is such a thing as a good Tory government — to get professional people into the outlying areas. Some of those initiatives were very, very lucrative. But where is this government's program to get people out? We're talking about the professions not doing it.

Well, the hon. Member for Lethbridge West talks about freedoms. At the same time he says, in essence, let's tell these people where to go. Well, I would like to tell the hon. member from Lethbridge where to go, but parliamentary rules prevent me from doing that. But I would like to suggest to the hon. member that maybe he go back home and get some facts.

MR. NOTLEY: Wherever it is it will be very hot and snow won't last long.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, some of the incentive programs to get professional people into the outlying areas haven't worked, and to me that's unfortunate. There is a responsibility on the professions to do their share too. But I would like to say to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower that he had better start looking at some programs to get professional services out into these areas because they are desperately needed.

This government has been in power six years now. Where are their mobile dental clinics? Where are their mobile medical clinics to serve the outlying areas? They're not in existence. Where is the provincial ambulance service — this Legislature passed a resolution that something was going to be done and nothing has been done, Mr. Chairman. Nothing has been done. So this now government — now what has happened? Nothing, that's what has happened. The government has the prime responsibility to supply these services.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate that the responsibility of government is certainly to provide services, to provide direction, for the majority of the people of this province. But it is also a very grave responsibility for them to protect the rights of the minorities. And which province in this Confederation has more means to do just that, to help people who come from foreign lands who are less fortunate than we are? Now, Mr. Chairman, it requires guts to do that. It requires guts to say to the people of Alberta, we have the money, there aren't that many foreign students we are helping to educate, surely we can do that. But you know, it's much easier to take the other route. It's much easier to say, well let's cut those people off — Alberta first. That's leadership? That's not leadership, that's following.

Mr. Chairman, the other point that's so very critical is this loss of autonomy and freedom of the universities in this province to do what they think is right. The minister is taking away that freedom, more and more and more. By all the actions that this government brings into this Legislature, the universities are losing that freedom. And if the hon. member from Calgary, the minister responsible for Calgary affairs, wants to do the people of this province a real service, he can donate his \$35,000 to the . . . [interjections] His salary, Mr. Chairman. Really we could get along quite nicely with a twenty-fifth or twenty-fourth minister, an associate minister. [interjections]

So, Mr. Chairman, the protection of the minority is crucial in this debate. And the freedom of the universities is most important in this debate.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a few marks — remarks. [interjections] I hope I will make some mark, but I'd like to make a few remarks about the question of foreign students at Alberta universities, because I resent some of the comments made this morning by some of the honorable gentlemen sitting in the opposition.

It is not true that because people advocate similar courses of action, they do it out of similar motivation. I think everyone in Alberta should be aware of that today, in terms of the Confederation debate that is

taking place. The argument has never been made in this province that we favor decentralization, that we favor strong provincial governments out of the same motivation that moves the present separatist government of Quebec. And I think the analogy can legitimately be made to the question of foreign student fees in this province.

I think it is unquestionably true, as some of the hon. members have argued, that some of the support the government receives from some of the people in this province for the question of a tuition fee differential is based on racism. I don't think there's any question about that. But I resent the implication that what may be the motivation of a few people in this province was the motivation of the provincial government when they made this decision. Not only do I resent it, but I reject it. And I think the hon. members sitting in the opposition — who claim to go from door to door in their constituencies, who claim to be conversant with the feelings of the people in their constituencies — know that is a specious argument to be making about the majority of the people in this province and about the government in this particular case.

Mr. Chairman, I see nothing wrong with charging legitimate costs to appropriate accounts. I see nothing wrong with granting the non-resident student less subsidy from the welfare of the people of this province. The critical question is whether we can separate the non-resident student as a generality from non-resident students who would be the deserving beneficiaries of our concern for the development of the third world.

Mr. Chairman, I think that quite clearly is the position of the provincial government. This province was the first in Canada to extend grants for foreign aid development, matching those raised privately within the province. Last year our matching grant was in excess of \$2.5 million, which means the private citizens of this province raised \$2.5 million for foreign work of various kinds. In addition it means the \$5 million which came from Alberta was matched again in large measure by the government of Canada.

This province, including the University of Alberta, has been a leader in professional exchanges for almost 20 years. I would mention the Faculty of Education and their work in Thailand, and the Department of Agriculture and their work in [central] Africa. The rationale for those programs is legitimate. It may not be agreed to by every member of this Legislature. But it is a rationale that can honestly be subscribed to by members, and it is honestly subscribed to by me.

Leaders of third world countries have come to North America, to Alberta, to Edmonton, and have said: sending our students to the University of Alberta poses two serious problems for us. First, when they receive an education which is important to the development of our country, in many cases they do not return to our country. We lose the education we so urgently required. Secondly, they say, we need to develop a strong postsecondary educational system in our own countries because the presence of that postsecondary educational system is necessary to motivate the 5, 6, 7, and 8 year olds who in 15 years are going to be the hope of India, Pakistan, Malaysia, or the Philippines.

The leaders of these countries have come to this

province and said, instead of bringing students here, instead of drawing them off from the country which most critically needs the education they are going to gain, will you send your professional people to us? Will you send your educators to Thailand? Will you send professionals from the Department of Agriculture to [central] Africa, so we can educate our people in our country, in our own environment, in our circumstances and, at the same time, provide an object lesson to motivate the young people whose education we need to encourage.

Mr. Chairman, to the extent we have done that, I think it is a legitimate and an honest response to the concerns expressed to us as a government — or to the government of Saskatchewan, or the government of British Columbia — by the people of the countries the hon. members opposite claim to be most concerned about.

The third point I want to make is that both provincially and federally we are providing scholarships, directed largely toward third world countries, the intent of which is to provide out of one pocket, explicitly labelled as our concern for the third world, the support which is necessary to provide into our educational system a true accounting of the cost involved in the service we are providing not only to the citizens of our own province and country but indeed to the citizens of the world.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude by agreeing once again that there are some people who support the differential fee for the most unfortunate of reasons. If I come in contact with them I will attempt to change their minds, as I hope and expect the honorable gentlemen opposite will. But the fact they are supporting this for the most unfortunate of reasons does not in any sense, or at least should not to honest men, suggest their unfortunate reasons were the rationale behind the decision of this government. I can only say I believe strongly that our motivations were well intentioned, that they respond to explicit concerns that have been expressed to us by some third world countries, and that in the long term they are going to be beneficial to the very people about whom we all profess to be most concerned.

Thank you.

DR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, in speaking to this, I feel we are supplementing fees in two ways. We're not only supporting students coming to our universities, but when our students go to foreign universities we're supporting them at the same time.

Last year I referred to chiropractic students. I would like to know to what extent chiropractic students are being assisted this year, either by grants or loans, at chiropractic institutions outside Alberta.

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West made some remarks about the College of Physicians and Surgeons being a little tardy in their duty. I would like to remind the hon. members for Lethbridge West and East that the city of Lethbridge is the most overdoctorated city, not in Alberta or Canada, but in the whole wide world. Why can't we take some of them out and put them in Fort Chipewyan for a while? They say they've got all the surrounding community to look after. So you look at the surrounding community and find a little town like Magrath with three doctors, the town of Cardston with 11, Macleod with 6, and you can go on and on forever. They're very well looked

after.

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West also mentioned setting up a denticare program. I can give you a good solution for that: take the \$7 million we spent on chiropractic and you could have an excellent denticare program.

The hon. Member for Clover Bar mentioned incentive programs and so on. We do have some incentive programs. We send dental students, dental mechanics, and dental assistants into areas with health units. That's at least a good start on it.

Then you look at what happens when government interferes with medicine. Just a couple of recent ones come to mind: the flu vaccination program that we spent millions and millions of dollars on, the banning of saccharine, and all this stuff. If they'd just keep their hands out of medicine for a little while, it might do a lot better. Nobody ever asked government to take over the funding of medical fees. They just started doing it — under a lot of pressure from the federal government, I grant you. They were forced into it. The Hon. Donovan Ross resigned over it just a few years ago. An excellent booklet written some 10 years ago by the ex-premier, Mr. Manning, sets out in detail all the problems associated with medicare. The statements he made then have come true today. We're running into those very problems: overuse, abuse of the whole system, and so on.

Then we get down to the cost of professionals in universities. I believe the cost of educating a doctor or dentist at the moment is somewhere around \$120,000. We in this province are graduating around 150 medical students a year. The province of British Columbia, with almost twice the population, graduates 98 doctors a year. So we are certainly doing our bit as far as supplying doctors, not only to Alberta but probably to other areas of the world. I would agree with the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands that it's much better to train these people and send them out. I think we do this under the CUSO organization.

There is a differential fee, as the hon. Member for Drumheller mentioned, in the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland. In fact they charge them the whole wallop, I believe. They just started doing this a few years ago. It is interesting that their enrolment is full. They have many more applicants than they had when they were supplementing the program. So it doesn't reduce the number of students in any shape or form. It just means the countries that they are coming from support them a little more. I think this is one of the things we should be looking to. If we are going to train these people, if we're going to support our students elsewhere, then the countries from [which] these students come should support their students here. I would support the differential fee structure.

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress on the same, and requests 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. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 1 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until Monday afternoon at half past 2.

[The House adjourned at 12:47 p.m.]

