

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

They're in the public gallery. I'd ask them to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

Title: **Monday, April 4, 1977 2:30 p.m.**

[The House met at 2:30 p.m.]

head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**Department of Education****PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 32****The Municipal Government
Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 32, The Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1977. The bill has three aspects. The first enables municipalities to establish non-profit housing corporations in order that they may benefit from financial considerations under sections 15 and 15(1) of the National Housing Act. The second enables municipalities to enter into agreements with the federal government for the relocation of railway lines within municipal boundaries. The third provides for consequential amendments to The Companies Act in order that municipalities may establish non-profit housing corporations.

[Leave granted; Bill 32 read a first time]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 32, The Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1977, be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the annual report of K Division, Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce two classes from my constituency of Edmonton Belmont. One is a grade 10 class from M. E. Lazerte, 11 students with their teacher Mr. Sparks. They're in the public gallery. Sitting in the members gallery is a grade 7 class from Steele Heights, 63 students headed by a classroom teacher Mr. Dale Smith. I should like to ask both classes to stand and be recognized by this Assembly.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce a grade 5 class from Richard Secord school, some 30 students accompanied by their teacher Alice Halvorsen.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, further to the Budget Address announcement by the Hon. Merv Leitch of increased grants for location allowances for teachers in remote and isolated schools, I am pleased to provide the following details.

In 1975-76, isolation bonuses were provided to school boards on an isolation index with rates varying from \$138 to \$860. Based on the recommendations of a report by Mr. E. G. (Gunner) Wahlstrom released last July, we began to phase in a program of location allowances. For 1977-78, additional funds are being provided for a total of \$865,000.

Under the proposed regulations the province is divided into five areas. Copies of the map will be distributed for the information of hon. members. In area 1, Fort McMurray, an allowance calculated at the enrolment times \$75 will be retained for 1977 and will decrease annually, to expire in 1981. In areas 2 and 3, an index based on location, road access, medical, communications, and other services is calculated. The allowances are expected to range from \$750 to \$2,750 per teacher in area 2, and from \$175 to \$875 in area 3. In areas 4 and 5 the range is expected to be between \$300 and \$600 per teacher, depending upon the size of school.

Provisions have been made in special cases to phase out the previous isolation bonuses and replace them with the new location allowances over a period of years. Increases in the amount of support for areas 2, 3, 4, and 5 are estimated at nearly \$200,000 for 1977-78.

Mr. Speaker, the expansions are based on recommendations contained in the report on the operation of the Northland School Division by Dr. Swift, and on the additional recommendations by Mr. Wahlstrom last summer. Together with the increased small school assistance announced earlier, this program contributes substantially to the recruitment and retention of staff in remote and isolated communities in Alberta, and reflects the recognition by this government of the higher costs associated with operating schools in such areas.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Alberta Energy Company**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. The question flows from the annual meeting of the Alberta Energy Company in Calgary tomorrow. The initial question to the minister is: what was the purpose of the Alberta government just recently acquiring on the Toronto Stock Exchange, I believe, a number of additional shares in the Alberta Energy Company?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the purpose was to maintain the government's share holding at 50 per cent, and it is now exactly 50 per cent.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister with regard to the Energy Company's annual meeting tomorrow. What instructions has the Alberta government given Mr. Mitchell, president of the Energy Company and the holder of the government proxy of the 50 per cent, on the matter of changes in the memorandum of association of the Alberta Energy Company?

MR. GETTY: We have advised Mr. Mitchell to vote the government's proxy in the best interests of the shareholders of the company.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the comment made in the House by the minister a week ago Friday, I believe, is the minister in a position to table with the Assembly the advice that the government and the Alberta Energy Company must have received from Price Waterhouse, the accountants of the Energy Company, on the question of changes in the memorandum of association? I ask the question, Mr. Speaker, because the minister indicated the sole reason for making this change was a supposed tax benefit to the Energy Company.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that the main reason was the tax matter. There were other inefficiencies in entering into agreements. I didn't mention something about "sole reason".

But, Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. Leader of the Opposition is seeking some information, he should place it on the Order Paper to be considered as to whether it's management responsibility or something that would be considered policy, which the government might respond to.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Alberta Energy Company meeting tomorrow, has the minister discussed with the president of the Energy Company, Mr. Mitchell, how he will handle the government proxy if the question of confidence in the president of the Energy Company is raised at the meeting?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I should point out two things to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. The government has confidence in the president, chief executive officer, of the Alberta Energy Company.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition should know that the shares being held in proxy, though, will not be voted in the annual meeting to elect directors. If he's familiar with The Alberta Energy Company Act, and I assume he is, in any year in which the government appoints three directors in lieu of voting its shares for directors, obviously those shares are not voted for the additional directors. Therefore it was a feature of the act that the majority of the directors are in fact elected by the shareholders other than the government.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I didn't explain the question well, or the minister didn't understand it. The question centres on a motion coming to the floor of the annual meeting tomorrow with regard to con-

tinued confidence in Mr. Mitchell as the president of the Energy Company. My question to the minister is: what instructions has the government given Mr. Mitchell with regard to what will in fact be a matter of voting on his own position as president?

MR. GETTY: We've told Mr. Mitchell that we have a great deal of confidence in the very fine manner in which he is managing the company on behalf of the shareholders. I would leave the rest to the imagination of the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NOTLEY: What about the Whitecourt riding?

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, we'll be pleased to report that to the Whitecourt constituency association.

Curriculum Policies Board

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, the second question is to the Premier. Has the Premier met with the education Curriculum Policies Board? If he has, could he indicate to the House the major areas of discussion in the course of his meeting with them?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I have not met with the board. I've been reading with interest the minutes of their deliberations, and certainly would commend to the citizens of the province the very excellent work they are doing on behalf of the citizens.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Is it the intention of the government that the minutes of the meetings will be made available to all members of the Assembly?

MR. LOUGHEED: No it's not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then a further supplementary question, this time to the Minister of Education. What practice will the government use in dealing with the recommendations from the education Curriculum Policies Board? Will the minister announce the recommendations, or in fact is the Curriculum Policies Board free to announce and talk in terms of its recommendations publicly?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, as I've already indicated in response to similar questions in this House during this sitting, the recommendations of the Curriculum Policies Board which deal directly with the goals and objectives of education will be made public so members of this Assembly can have these at hand when entering the debate — perhaps not this spring, because I doubt that any recommendations will be coming forward before the fall session. But I expect recommendations will flow from that board prior to the fall sitting, at which time those recommendations will be available. With respect to other curriculum changes, what will be announced will be the decision I make with respect to the recommendations of that body.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has the minister advised or made it clear to the board that in fact they are not to speak

publicly with regard to their recommendations, once they are in the minister's hands?

MR. KOZIAK: No I haven't. The members of the Curriculum Policies Board appreciate that the board on which they sit is advisory to me. Of course they all have interests in education beyond their responsibilities on the board. I'm sure that in the course of their discussions, particularly those who represent various organizations such as The Alberta Teachers' Association, CASS, and the Alberta School Trustees' Association would presumably bring to the board the advice of their particular organizations.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary question to the minister. It's the position of the minister, then, that members on the education Curriculum Policies Board are at liberty to discuss publicly the recommendations the board has made to the minister once the minister has received the recommendations, or after a reasonable time?

MR. KOZIAK: That's not quite the answer I gave the hon. Leader of the Opposition. What I indicated with respect to recommendations of the board is that those recommendations will be announced by me when I've acted upon them positively.

With respect to each individual member, I'm suggesting that the members are free to discuss with their association the representations they'll bring to the board. But the minutes, discussions, and decisions of the board I believe they have decided amongst themselves will be internal to the board.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then I might pose this question to the minister. Are individuals who sit on the education Curriculum Policies Board who are not representatives of provincial education organizations at liberty to discuss with the public the recommendations the board makes to the minister once the minister has received the recommendations?

MR. KOZIAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, the members on the Curriculum Policies Board who are not representing specific organizations I hope would discuss with the public on every occasion afforded to them those areas they would be discussing and making recommendations on to me. With respect to those areas where recommendations have already been made, I believe that's a decision of the internal workings of the board.

Grain Transport

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister any information in regard to the backlog of ships at the coast, which has meant that much of our grain hasn't been loaded the last three weeks and which, in turn, has backed up our loading of freight cars on the prairies from Saskatchewan west?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I have some. But really I don't have information I would consider up to date and accurate.

Land Caveat Legislation

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

tion to the hon. Premier in light of the introduction of Bill 29, which precludes access by native people to the use of caveats to state an interest in Crown lands. Has the government developed a policy with respect to the passage of retroactive legislation whenever its legal position becomes unclear?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd refer that question to the hon. Attorney General.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, in commenting on this question in the House earlier, I think I indicated that the reason for bringing this legislation forward at this time — specifically its retroactivity — had to do with comments by the Chief Justice of Canada in the Paulette case. Because of the construction placed on Alberta legislation, or the impression left with the court and now with the legal community as to the legal effect of Alberta's legislation, we felt it necessary to clarify the law. Normally retroactive legislation is not produced by this government, or most other governments, and it's only in circumstances such as this where it needs clarification going back to the time when the loose title system was introduced that we felt it appropriate to bring this matter forward.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Is the Premier in a position to advise the House whether he has received a request from the Alberta membership of the Canadian Civil Liberties Association for him to receive a submission on this question from a blue ribbon delegation headed by the hon. Mr. Justice Emmett Hall, and if so, whether or not he has responded to it?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I believe there was a response, but I'd have to refer the question to the Attorney General.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, yes, such a letter was received and a response was given. The letter received by the Canadian group was dated the same day as I introduced Bill 29 in this Assembly. One might therefore conclude that the authors of the letter were not specifically aware of the specific terms of Bill 29. Therefore they may not have been aware that the government's intention was to clarify the law and not to take away from any individual or group of individuals — in the case the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has referred to, native groups — any rights in law they may have to commence proceedings in the courts to determine whether or not aboriginal rights exist. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, in my judgment there is no attempt in this legislation to remove rights. Therefore . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I think we're starting to debate the question.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General or the hon. Premier. The question really related to the receipt of a request for a meeting with a group of people from the Canadian Civil Liberties Association including one of the most prominent jurists in the country, Mr. Justice Hall. My question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Attorney

General is: where does that request now sit in terms of holding a meeting with this committee?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I was attempting to reply and can say that because of what I think was a misunderstanding in the minds of the authors of the letter, I don't think a meeting as such is necessary. The authors of the letter indicated that their intention was to present a short brief to the Premier. I got a copy of the letter, so I assume a copy to me. The response to that letter has been that if it is the intention of this group of people to submit a short brief on the point, we would be very pleased to receive a copy of the brief at their convenience. That response has gone to the organization.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General. Is the Attorney General in a position to advise the Assembly whether the government will entertain any further briefs from any other organizations before proceeding with this bill or, for that matter, consider public hearings in view of the magnitude of the bill?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I really don't know that public hearings add any particular advantage to this legislation. Certainly if groups or individuals in our society have a view on Bill 29, all members of the Assembly, including me, are happy to receive those views. If some organizations wish to present specific briefs to me on the subject, of course I'm very happy to hear from them.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General. In light of the Attorney General's assessment that Bill 29 would in fact change the law to bring into force conventional understanding of the law among the legal fraternity, is there any specific basis in fact — has there been any compilation of background, any legal precedents or what have you — which would lead the Attorney General to the view that in fact that is the prevailing view of the legal community?

MR. SPEAKER: It would seem the hon. member is now trying to delve into whatever legal research might have been done as a background to a certain decision. I would question whether that would be a topic that ought to be raised in the question period.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can rephrase that to your satisfaction and mine by asking the hon. Attorney General, in view of his comments on this matter, whether or not there have been any studies as to the nature of the original law with respect to the caveat question and also legal opinion?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I think the comments I have made so far inside and outside the House are accurate in law. I think you can assume that while I am not omniscient, I am advised by competent men and women of the legal fraternity. I don't want to get into a debate in the question period — I'll be happy to in the discussion of Bill 29 — as to the reasons for our views on the specific amendments proposed.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I might ask a further supplementary question of the Attorney General. Is it the

government's intention to proceed with this legislation at this spring session, or is the government prepared to hold over the legislation, after perhaps second reading, until the fall session?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, having two sessions, the government would of course like to utilize both sessions and often leaves highly detailed and complex legislation on the Order Paper until the fall session. The amendments proposed in Bill 29 are not all that comprehensive or highly technical, and I think can be examined and understood . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FOSTER: . . . by competent legal people advising members of the House. So I don't particularly see any necessity to leave this bill on the Order Paper until fall.

I would like to emphasize, however, that it's not the government's intention to deal with the bill in any extraordinary fashion; that is to say, to move it to second reading and then perhaps third reading out of the ordinary. The bill will proceed on the Order Paper as any other bill would.

Hearing Aid Consultants

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Has the minister or her department received any complaints regarding the quality of service afforded by hearing aid audiologists from senior citizens receiving hearing aids under the extended health benefits program?

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, not recently, to my knowledge. We seem to have had some difficulty when we first implemented the program. But the follow-up procedures and the requirements we built into our agreements seem to have resolved a number of them. If the hon. member has some in mind, I'd be pleased to receive and deal with them.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Has the minister met with the Hearing Aid Advisory Board to discuss the qualifications of the hearing aid audiologists?

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I've met with two groups, but at the moment their specific titles escape me. I'll have to check and advise the hon. member.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is the minister or the government considering introducing legislation which would provide minimum standards for hearing aid audiologists?

MISS HUNLEY: Not at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

Planning Act

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. In light of the Attorney General's remarks that quite complicated and wide-ranging legislation would be considered [for] holding over, can the minister indicate if Bill 15, The Planning Act, will be held over as

requested by a unanimous resolution of the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we haven't made that decision with respect to the proceedings of The Planning Act, 1977. But I fully intend to take the bill to committee stage to allow full and complete discussion of the subsections of that act.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister indicate if he will follow through with his promise to have the regulations available for the Legislature before the Easter break?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, as I recall my remarks on Thursday, I said I would advise the House. I now have that information. It would appear they will not be ready before the Easter break, but hopefully I'll have them in time for the committee study of the bill.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Did the minister say he'd now hopefully have them for committee study of the bill? Is it now the government's position that the members of the House will not have the proposed regulations prior to committee study of the bill? Earlier in the House the minister indicated to us he would have the regulations prior to . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: He said, maybe.

MR. CLARK: No "maybe" at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you know how to handle legislation in this House?

MR. CLARK: Yes, I do. [interjections] Well, start doing it then.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. CLARK: You've had this on the burner for three years.

MR. NOTLEY: Four years, actually.

Tax Discounters

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It relates to the matter undertaken by the minister last week. Does the government intend to proceed with legislation on credit abuse that will effectively restrict the latitude allowed income tax discounters, as was adopted by the Manitoba legislature and more recently the British Columbia legislature?

MR. HARLE: There is no present intention, Mr. Speaker, to make any change to The Credit and Loan Agreements Act.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In light of the expression by the Ontario Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations that provincial attempts to control tax discount operators might be unconstitutional, is it the minister's intention to make formal representation to the federal government on this matter?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, there has of course been some contact by all provinces in the meetings consumer affairs ministers have had in relation to tax discounters, especially the western ministers. At this time I see no change in that position.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question. What measures has the minister undertaken to monitor the practice of nation-wide tax discount operations which have chosen Alberta as the haven of their head offices?

MR. HARLE: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure the member is well aware, amendments were made to The Credit and Loan Agreements Act last year which permitted a registration of tax discounters. This is the first spring that that legislation can operate. At the present time we are carrying out the necessary auditing that that legislation permits.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. I was wondering if he could answer if any groups, such as CN Credit Union or groups from the university, have made representation to him for funding for the service they are currently offering the public.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, as I believe I indicated on an earlier occasion I'm not aware of anything specifically. However, I do know Student Legal Services would like to have the assistance of people who are qualified to help them with the preparation of tax returns.

Income Tax Revenue

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer. Has he had an opportunity to look at the federal budget, especially from the standpoint of any effect it will have on provincial revenue in the area of income tax? Will there be a reduction in income tax coming to the province of Alberta as a result of any changes in the federal budget?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, we haven't yet had the opportunity of doing a detailed review. But I anticipate a reduction in provincial income tax revenues as a result of some reductions in federal income tax levels, because they are based on federal income tax. The preliminary indications are that it would be in the \$15 million range.

Fort McMurray Finances

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. It pertains to concerns expressed recently by the chairman of the town board of Fort McMurray concerning taxes in that community. Has the minister made any effort to meet with Mr. Knight or with the Commissioner of the Northeast Alberta Region to discuss these particular concerns, beyond the announcement made in the budget for some additional assistance?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I meet on an ongoing basis with the Commissioner of the northeast area. Last week we met and discussed several items of concern with respect to Fort McMurray. I have not

had any direct requests for a meeting on budgetary items for the town of Fort McMurray. As the hon. member knows, the budget of any new town is processed through the Local Authorities Board. Should there be any need for my advice or for me to look at the budgetary items, of course I would be requested to do so.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of Fort McMurray's unique circumstances, has any consideration been given to establishing a formula whereby the province would pick up most or all the tax burden above an established limit?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, perhaps during consideration of the estimates for Municipal Affairs we could look at some of the innovative programs we have developed for the town of Fort McMurray.

Check Stop Program

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the hon. Solicitor General. It deals with the apparent lack of enthusiasm for the Check Stop program, especially in Edmonton. I'd like to know if the minister has had any recent consultations with either the Edmonton police chief or the traffic inspector about the Check Stop program.

MR. FARRAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to say that the Edmonton city police has assigned a special squad to this type of project, and the number of check stops conducted by the Edmonton city police in the last two to three months has increased considerably.

Fish and Wildlife Officers

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife and ask if he's had a meeting with the Fish & Wildlife Officers' Association. The request for such a meeting followed a meeting they had some time ago.

MR. ADAIR: Yes I have, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK: Is the minister in a position to indicate what policy changes or what changes the minister has made as a result of that meeting?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, a number of points were discussed with the members of the officers' association and members of the fish and wildlife officers' division. I'm not prepared to discuss those at this particular time. I did discuss them openly and frankly with them. We had a good meeting, and we'll be having possibly one or two more meetings.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the minister not being prepared to indicate the results of the meeting, is the minister in a position to indicate to the House why he didn't take steps a year ago when he held a similar meeting?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is clearly inviting or inciting to debate.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then we'll put the question to the minister this way. Is the minister in a position to indicate to the House if he had a meeting with the president of the Fish & Wildlife Officers' Association a year ago? At that time did the president express many of the same concerns expressed to the minister in his recent meeting?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, the meeting I had with the president of the association a year ago dealt with a request for handguns. Strictly speaking, that was all we spoke of at that particular time. This meeting we had just recently with some 17 members of the division, association, and officers covered a broad number of points from as far back as 20 years ago. It was certainly a very good meeting, a very open meeting, and a very frank meeting. If anything, there was possibly what one might consider a lack of some communication between the field and the staff, and we'll certainly rectify that.

Butter Subsidy

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether the increased subsidy for butter producers announced recently by the federal government will have an influence on butter producers in Alberta? And what . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is really not relating the question to any official duties of the minister. He's asking, in effect, to have some research done in the question period it would appear.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, maybe I could reframe that question? I'm not sure I can.

Regarding the increased subsidy announced by the federal government, will there be increased or decreased production of butter by the producers, and will this have an effect on the price of butter for consumers?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect and also regret, the hon. member is asking for an expression of opinion, which is beyond the scope of the question period.

DR. PAPROSKI: The final try, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would indicate whether he has information that there is going to be a subsidy from the federal government for butter producers in the province of Alberta.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, earlier today in the House of Commons in Ottawa the federal Minister of Agriculture announced a new dairy policy for Canada for the fiscal year beginning April 1, 1977. I have not yet had an opportunity to review that policy in full, except to say that at least one area of that policy announced by the federal minister is undoubtedly provincial jurisdiction.

Pheasant Population

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. Does the minister have any statistics to determine the

extent of death loss in pheasants in southern Alberta in the storm a week ago?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, no. I have a preliminary report that the loss is not as great as we had anticipated. I'm hoping to have a further update by Wednesday.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware of any studies that have been carried out that would indicate whether the pheasant population is increasing or decreasing since prohibition of hunting hen pheasants?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any studies done specifically on that.

Propane Prices

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, on Friday I was asked a question I didn't know the complete answer to. I now wish to give that to the House.

I was asked by the Member for Lacombe about the hearings scheduled by the Public Utilities Board with respect to propane prices. I've secured that information and can report that there will be a public prehearing conference in Calgary on April 18, then a public hearing on that subject by the Public Utilities Board in Edmonton on May 2.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Lloydminster revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Legislature, 30 students from Lloydminster junior high school. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Isaak and their bus driver Mr. Latimer. I hope they are seated in the members gallery by now, and I ask that they stand and be recognized.

MR. SPEAKER: It appears that on Friday, as I was dealing with the matter of emergency debate, I may have given the impression that because of the temporary standing order which provides for the designation of a motion for Thursday afternoon by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that temporary standing order would abrogate the effect of Standing Order 29, which provides for emergency debate. That wasn't the intention at all.

I think all hon. members are aware that the hon. Leader of the Opposition uses his prerogative under the temporary standing order not only for the members of his own caucus but also for the benefit of the other non-government members of the Assembly. Since the Assembly saw fit to adopt the special standing order and leave Standing Order 29 in place, I would think there was no intention to have the

temporary standing order limit the scope of Standing Order 29 with regard to emergency debate.

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: Were there any further questions to the hon. minister?
If not, Mr. Minister.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman and hon. members of the Assembly, I should like to acknowledge with real thanks the excellent, perceptive, and serious debate on the significant matter of foreign fees that we had here on Friday afternoon. It was acknowledged in this Assembly on Friday, and in other forms throughout Alberta, that Albertans for the most part not only support an additional fee for foreign students but indeed feel strongly that that should be the case.

While some people, mostly in our institutions of higher education and mostly in the universities, read all kinds of motives into the position I have taken, all I am attempting to do is simply to provide financial benefit to Canadian and Albertan students by subsidizing them more than foreign students, keeping in mind that both groups will continue to be heavily subsidized by Canadian and Albertan taxpayers.

I feel strongly, Mr. Chairman, that a differential fee is a reasonable and realistic step to take to recognize several generations of taxes that have gone into place to build the institutions we now have. On a per 1,000 people basis in Canada, Alberta has more places for advanced education and it supplies more money per student in advanced education than any other province in Canada.

In addition, the value system our forefathers placed on higher education is significant to mention. Had they not pursued this value they had for higher education and placed it in practice through the institutions we now have, we would have neither the numbers of institutions or numbers of places, nor the diversity of institutions, nor the quality, which is the highest.

There are those who remind me that universities are universal institutions and so all should have equal access to them. But the argument breaks down, Mr. Chairman, on what universality really means.

Universality really means scholarship, the reason for a university's existence. The whole universe is a source of things to know, to find out, to prove, and to disprove. The accumulation of knowledge, its extension, its sharing, its storage for future use: this is universal. The research that is the essence of a university is universal. That is the meaning of universality. The university's role as a critic of the larger society and of itself is universal. That's how we define the work of a university. In this sense the university has neither limits nor boundaries. It is in the notion of scholarship that the university is

universal.

The point with respect to foreign fees, though, is that the cost of university education is not met universally. It is met by the taxpayers of Canada and Alberta. The additional fee by foreign students will in fact make access somewhat more equal.

Mr. Chairman, there are those who tell me there are not yet enough foreign students to make it reasonable or sensible to apply the foreign fee. What am I to make from counsel that says in the first instance there ought not to be foreign fees at all, but in the second instance says if there were more of them, if there were enough of them, it would make some sort of sense. What is one to make of that kind of counsel? Is it not better, Mr. Chairman and members of the Assembly, to put in place something we believe we ought to, when there are a few students, rather than when there are many, so that they know in advance what the rules of the game are, what the costs are going to be on the long term.

In response to an hon. member who cited figures with respect to foreign professors, and talked about averages from 45 to 55 per cent in Canadian and Albertan universities as being disproportionate, I agree. Clearly the corrective measures that might have been taken, that should have been taken, were not taken at the appropriate time. Using that as an analogy, it seems to me it's incredibly fair to do this early rather than when there would be very many foreign students on our campuses.

I recall — and it's important to do so — that we have made this as fair and reasonable as we could. Only first-time entries into our universities, colleges, and provincially administered institutions will pay the extra fee. Those now in place will go through the system without having to pay that fee. How can a new policy more fairly be put in place?

I have been lectured time and again, Mr. Chairman, that I will be responsible for a reduced number of foreign students on the campuses of Alberta. The evidence is irrefutable that in those countries, states, or provinces where foreign fees have been put in place, there is no reduction whatsoever in foreign students. This is a matter of record, not an opinion. So, for the record, no reduction whatsoever.

It makes sense, Mr. Chairman, because the big expense for a foreign student is the flight over. Go to an air line counter and find out what it costs to fly from Africa, Hong Kong, the deep south or east of the United States, or the United Kingdom. That's the big cost. When the students come to Canada, they share exactly the same costs as our students: books, registration fees, board, room, transportation. As one hon. member in support of my position — though sitting across the House — said: isn't too much being made of the notion of foreign fees? I submit that it is. But we live in the kind of country in which whatever case needs to be made, can be made. That too is a mark and a stroke for democracy.

I spoke some time ago with an ambassador from an African state, and I want to relate this little story. It so happened I was hosting, on behalf of the government, an ambassador who was leaving after five years of office in Canada. He was making his way from the maritimes to British Columbia, and on to Africa. As we spoke before lunch and at noon of other things and other places, I knew and he knew we were both thinking about the same thing: foreign

fees. He mentioned he had met African students at the University of Alberta in the forenoon. So I thought I would be fair and broach the matter. I said, Your Excellency, you know we have put in place for the fall of this year a set of fees that will cost your students more money. Frankly, honestly, what do you think? He said, it is fair, it is reasonable, it is the proper thing to do. He smiled and laughed and said, just don't overdo it. But he said, do it. It's fair and it's reasonable.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Assembly, we are speaking about a very, very serious matter. It's important to quote the ambassador further. He said two things: that so long as students from his country can come to other countries, notably Alberta, for what he called token costs, as far as fees are concerned, token costs — at that time they were \$400; since then they've increased to \$500 — they will keep coming and, secondly, they will never build or have cause to build or be pushed to build more and diversified institutions of advanced learning in their own country. It is simply not historically nor currently true that all third world countries cannot build more institutions, would not build more institutions. But as he pointed out, it's not something we have to do.

On the basis of this discussion with this ambassador — and I spoke to two or three others — and other conversations I've had, I can stand in my place in the House and say to those who tell me our reputation abroad is going to be hurt or smudged, as one critic said recently, that that is simply not the case. It is simply not true.

Those who confuse foreign fees with foreign aid simply do not understand the difference between federal responsibility with respect to foreign aid and provincial responsibility with respect to foreign fees. Mr. Chairman, there is a difference. My colleague the hon. Minister of Culture can tell you the significant amount of money this government has chosen to put in place on behalf of its people, alongside money other groups and individuals put together for foreign aid, which is usually but not always matched three ways by our federal government. So we are involved in foreign aid. But I want to make it clear that foreign fees have nothing to do with foreign aid. Some of the members in the House who pride themselves on knowing constitutional relationships had better read some of the chapters over again.

Mr. Chairman, many claim that autonomy is at the heart of the issue. This has been championed by two members across the floor and many people outside the House. As I travelled hundreds and hundreds of miles on this issue, wrote hundreds and hundreds of words, and said them over the telephones — and I should; it goes with my job and I found it very interesting — how many times have I heard that the act says the board of governors shall set the fees. But, Mr. Chairman, that is not at all what the act says. It says that the board is to "determine, subject to the approval of the Minister, fees for instruction and determine such other fees as the board considers necessary." The board is to "determine, subject to the approval of the Minister, fees for instruction . . ." That becomes a totally different matter. The setting of fees is clearly a joint responsibility of the institutions and the minister.

In a publicly supported institution, Mr. Chairman, there is no such thing as absolute autonomy. Surely

it's not by incredible and unusual coincidence that fees at all universities are the same. Surely it's not by unusual coincidence that fees at all colleges are the same. It's clear that the institutions and the government, through the then Department of Education and the now Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, have worked together to agree on a set of fees acceptable to both. Otherwise fees would be different from one university to another. So the notion of autonomy falls down on the proposition that it has traditionally and always been a shared responsibility. That's not the issue. The issue really is: who pays the cost of higher education?

Mr. Chairman, the spectre of racism remains to be dealt with. That it should have been raised is unfortunate, because it is not only untrue but known to be untrue by those who level the charge, and therefore mischievous and damaging to the public good.

Let me say I'm not generalizing. I know that some people genuinely believe this to be a racist thing. But those are few and far between. I say, and I believe, that most of those who say it's racist know it isn't. That makes it a very, very serious matter and damaging, as I say, to the public good. And disappointing, disappointing when people will say this because they're against what you are doing. When you run out of real reasons to argue and set aside the notion someone else proposes, you begin to grab. You grab at things like, it'll cost \$85,000 to administer. What a figure. Then you reach for something that really should not be reached for, and that's racism.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands was right when he said racism is the motivation of some people who support foreign fees. We have our share of racists and bigots. But the hon. member was also right when he said racism is not the motivation of most Albertans, and is absolutely not the motivation of the government, with respect to foreign fees.

One hon. member said it is best not to do anything to bring out the worst in people. I find that very interesting. He was shaken to find that some people are brutish and mean, to paraphrase the English philosopher Hobbes. These fees were not introduced to bring out the worst or the best in anybody. But if that is what happens, let it be in the open. The incidents in the Toronto transit system were not the result of Alberta student fees. Not even discrimination, much less racism, is the issue. The issue is, who pays for the cost of higher education?

People speak of the merits of foreign students on Canadian campuses. This has never been and is not now in question. The cultural and intellectual interchange among students and professors of many lands is part of what we know, part of what we expect, and part of what we accept a university to be. A fee differential will not inhibit or detract from the fundamental notion of what a university is. Neither will it reduce the number of foreign students, nor render them inarticulate. So the argument of cultural diversity will remain intact.

Institutions of higher education need to be sensitive to the larger environment. They are responsible to public policy. This policy will properly and fairly be served by additional fees for foreign students.

Mr. Chairman, the burden for foreign fees lies heavily upon the Alberta taxpayer. To recover more of this cost from foreign students, who for the most part will not return any of it in taxes, is fair and just.

As important, the subsidy to Canadian students will be greater — entirely a fair and just approach particularly, but not only, during periods of fiscal restraint. Above all and anything, our institutions must meet fully and completely responsibilities to domestic students whose parents and grandparents built them with their tax money. This in no way is prejudicial to the notion of international students on our campuses.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Assembly, we did not invent fees for foreign students, neither did we copy them. The additional fees for foreign students which will take effect in all institutions of higher learning in September 1977 are a policy position reflecting properly the fair and reasonable will of the people of Alberta.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make just three comments to the minister. First of all, Mr. Minister, I'd be very interested in what your plans are as far as the University of Alberta is concerned. Unless there's been a very recent change, the University of Alberta board of governors has chosen not to go along with the idea of a two-tier system. As I recall the legislation, it is true that fees are to be set subject to the approval of the minister.

But herein lies one of the real questions in what's taken place. I fail to understand why the minister didn't sit down with the universities, or at least the presidents or the chairmen of the boards or both, and discuss the whole question of foreign fees prior to making the announcement here in the Legislative Assembly, which was virtually last year during the estimates and during question period.

Now, what the minister says about autonomy is accurate. But the fact is that autonomy is a two-sided sword. The minister can't condemn the universities on one hand, then on the other hand make unilateral decisions when it comes to tuition fees, in this case the tuition fees for foreign students. I say to the minister very, very candidly that in this case, Mr. Minister, I believe you were neglecting your responsibility as far as sitting down with the universities . . .

DR. HOHOL: You'll be sorry you said it.

MR. CLARK: That won't be the first time. But there are occasions when one has to say pretty frankly what one thinks. I say once again that I believe if the minister is serious about working with the universities, and serious in what he says as far as autonomy is concerned, he would have been wise to sit down with the responsible people at the universities and colleges prior to making the announcement here in the Assembly.

The second point I'd like to make is this question of who pays? There's no question that the amount of additional revenue from the foreign students' additional fees isn't going to be substantive at all. I'd like to ask the minister if he has a projection as to the amount of additional revenue the fee will bring in. What percentage will that be of, let's say, the appropriation we're being asked to vote on before very long, when we get to the University of Alberta? What percentage, what kind of ballpark figures are we looking at? That's really the second point I'd like to make.

The third and last point is a very specific question to the minister. Mr. Minister, if my figures are accurate, during the last two to three years the

number of foreign students at the University of Alberta has declined. My question is: what was the motivating force behind the government making this decision? Was it fear that there were going to be ever-increasing numbers of foreign students? Does the government have some information they haven't shared with the Assembly as far as a large influx from other parts of the world is concerned? What percentage of the students in the province does the government think is reasonable? Are we about where we should be now as far as non-Canadian students in our postsecondary educational system are concerned? What kind of figure does this government consider reasonable?

I'd just conclude my remarks by saying it's obvious from what the minister said today that the government isn't prepared to back off from this position. In light of that, I think it's incumbent upon the minister to give us some indication of why there was no consultation, and what the government feels is a reasonable mix, if I can use that term. And how much money — what portion of the budget of the University of Alberta, for example — will come from foreign students' fees?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, on the matter of consultation I would simply say I wish I'd kept a log book of the hundreds of miles — likely several thousand — I travelled in Alberta, talking to individuals, groups, senates, boards of governors, and faculty associations. Anybody and everybody who asked for a meeting was not denied.

I laid out the proposition in positive terms, Mr. Chairman, in exactly the same way as I did the draft adult education act, and then kept silent. As the evidence came in on the draft act, we withdrew it because the evidence was that we should. Had the evidence come down that we should withdraw from this position, we would have. But the evidence did not stand up, so the fee stayed in place.

So consultation — in over five and a half years in office, Mr. Chairman, I have not spoken, written, talked, travelled as much on any other issue, likely on all other issues, as I have on this one. That's why I said the hon. leader will be sorry, because what I'm telling you is a fact. So you simply didn't know. I forgive you for not knowing. How could you? You were busy doing other things.

As far as the amount of money is concerned, Mr. Chairman, it could have been more. But I understood all the institutions to say that once we finally made up our minds — and I use that in the positive term because of consultation that went on for nearly a year — they would accept it. But until that time they would disagree on principle, though that principle was never clearly defined.

So the amount of money is not going to be very much initially, not till all the students going through the system have gone through the system and all the foreign students are in for the first time.

MR. CLARK: How much this year?

DR. HOHOL: I don't know. The universities and colleges will know by counting the number of foreign students and applying the \$300 or whatever the case may be. It could have been more. We initially spoke of all foreign students, and I had in mind a good deal

more than \$300. But in the spirit of give and take and trying to compromise in a positive way, we came in on first-time students, and only \$300. It could have been more, and it could have been for all the students.

As far as why, I have repeated it over and over and over, I'll do it once more. The issue is: who pays for the cost of education? Now if that concept is difficult to understand, I can't make it any clearer. For years Albertan and Canadian taxpayers have exercised their value judgment with respect to postsecondary education. As our grandparents hacked trees, carried water, built the railroads, dug the mines, and did all the things they did, they said: we don't want this for our children, we want a university education, a college education. If they hadn't done that, we wouldn't be here today arguing. We'd be here, but we wouldn't be arguing this issue because those institutions wouldn't be there.

As far as how many foreign students would be right, what the mix should be: it's a good question, a proper question. That question and many others will be addressed by the committee of significant Albertans I will name later in the fall to look at all the costs of education that all students have to meet at whatever institution they qualify for and choose to take their education in.

MR. CLARK: The minister did a beautiful skating job. The question I put to the minister first of all is about consultation before the decision was made. I know the minister has gone across the province. If I may be so frank, he's there to get out and meet the various constituent groups. As I said Friday in my remarks, in fairness I think he has done a reasonably good job of that. But, Mr. Minister, the question to you is: what kind of consultation did you have before you made the announcement? That's the question.

DR. HOHOL: It doesn't matter.

MR. CLARK: None, is that right?

DR. HOHOL: Pardon?

MR. CLARK: There was none, right?

DR. HOHOL: Well, your question simply begs the point.

MR. CLARK: No it doesn't.

DR. HOHOL: Whether I begin by placing a proposition before all Albertans and then ask all Albertans, not just the universities, I respect the concern of all the institutions of higher learning on this matter. I respect it, and I read it. And I talked hundreds of thousands of words and listened to the same number or more, because I usually met alone with five, six, 10, 20, or 100, putting out the proposition in a positive way that this is the statute, the draft act that will go forward. This is the fee that will go forward. Then the onus is on all Albertans, including the institutions, to make the case for or against. In the case of the draft act, the case was made against it. In the case of foreign fees, the case was not made and the consultation before or after, with respect, Mr. Chairman, is purely academic.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the question of consultation before or after being purely academic, the next time the minister or one of his colleagues gets up and rants and raves in this Assembly about the federal government saying they're going to do something and then coming along and crying about no consultation after, I suppose we should read back to him his assessment of consultation.

DR. HOHOL: That's not the same thing at all.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Chairman, I'll try to make my points very brief today. They may be repetitive, inasmuch as I'm not sure of all the points raised Friday. But I would like to have the minister perhaps cover or take into consideration approximately four points I would like to put forward.

One is in the area of the mandate the colleges and universities have. In my discussions with various representatives from the colleges, they seem to be unclear at this point as to the mandate for public colleges as well as universities. I'm not sure whether the unclearness is simply in the minds of the college boards and representatives, or whether it's a matter now being discussed that is to be more fully outlined in detail. Perhaps the minister may wish to make some comment with respect to that matter.

Recently there have been some suggestions or pressures coming forward that in the very near future we are going to need a fourth university in the northern Alberta area. I'm not sure whether the hon. minister has had representations to date on this matter. He may have. I have some concern if we are beginning to receive pressure for a fourth university when it would appear the universities of Lethbridge and perhaps Calgary do not have their full enrolment capacity, or to the extent it is reasonable to have before one contemplates the development of another institution. Perhaps the minister could bring us up to date on the expansion or the role Athabasca University is currently playing in providing its courses, and the breadth of courses for students across this province. I'm not sure whether they have now extended the number of courses available and whether the mandate assigned to Athabasca University has been broadened.

The commission on Canadian studies, I believe, raised the matter of tenure of professorship in universities. This subject has been under consideration from time to time over the past number of years, although never having come to grips and having a final decision made. I think it is time to review the cost of education, the personnel, the staffing in our faculties, and whether the matter of tenure at universities allows for the kind of constant competence and capability in staffing to be put in place at our universities and whether that allows for a balance of both Canadian and foreign professorship.

Perhaps the minister could touch on another issue that has been dealt with more recently: that is, the request for a school of optometry in western Canada, preferably at the University of Alberta. I know there seems to be some discrepancy in the need or the expansion required at this time, or whether the places Alberta has purchased at the Ontario universities are adequate and will meet the need for trained people in this particular profession. Has the minister made available any statistics as to the number of

people in this and related professions that provide for the examination and care of eyes, and whether in fact the school of optometry should be put in place in the near future, bearing in mind that it does take a number of years to develop such a program? I believe we have perhaps four years left in our agreement with the University of Western Ontario.

In addition to those remarks, I would just like to make a comment. It was my understanding — and perhaps the minister could correct this — and I believe the majority of the citizens in my constituency understand, that the appointment of the board of governors for postsecondary institutions is for the purpose representing the interest of the public and to be sure the cost and the services being provided at these institutions are in the interest and constantly reflect the need of our society in Alberta and Canada. It would seem to me that somewhere recently some of the expressions or public positions taken by some members of the boards of governors hardly reflect the interest of the public of Alberta and Canada. I wonder whether the hon. minister is finding some difficulty rationalizing their positions with their appointments to represent the public interest.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. HOHOL: Briefly, Mr. Chairman, I don't think there's any question about colleges or universities being clear on their mandates. I try to understand it as well as I can, and I don't think there's any argument between them and government, through my department and me, on the basis of mandates. Sometimes there are problems with respect to things like transfer, accreditation, other matters, but not really with respect to mandates.

With respect to a fourth university, we are watching figures very, very closely. It would be my view at this time that we're not looking to a fourth conventional university. Athabasca University will not materially affect whether we have a fourth university of a conventional kind, because its mandate is to deal with individuals in remote areas in particular who have missed out or in some way want additional education that can be obtained through the media Athabasca University employs: the use of cassettes, paper, mail work, telephoning, visits, working with other colleges like Lakeland College, Fairview, and so on. I recall that Athabasca U. obtained its permanent mandate about a year and a half ago, and is certainly looking to a solid and rather exciting kind of career as an institution. I think it is going to materially affect the capacity of people in remote places to improve, increase, and obtain education.

With respect to a school of optometry, we have done a great deal of work in this area and will continue. We have files of material. Any hon. member is welcome to examine it and get copies of it. It is correct that we have four years left on our agreement with the University of Waterloo. It has been put to us by the optometry association in Alberta that we should now have a faculty or school of optometry. We as a department are not ready to recommend one way or another. It will not be for a while. But we're not turning our backs on the problem either; we're working at it, and working hard.

With respect to boards of governors, their job — without reading the act — is to manage the other than academic affairs of the university. That is the

realm of academe. That's where the real autonomy is: how someone provides the scholarship he has, how he shares it with his students, and so on. Even though the boards and I have a fundamental difference on the matter of foreign fees, I would be very surprised if they said our relation as minister and boards is not healthy and in good shape. I'm so close to the forest that I may miss a tree or two, but I think that making a public statement of this kind will permit the boards to respond one way or another. I'm quite sure it would be positive.

Thank you for the questions.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, let me start by saying I'm reassured by the minister's last answer. Even though he's close to the forest and may miss a tree or two, he's making the appropriate answer to the question posed by the Member for Edmonton Norwood. I was quite frankly rather startled to hear the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood raise a question — a perfectly proper question; I'm not suggesting it's improper — but I was startled that it was raised. Because the suggestion is made that if one somehow disagrees with the minister on this important question, the reflection of public opinion may not be accurately portrayed at the board level. If that's an inaccurate assessment of what the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood said, she'll no doubt correct me.

I would hate to see it happen with any government that the day would ever come — when boards of governors have a fundamental difference over policy with a minister, I think they have a right to tell you literally where to go, Mr. Minister, and to do so publicly. I think the government has to be big enough to live with that and not try to make changes in the composition of the board of governors. I think that would be true of the minister and has to be true of the Legislature if in fact the board of governors and the people on the board are to have the necessary standing to properly fulfil their functions.

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with three or four points. I don't want to belabor the question of the two-tier system. I remain as adamantly opposed to it as I was before the minister gave his response today. I suppose we could carry on the debate here for another two or three hours and it wouldn't alter the final result of the vote.

There are several points I want to make, however. The minister suggested that in a meeting with an ambassador from one of the African countries the ambassador had suggested a two-tier system was reasonable. That may be the opinion of that particular ambassador, and it even mean that country has no objection. I suggest it may also imply another thing: ambassadors are diplomats. One of the most important parts of diplomacy is always to make your host feel he's a great guy.

MR. CLARK: He did in this case.

MR. NOTLEY: I'm not suggesting the hon. minister was taken in. I'm just saying that in dealing with the issue I remain from Missouri. I'm afraid the hon. minister is going to have to show me more than one particular interchange with an ambassador before I'll be convinced a two-tier system . . .

DR. HOHOL: They may be statesmen, but they're not liars.

MR. NOTLEY: I beg your pardon?

DR. HOHOL: They may be statesmen, but they're not liars.

MR. NOTLEY: I think a former secretary of state in the United States once said that the price of a consistent foreign policy would be that the secretary of state would be hung for treason. I'm sure we all know that in diplomacy one can go either way.

Mr. Chairman, I want to move from that point to probably the strongest argument the minister presented, and basically the one I think the case for the defence rests on; that is: who will pay? I suppose it's a case of drawing a balance. It seems to me that there may be some argument if you put the case on the grounds of who will pay. I wouldn't accept this. I oppose that argument. But there may be some argument for saying, all right, why a difference of only \$300? Why not a difference of whatever it costs? If you say, who should pay, if you're going to use the argument that Alberta taxpayers are now paying 90 per cent of the costs for all students, then it seems to me you have to use a corollary of that. If you come from England or Ghana or the United States, you have to pay the full share of the freight: not \$300 more, but whatever that difference may be. And yet, members of the committee and Mr. Minister, you're not doing that. You've worked out what seems to me a rather niggling compromise: a slight increase, a \$300 increase, which is going to create all the concerns the opponents of the two-tier system raise — and I share those concerns, and support them in those concerns — but which at the same time doesn't meet the basic objective of your central argument, which is who is going to pay. I raise that because it seems to me that when the minister concludes discussion on this matter, he might outline more fully how he arrived at the particular compromise of \$300.

I raise this not just to be argumentative, Mr. Minister. But in the course of your remarks you said, look, we have a small number of students at this point in time. Better to phase in the two-tier system now, so that students know what they're in for. Well, are they in for a \$300 increase or is this just the thin edge of the wedge? Is it the objective of the government over the next five or 10 years to move to a full sharing of the actual costs of that space in the form of fees for the student from another country? I think that's something in terms of policy that we ought to know as well.

Mr. Chairman, the other point I would raise as a question to the minister is: what is the game plan with the University of Alberta if the board of governors says no. The minister says, all right, it's a shared responsibility. We realize it's a shared responsibility. What happens if the board of governors continues to say no? Are we going to be looking at legislation? Will we be looking at retroactive legislation in the fall? Obviously there won't be any legislation this spring. Will there be retroactive legislation in the fall that will in fact make changes so the government's policy becomes the fee structure at the University of Alberta?

The point I would like to conclude on, Mr. Chair-

man, is to have the minister expand a little on the committee of prominent Albertans he cited both during the question period several times this session and a moment ago, the committee on the future role of postsecondary institutions, financing, the student assistance program, and what have you.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, we can debate this *ad infinitum*. I still believe we have the resources, the wealth, and really the space at the University of Alberta not to move in the direction of a two-tier system. The day may come — if 25 or 30 per cent of our students were from other countries — when we have to look at some kind of measures. But I submit even here, Mr. Minister, an outright quota system would be a better approach than a differential fee structure. I have yet to see the argument for a differential fee structure being fair.

I just revert to the whole debate over foreign university professors. It seems to me you can argue quotas on whether you have foreign university professors, but I don't think you use pocket-book rationing. I don't think you pay them half as much because they come from another country, to carry through the logic of the two-tier system. I just think that's the wrong approach to take, if we get ourselves to that point where it is a very serious problem. But with 5.8 per cent, if anything I think we should be bringing in more people so we can reach that objective of the cosmopolitan university, which is basically what our universities should strive to achieve.

MRS. CHICHAK: I just wish to make one point, Mr. Chairman. There is no way I am going to let the Member for Spirit River-Fairview get away with his interpretation of my reference to the board of governors, because there wasn't anything of that kind in my words. My words were that I felt the board of governors was not reflecting the interest of the greater public that pays the bill. That was simply the comment I was making. There was no mention as to the relationship between the board of governors and the minister, or any other interpretation the hon. member wishes to put. So let's leave that to rest.

DR. HOHOL: The hon. member has a cute way of, you know, laying something not quite there, but the hint is left that maybe it might be like that. On Friday his comments about racism, I am sorry to say, were just a little bit like that.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview says that on the proposition of who pays for the cost of education the logical thing should be that the foreign students should pay the full cost of education in institutions of higher learning in Alberta. I ask him straight out: is he recommending that to me and to this government?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, absolutely not. I was just taking the argument of the minister. Absolutely not. [interjections] There's no question about that. In no way would I recommend that proposal. But the argument the minister put forward was simply: who will pay? That was the basic argument of the minister. And I said, if we are going to take the logic of that. . . . But I don't accept the logic of that position. I think I've made that point clear, and I make it clear again. I would certainly not recommend that. My recommendation to the government of Alberta, Mr.

Minister, is very simple: abandon the two-tier system. That is my recommendation. [interjections]

DR. HOHOL: I find it strange, Mr. Chairman and hon. members of the Assembly, that the gentleman deals in logic and says the logical thing to do is this, and then he says don't do it. Do the opposite. [interjections] With that kind of help, you know . . . Thin edge of the wedge — that is what the gentleman was saying before the House came down, or not came down. [laughter] But before the session began — that this is the thin edge of the wedge, and in two or three years domestic students will pay the upper fee. I want to place on record — I guess we are not going on record — that that is simply not the case. That is just a very weak sort of argument. It may have happened somewhere else; I don't know. What will happen is that the fees will go up, but they will go up little by little in line with the costs of other things going up little by little, rather than staying dormant as they did for six or seven years and then going up 25 per cent. So that difference will always remain. The next time the general fees go up, that \$300 differential will be there.

As far as the committee is concerned, I repeat that its job will be to look at what it actually costs students to go to institutions of postsecondary education, whether provincially administered institutions, public colleges, or public universities. It will simply do with costs. What does it cost to go in this faculty, to that school? It will have to do with costs. It will include, but just as one of several items, the matter of foreign fees.

The quota system — certainly. I don't think it's either/or. We didn't invent the quota system either. It's now in vogue in certain faculties, and has been for years. If the hon. member is asking whether quotas will become a universal part of postsecondary education, I rather believe that will be the case. That will occur. But fees and quotas, you know, are not mutually exclusive. Both occur at the same time.

As far as the U of A is concerned, if we were in formal session I would properly say it's a hypothetical question. I assume the University of Alberta, like other institutions in advanced education, will implement the fees this fall and get on with lots of other things to do, like the question of tenure posed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, which is a difficult and complex matter taking the time of one university to no end. I'm not saying this unkindly, but there are other things to do. We have to implement this fee and get on with the job.

MR. ZANDER: Mr. Chairman, I have only two observations to make in reflecting on some of the statements the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview brought in last week — and he mentioned some of the percentage figures today. If I understood him correctly, he said 48 per cent of the professors in our universities today are from foreign countries, and only 5.8 per cent of the students in our institutions today are from foreign countries.

I know that not all of us come from very wealthy constituencies. We have a considerable number of people within our constituency who are below the means of quite a number of people who are more wealthy and more able to provide university education for their students. I wonder how many — if it

were possible to find out, and it would be interesting to note, Mr. Chairman — of these foreign students come from wealthy families, and how many do not. Many of us find in our constituencies that we cannot get students in who would get university entrance, but certain faculties are full so they cannot get in.

I have always considered the fact that it is easier to bring the teacher to the pupils than the pupils to the teacher. This is why I am considering the 48 per cent of our professors in the universities who are from foreign countries. I wonder if they could not provide a better service to their own countries if they returned and educated the pupils there. It is considered in business, in the logging industry and sawmill industry: it's easier to take the sawmill to the logs than the logs to the sawmill. It is much more expensive to do it the other way.

The other thing I want to say: I wonder how many Alberta students have to take out loans we are providing or who have to borrow on some other means to get an education, and how many students from foreign countries do not require a loan come to Alberta for their education. It would be very interesting to note. I wonder if the minister could give us that information, because certainly we cannot judge what types of students come from foreign countries. Do they come from wealthier families than most of us come from? That is the question.

I think the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has to admit there are families from his constituency, also from my constituency, who cannot afford to go to university. I believe in treating all people alike, but surely charity begins at home. If we as a province are so wealthy that we can provide education for foreign students, why don't we do it for our students at home first of all? I think we have to agree to that. If they can't do it, let's do it by loans. But let's give them an education. I think the hon. leader has students in his constituency who are very bright but cannot get into university because of lack of funds and lack of faculties. I think we have to be honest with ourselves and honest with our constituents, and not stand up and say we want everything to happen. I would like to see students from all parts of the world come and be educated. But my God, I have a lot of students in my constituency who financially are unable to go to a university. I think that point has to be noted, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NOTLEY: I just want to respond very briefly to the Member for Drayton Valley. Frankly I agree with some of the points he's made. When we take a look at the student assistance program, I think we should bear in mind the points he's made.

He did ask several specific questions. First of all, on the question of the kind of students that come from other countries — whether they come from wealthy backgrounds or not — it is very difficult to know for sure. They come from all backgrounds. Some are from wealthy families; some from relatively low- and middle-income families who band together to send a student overseas.

As to the quota faculties, I thought I'd just go over this again, Mr. Chairman, because I was able to get some fairly recent information. The number of foreign students in the quota faculties is really such a small percentage of the total as to be largely irrelevant. For example, in dentistry only one of 188

students is a foreign student; in engineering, 64 of 1,469 — that's about 3.5 per cent; in law, zero out of 484 — mind you, we'd probably be better off if we had more foreign students there, a good number more; medicine, 27 of 752; pharmacy, zero out of 386. So of the quota faculties, a very, very small percentage, much smaller than in the university as a whole.

Agreed to:

Ref. No. 1.0.1	\$129,920
Ref. No. 1.0.2	\$150,175
Ref. No. 1.0.3	\$4,401,535
Ref. No. 1.0.4	\$402,348
Vote 1 Total Program	\$5,083,978

Ref. No. 2.3

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, rather than wait until we get to 2.3, perhaps I might ask the minister if he can give us an up-to-date assessment with regard to this question of maximums at the University of Alberta, also where the government is as far as this master plan at the University of Alberta and the University of Calgary.

Perhaps the minister would also want to take the opportunity to fit in this advisory committee he referred to earlier in his remarks — I think he used the term "committee of significant Albertans". It would be interesting to know, in general terms, the terms of reference of this committee of significant Albertans, what areas in postsecondary education they'll be involved in. I understand it's a matter of looking at various specific areas.

Then, of course, I'd be less than fair if I didn't say to the minister that I'd like to know what progress he's making as far as a particular college in my own constituency is concerned — Olds College — especially with moving in the direction of a board of governors there.

DR. HOHOL: With respect to growth plans, Mr. Chairman, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows from his prior work in this House, that's an ongoing sort of thing. I said that generally speaking, the University of Alberta — and this is not a categorical statement, but a reasonably accurate one — has either reached or is rapidly reaching its maximum capacity with respect to growth. That is not the case with the University of Calgary, or at least it's less the case. Lethbridge is a long way from its total growth plan.

My department officials and I are currently involved with the institutions in a pretty thorough look at what these might be. And a period of restraint is a reasonable and effective time to do it. It has to be done in any case, but this is a particularly suitable time.

With respect to the committee, I want to make two things clear. One, I will not put the committee in place until the fees are implemented this fall. I want no misunderstanding about the function of the committee. It will not be solely to look at the notion and fact of foreign fees. It will be to look at all the costs students bear when they go to any institution of higher learning.

It's important to do it this way, because some

people fairly enough, some others surprisingly, believe the committee I'm talking about will look solely and only at the matter of foreign fees. That's not the case. And to make sure this is kept separate — the total cost, all the costs — the implementation of the fees in the fall, then the committee. Its sole reference will be to examine the costs of education and to recommend, as they might see fit, what these costs might be.

On the matter of provincially administered institutions and the possibility of some of them becoming public institutions, I said during the estimates last year that it is a predisposition I hold personally that there should be public involvement in institutions whose function today is not the function that might have been, or in fact was, many years ago. During this year we have done a great deal of work. I'm not in a position to go beyond the statement I now have made, other than to reaffirm my proposition that if any institution maintains its provincially administered status, it will be because we have examined its role, function, and the nature of its administration, and find it reasonable in these times. If we find it not to be reasonable, and of the kind that should have public participation and the views and direction of public people with respect to policy, then we will move that way. And after discussing it with those institutions, I would make a public announcement where it's properly made, Mr. Chairman, on the floor of this Legislature.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just following that along, might I ask the minister very specifically: does the government have under active consideration right now the question of governance of NAIT and SAIT, also the question of the maximum sizes of NAIT and SAIT?

DR. HOHOL: I could say yes, yes, and sit down. But that wouldn't be entirely fair. Yes, the government has had, has, and will have under consideration the notion of public participation in the governance of the two institutes. Certainly I, personally, and the government and the department are concerned with the maximum size, as are the institutions themselves. Again, apart from some additions here or some expansion there or some levelling off somewhere else, or some service function, I would view those two institutions as being very close to their maximum capacity. Any bigger and I'd have some doubts. And I shouldn't be in a position of doubt about the capacity of the institution to deal effectively with the individual.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just following the minister's comment. The reason I raise this is that it seems to me that if the government is thinking seriously of some additional facilities in Edmonton or north of Edmonton — and frankly I hope they are — I know not all members in the House will agree with me on this. Before long that pipeline, in one form or another, is going to come down from the north. In all likelihood it's going to come through Alberta. I wouldn't want to be in my place in the Assembly two or three or four years from now and say to the minister: Mr. Minister, it was four years ago that we said, get going.

I think now is the time to make some very difficult

but very timely decisions as far as knowing the governance of NAIT and SAIT is concerned, also whether NAIT almost doubles in size again or at least grows by half of what it is today. Frankly I would not want to see that happen.

It would seem to me far wiser to make a decision on some other institution, an institution that hopefully would have the same very high standing in the community that NAIT has. But I think it's incumbent upon us to have the training potential available, rather than have to scramble to catch up in a period of time. This becomes very important too, because we're now talking in terms of a third tar sands plant in the province. That has some specific implications for Fort McMurray, but it also has some very definite implications as far as Edmonton is concerned from the training point of view. When we talk in terms of petrochemical development in the province, certainly NAIT isn't going to have to carry all that responsibility. But it will likely carry at least as much responsibility as any government educational institution. That's why I take the opportunity to say that now isn't the time for us to procrastinate as far as decisions on the eventual size of NAIT and SAIT — especially NAIT — are concerned. If we feel the facility is big enough now, then what kinds of alternatives and when can we expect some kind of decisions to be made so we've got the places in effect?

Alberta was very fortunate a number of years ago when those institutions came into effect that in fact we didn't have the kind of advanced planning we have the opportunity to have now. We may not be so fortunate as far as the institutions are concerned. That's why I ask the minister the question. I'd like the minister to elaborate somewhat.

DR. HOHOL: I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, that I agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition. We are doing those things. We are studying. We are taking that hard look at NAIT and SAIT, and alternatives — places like Keyano College are doing certain things, Fairview, Lakeland, some of the Alberta vocational centres.

The notion of size is important, because these other places will not pick up the difference the hon. Leader of the Opposition is talking about. I agree with him that in years to come — and in not many years — there will be an additional need for a vast number of students who will seek trade training. Because unlike in other years in Alberta, there's clearly a future in the trades.

So some options and alternatives will have to be looked at. We're doing that now. It would be improper for me to prognosticate as to when I might be able to be definitive. But I do agree and the agreement is derived from the fact that we are doing the things the hon. Leader of the Opposition is talking about. In due course we will be able to report on our positions.

But I want to stress again that in the admitted knowledge NAIT and SAIT are about as big as they ought to be, it clearly follows that we have to look to alternatives and options.

MR. KIDD: My information, and I believe it to be correct, indicates that our Ph.D. graduates — and from a parochial point of view in my own interest maybe, our M.Sc. and our M.Eng. graduates — peaked about 1972. Ph.Ds have declined considera-

bly since then. But the Master of Science graduates and the Master of Engineering graduates have declined appreciably. I wonder if the minister could make any general, perhaps even philosophical, comments on the reasons for that.

DR. HOHOL: I think the reason is a generalized one, and that's the clear incapacity of Canadian institutions of higher education to hire graduates of Canadian universities mostly Ph.Ds but in some areas Masters also at the level of advanced learning. I would ask for the help of the Assembly if they're familiar with more precise reasoning. As far as I can say, it's because the market for them simply isn't there. And if the market isn't there for a particular occupation in the long term, the enrolments simply drop off and they increase elsewhere, where the long-term occupational capacity appears to be.

MR. APPLEBY: In this particular vote, Mr. Chairman, we are looking at a number of community college institutions — Grant MacEwan, Keyano, Lakeland, and so on — that in recent years have seen a very rapid escalation in the type of programs being offered and also a great increase in the popularity among our province's high school graduates of attending such institutions, which have a much more practical type of background in what they're offering. I think this probably is the reason for the popularity, because a lot of students are looking for something where they're going to be assured employment when they graduate rather than having a piece of parchment they don't know what to do with.

However, I would be interested in hearing the minister comment on the future of Athabasca University. Because I think we're all aware that originally the plan for Athabasca University was to develop a massive campus on a grandiose scale, right on the outskirts of the city of Edmonton, near a present major university. Over the last few years this concept has changed considerably and the types of program now being offered are of a more flexible nature using home study, electronic media, and various other means of bringing education to people without having them in a formalized, campus situation. However, I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the minister might tell us if they have definitely decided on a future program for this university, in the way of goals and objectives; and perhaps what the future may hold in the way of a permanent location for its headquarters, if this type of instruction — which personally I support and think is a very good concept — is to be continued. I wonder just what the future holds for Athabasca University.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, Athabasca University obtained its permanent mandate about a year and a half ago. Before that, it was a pilot project attempting to examine the notion of a delivery system of education to individuals and groups at other institutions in more remote areas of Alberta. The project was successful.

If I may back up for just a moment: when we came into office we found the circumstance the hon. Member for Athabasca described to be out of the times, if one might put it that way. Examination of the numbers of students about to enter university led us to the proposition that the university would be empty for the most part if we proceeded with the

conventional institution plans, in place when we came into office. At the same time we did not want to abandon the university, and spoke of the research or project notion.

It has been successful. For Athabasca we see a very promising future. We have a staff that has been carefully selected for the peculiar kind of work Athabasca has to do. In addition to the flexible programming in three areas, three more are being put in place. We have talked to Athabasca University to think also in the long term about a significant area of research; and that is, how do individual people learn? How do you teach individuals who are middle-aged, younger or older, in some remote place in Alberta? What is the psychology of teaching and learning in a circumstance like this? Most of our research is more in the mode of a person and a number of people in a room or in an auditorium. The notion that is Athabasca U. is not new. This is a concept that Britain and other countries have used for years. But in addition to the program work with ACCESS, with other colleges in remote areas, we have asked them to look at the nature of how people learn alone in contrast to how they learn in groups.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. My question relates to a matter I raised before in this Assembly which I regard to be of prime importance to students in our institutions, at colleges and universities in this province. I wonder if the minister could comment on the functioning and operation of the Council on Admissions and Transfers: how it is presently functioning in the province, how he views the success of the operation to date, whether he expects it will continue to operate in the future, and what changes, if any, might be necessary in his opinion.

DR. HOHOL: The Council on Admissions and Transfer embarked on a very difficult and sensitive area of work in postsecondary education. That's the tough and important problem of transferability, the notion that credits taken at one institution are known in advance to be transferable and acceptable to another institution. The universities and colleges have worked on this matter for many, many years with varying degrees of success.

The Council on Admissions and Transfer was put in place back in 1973 or 1974 to assist the institutions to do what they have to do in any case. It's a tough, difficult job. It's being done very well by Dr. Baker, the chairman, and the members of the council. Most of their work is based on the notion of their own scholarship and capacity to define and describe problems in the kind of way that reasonable people in colleges and universities would accept as the proper relationship between them on a particular subject or course of studies. They have issued two annual reports, one I tabled last year and one I am about to table this year. They have also issued a book which attempts to list those courses which are in the colleges and acceptable and transferable to the universities.

To say, Mr. Chairman, that all's well on the western front with respect to transferability and admission standards would be to mislead the House. This I have never done by intent, and hopefully not by accident. There are difficulties. It's a tough problem. We find that while things have improved, we still have prob-

lems where right within one institution, changing faculties may lose a youngster more credit than some people believe proper. We find that graduates of some of our institutions like NAIT and SAIT and some of the colleges can receive more credit at institutions in other parts of the country or in the United States. I'm not talking about C or B universities. I'm talking about prestigious, name universities.

So while the job is being done much better by both the council and the institutions, a great deal remains to be done.

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could comment briefly on the future role he sees for private colleges in the educational system in the province. As he is aware, I have one in my constituency. I wonder if he could relate his comments, in any sense, to the proportion of financial assistance provided to public as opposed to private colleges.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member said that I am aware he has a private college. I was going to say as an aside to him, yes I sure am. We get along real fine.

I want to make a philosophic comment that I believe strongly in plural educational system underpinning a plural society such as we have in Canada. During the restraint period the percentage of aid to private colleges dropped in contrast to the public colleges. I do not know the exact amount or proportion at the present time. I can provide it to the hon. member in a memorandum or in the House later on. But in the long term, it would seem to me that in view of the fact that government does not assist private colleges with capital construction or capital costs of any kind, Mr. Chairman, somewhere between 65 to 80 per cent would be a reasonable and fair kind of assistance to private colleges. We will work toward that kind of assistance.

MR. KING: I'd like to thank the minister very much for those comments. I'd also like to ask if he could comment on the long-term plans for the development of Grant MacEwan Community College. One of the figures that comes to my mind is that they have half the net per student square feet of instructional space available to other public colleges in the province, particularly Red Deer since their addition is under construction. I wonder if the minister could comment on plans for additional capital construction at Grant MacEwan Community College.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands describes the situation accurately. It's one of these things that happens when you bring in a restraint period at a point in time. The Red Deer addition had been approved and [put] in motion. The addition to Grant MacEwan was the campus at Mill Woods. The restraint period came into place. With an enterprise such as Advanced Education and Manpower where most of our money goes into wages and salaries, we have done very little in capital construction or capital costs apart from minor additions, renovations, replacement of furniture and equipment, and so on. But we have not undertaken to build a campus or a new building. So while the hon. member's description of the situation is accurate, it will not be immediately but later, when the restraint

period on capital funds is off. Because when you're talking about buildings, you're talking about very, very expensive kinds of enterprises. That is one of the unfortunate things that occurred to Grant MacEwan with respect to buildings. They are short of space.

MR. KING: Would the hon. minister appreciate a lobby by the Edmonton MLAs with the Treasury board this fall in support of Grant MacEwan College?

DR. HOHOL: All kinds of help are always appreciated. I do want to say this, though: we are taking a close look at Grant MacEwan. The department officials are working with those of the college. We're not unmindful and we're not turning our backs on their circumstance. What happened to Grant MacEwan is the effect of success. They turned away 1,000 students last year, I am certain. But the space isn't there. To provide the space would be to fracture the whole notion of our restraint guidelines. I cannot do it any more than any other minister can. That is the problem. But we're not unmindful of it. We're going to try to assist by some arrangement for some extended or increased space for Grant MacEwan.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, with regard to Vote 2.1.2, New Course Development. Mr. Minister, I see you've got \$1 million there. I assume that will have to be allocated prior to September 1, or approximately September 1, because any new courses offered would have to be funded well before then. What new courses do you expect this money to go to this year?

DR. HOHOL: I'm not certain that all of them would have to be approved [between] now and the beginning of September. Certainly that would be the reasonable thing to do. I'm sure we've approved a whole list of programs. I'm sure they're somewhere in this whole list of papers. Maybe what I can do is compose a memorandum of information and send it over. I've lost my place.

Agreed to:	
Ref. No. 2.1	\$8,299,573
Ref. No. 2.2	\$72,525,426

Ref. No. 2.3

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I see an increase here of something like 33.9 per cent from last year's to this year's estimates. Mr. Minister, I take it that's primarily for increased student population in the colleges. Is that right?

And can you be specific, Mr. Minister, with regard to the financial problems Grande Prairie College is having? What's the status of their situation right now? I'm sure the minister and many other members have heard of it on numerous occasions.

DR. HOHOL: That is true, Mr. Chairman. But not unlike municipalities, school boards, hospitals, and so on, Grande Prairie's particular problem is a shortage of money to develop an industrial arts/vocational education program that has been funded as a special project up to this time. We're not certain we should continue it on a special status basis, yet there is not

enough money in the allocation of funds from our 10 per cent as a department to maintain the program or move it into the global budget. So in the case of Grant MacEwan, the restraint situation hurt them on space. In the case of Grande Prairie, it's hitting them on this particular program.

I think we can go down every institution, about 25, and find a peculiar circumstance. But the overwhelming notion of restraint is something that even the colleges support. But they say, despite our support we are hurting over here. We know that.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, we can't let the minister off quite that easily. With regard to the Grande Prairie situation, the special project the minister talked about — I believe it was basically industrial arts. Mr. Minister, what was the reason for stopping the special project funding? If on one hand you don't feel you should carry it on under special project funding, I assume you didn't feel the program was successful. What circumstances led to the decision not to continue under special project funding? Secondly, Mr. Minister, you didn't really answer the question: is the 33.9 per cent because of that kind of increase in student numbers right across the public college system?

DR. HOHOL: With respect to the special project funding, there is a limit to how many projects you can fund outside the regular budget and stay in the restraint program. Mr. Chairman, the hon. leader would properly be the first to say: look, your budget isn't 10 per cent, it's 16, 17 per cent. I've taken a pretty hard position with the institutions and said that as far as I was concerned, the guidelines were real and they had to live within them. To continue to fund that particular program outside the budget would be to fund it beyond 10 per cent.

The difference in what we think is inflation for our institutions — and I think Alberta generally — might be 6.7 per cent maximum. The rest would be used for pupil growth; that is, roughly one-third.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of difficulty following the minister's logic. Because, Mr. Minister, the money for the special project at Grande Prairie would have been included there last year.

DR. HOHOL: No, it was on a special project basis.

MR. CLARK: It was a special project last year?

DR. HOHOL: Yes.

MR. CLARK: So that money was included in your budget last year, Mr. Minister. Now, what you're really telling us is you didn't give the program at Grande Prairie that we happen to be talking about — and we could have talked about another one, but let's say the industrial arts program at Grande Prairie — as high a priority in the department this year as it received last year. Isn't that really the situation?

DR. HOHOL: Partly.

MR. CLARK: Well, what was the rest of the reason then?

DR. HOHOL: Well, the institution itself also has to set some priorities. If it has a set of priorities that goes beyond 10 per cent, it has to come to terms with itself. If we stop funding outside the global budget — and we're doing that nearly without exception — then something has to go. We didn't approve it as a special project.

The allocation of funds is an estimate now, Mr. Chairman, because you'll recall that the college budget year begins on July 1, unlike the universities and other institutions generally, on April 1. Certainly we've had representation from the college to look at this again, and we will. But I would not want to raise the expectation of anyone in Grande Prairie or in the House that that may necessarily be changed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could just get this clear in my mind. On Elements, page 6, are you saying, Mr. Minister, that the special project funding was contained in the '76-77 forecast? Because you'll notice there is a drop of about \$18,000 this year or approximately 1 per cent. Similarly Medicine Hat College: a drop from \$2,070,000 to \$2,056,000, about .75 per cent. So there has to be some sort of explanation for those drops, when I see on the other hand Red Deer going from approximately \$3.8 million to \$6.4 million and all the others going up by lesser amounts, but going up. But [there is] a drop in the case of Grande Prairie and of Medicine Hat, when obviously their overall operating costs would be increasing by the same general level, one would think, as other institutions.

DR. HOHOL: The real difference is that last year in our budget document we included capital and operating costs as one figure. The figures we're looking at exclude capital costs.

MR. NOTLEY: In the forecast?

DR. HOHOL: In the forecast. What page are you looking at, Mr. Member?

MR. NOTLEY: Page 6 of the Elements.

DR. HOHOL: Oh, yes. I wonder if we can go on while I find the information on that particular element?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, could we hold that vote and then come back to it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that we hold 2.3 for a few moments?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Agreed to:	
Ref. No. 2.4	\$1,465,000
Ref. No. 2.5	\$195,140,000

Ref. No. 3.1

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on 3.1. Looking over page 8 of the Elements, I notice a decline in students' finance this year from \$9.8 million to \$9.3 million, a decline of approximately \$500,000, about 6 per cent.

I'd like the minister to outline the reasons for that. Do we expect fewer students to take part in the program this year?

Following that up, I notice training assistance is exactly the same as it was last year. It would seem to me that with higher rates of unemployment in the province this year compared to last, there would be some argument for increasing that particular estimate.

The final point, Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I'd like to just take a little time and go into this business of the report of the federal/provincial task force that looked at the question of remissions, which would be up to 100 per cent for certain types of loans depending on the financial ability of the students in question.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview is correct in his estimate of why the money is down with respect to student finance. In the first instance, fewer students are applying for the maximum capacity; and secondly, over the last couple of years we have tidied up small loans and cleared those off. If you recall, last year we had a pretty detailed discussion on our increase in remissions. The combination of those three factors have led to the lower amount of money.

While I'm on my feet, [I'd like] to respond to the hon. Leader of the Opposition with respect to the new programs. There are a few, and I'll run through them very quickly. Some of the programs we will be looking at or have approved have to do with social and economic policy, apprenticeship, early childhood services, native education, education in correctional institutions, programs for the socially disadvantaged — including the poor, handicapped, and women looking for jobs the second and third time around — industrial employment programs, and three other programs. Those are the programs the hon. member was talking about.

With respect to Grande Prairie, vocational education at Grande Prairie is being funded but not in the full amount requested by the college. This is not the kind of experience that most institutions will have. So that's the information with respect to Grande Prairie. That program is being funded, not in the amount the college asked for, but less.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, going to student assistance that we're now on, just very quickly, my figures indicate that from the standpoint of program support we've got something like a 10.4 per cent increase from the estimates last year. Then we move down to the student finance area itself and actually a 5 per cent reduction. Mr. Minister, I'd like to be convinced that this can be justified.

DR. HOHOL: It was a judgment. We talked about this with the Students Finance Board and the department. It was a judgment factor we had to make. We made the judgment two years ago when we set the student finance costs in place, or estimated them in advance, and felt that we would wish to be in a position to be able to respond to students on a two-year basis and assign a like amount in two successive years. What experience has shown us is that the second year could well have been less than the first year for the reasons reviewed a while ago. That's why we have an increase on the one hand of 10 per cent — we

went on a two-year kind of line appropriation — and a drop of 5 per cent based on what actually happened with respect to student loans and remissions.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just following that along. Mr. Minister, if you'd look at page 35 in the Estimates book, when we look at manpower costs — once again looking at the estimates from last year to this year — we have an increase of 11.2 per cent. Yet if we go down to the summary of manpower authorized for financial assistance to students, we've got five fewer people. The numbers are 58 this year as compared to 63 man-years authorized. Now, Mr. Minister, how does that square with an 11 per cent increase in the area of manpower costs?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, I'm looking at page 35 also, and the summary of manpower authorization on permanent full-time positions is the same: 58 and 58, and that's a significant figure. By the way, Mr. Chairman, that has not changed for five or six years.

MR. CLARK: I'm sorry. You're right; it's the same as it was.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go back to the question I raised before. I realize the committee is going to be looking at this question of tuitions in the fall. But I just want to go back, Mr. Minister, to this interprovincial committee that studied remissions. One of the points in that report, as I understand it, was a level of remission which related to the income of students at the postsecondary level, particularly graduate students. I'd like you to bring us up to date on just where things stand as far as that matter is concerned. Will any changes in student assistance be kept in abeyance until this committee you talked about reports in the fall? What is the situation on that?

DR. HOHOL: No, the committee is in place. Alberta is very well represented on it and is proceeding with this work. It has made its recommendations. We're looking at them. But certainly the improvements we have made, and improvements on what I must fairly say was a good student finance plan when we came into office — since then we've made some significant changes and improvements, including this year. No, we wouldn't wait. There are some notions in the federal report — federal in the sense that the 10 provinces worked together on it, and federal in the sense that the federal Secretary of State also has a particular interest in the matter of student finance — that will take some time to work out. The Council of Ministers of Education is looking at it; the provinces separately. We have a plan in place unlike any other province. We use the Queen Elizabeth Scholarship fund very effectively. I have to give credit to the board, the chairman, and the officials of the Students Finance Board for managing the finances in such a way that the funds are effectively used and the students are assisted to the maximum, yet not heavily burdened with debts, six months after they graduate from school.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Chairman, if I could, just one brief question. I wonder if the minister could tell me: in selection of students who are able to receive financ-

ing, is the capability of their parents to pay taken into consideration if they're over 18?

DR. HOHOL: Yes it is, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PLANCHE: I'm wondering if that's altogether fair in view of the fact that a lot of people over the age of 18 who are adults in every other respect may not get any support from their parents, may not want to be in a position where they have to, and would like to negotiate their own business deal on their own merits.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, I have to say that is one of the persistent and consistent representations being made to the Students Finance Board and to me as the minister to whom the board reports. I think the hon. member makes a good point well. The board and I are looking at ways of dealing with a circumstance that is really a result of the kind of society we have wanted over the years. We have asked youngsters to stand on their own feet, to get their education or earn their own living, to look after themselves. On the balance, I have to agree with the member. I caution that this is not something we can respond or react to overnight, and I'm sure you would not expect me to. But this is a matter we are dealing with because it's a predominant view of Albertans and we have to respond to predominant views of Albertans.

Agreed to:

Ref. No. 3.1	\$1,016,471
Ref. No. 3.2	\$9,311,000
Ref. No. 3.3	\$6,833,427
Vote 3 Total Program	\$17,160,898

Ref. No. 2.3

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you prepared to go back to 2.3, Mr. Minister?

DR. HOHOL: Yes. The response is that operating costs will increase at the same proportion in all colleges; that's the 10 per cent guideline. When applied, it appears slightly under for some colleges and shows more in some. It includes capital; I said it didn't. It includes capital which, in our department, by choice includes only renovations, minor additions, replacement of equipment, and writing off depreciation.

Agreed to:

Ref. No. 2.3	\$33,921,000
Vote 2 Total Program	\$311,350,999

Vote 4

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the minister to do two things. First of all, Mr. Minister, could you outline the government's plans with regard to this whole question of summer employment? It might very much speed the passage of these estimates. Secondly, I'd like to refer to a question I asked in the House on March 29:

I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. It really touches on both facets of the minister's responsibility. Is the government of Alberta involved in any advertising or recruiting programs aimed at attracting people living outside the province to migrate here to join Alberta's work force?

And the answer is:

No, we haven't . . .

I'd be very interested in having the minister square that with the program descriptions on page 36, especially with regard to objectives of the program and services provided. It seems to me the answer the minister has given is . . . well, I have to be convinced.

DR. HOHOL: I think there's room for a margin of error. Apart from checking with the department, I've since looked at the newspapers, and we have advertised. But we haven't advertised in quite the context the hon. leader asked the question.

I distinguished our advertising from Canada Manpower advertising. It advertises generally, while we advertise for specific jobs, open and vacant at a particular time. We're not asking people to come west in great numbers because there are all kinds of job openings here. When we advertise, we advertise for a millwright or whatever the case may be. To that extent, there's room for modifying my response to the hon. leader. I was speaking very much in broad terms of advertising "come west", as Canada Manpower tends to do.

I'm saying that those who do so without checking very carefully with our office in Toronto or in Alberta or in London, England make a serious mistake. Because they might find that all those jobs they're anticipating or have been told [about] by friends or relations or read through Canada Manpower advertising are simply not true. There are some kinds of job openings, but not all kinds of job openings. But I have modified my response to you, sir.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just following along. Mr. Minister, the reason I raised the question is that there's unfortunately a feeling outside Alberta among a number of people that you can come to Alberta and get a job, whether or not you have any qualifications or skills. It seems to me that if your department is doing work in this area at all, it should be making it very clear that there are very few more opportunities in Alberta for unskilled people than in other parts of Canada and that we need highly skilled people in a number of areas.

Mr. Minister, is that the kind of advertising your department is doing? How is it being done? Is it in co-operation with industry? Let's take people in Ontario for example, because if I recall the estimates from the minister responsible for social services, the number of people coming into Alberta and ending up without a job is fairly large.

Mr. Minister, in the course of your comments last week you indicated that Canada Manpower was advertising "come west" in this very general way. You indicated in your answer that on occasion you'd had Canada Manpower send people back to where they'd come from. I think this is a rather serious situation. I'd like you to elaborate on that particular area. I've had people express concerns to me from two points of view. One, very disillusioned people

who've arrived in Alberta have given the government of Alberta some of the credit or blame, depending upon your point of view, for having them here. On other occasions people have had their way paid to Alberta by Manpower with pretty strong indication there would be jobs available to them. When they get here they don't have the qualifications needed in areas where there are opportunities. They found it difficult to get into some of our Manpower training programs because they've been told they've been filled. They've been left high and dry, and in some cases end up the responsibility of the Department of Social Services and Community Health.

DR. HOHOL: I can be brief, because the hon. Leader of the Opposition describes the circumstances very accurately. In making reference to Canada Manpower, I want to be clear that I'm not being negative or improperly critical. They have a job to do. They obviously view [it] to be the way they're doing it, or they'd do it some other way.

But we have written to them from time to time and made clear that all these job openings are just mythology, that what we need are not unskilled people. We have our share of those in Alberta. That's why we have training, retraining, upgrading, and updating programs. We do need highly skilled, highly competent people in specific areas. The hon. leader is quite welcome to visit my office and look at the correspondence we send east and to other people saying, please take care, because those jobs simply aren't here. Our advertising is the kind the hon. leader describes: assistance to particular industries and enterprises looking for a specific, definable, and describable skill. We assist them in advertising to locate people like this and try to bring them together. We do no general "come west" advertising. On the contrary we use every opportunity when we have conferences at the interprovincial level, when we meet with the federal people . . . I said to the Hon. Mr. Cullen just a few weeks ago when I was in Ottawa, for goodness sake talk to your officials, talk to your people, get a handle on this to the extent you can. In all fairness though, it has to be said that many people of the full age of majority and judgment use discretion badly and come west. The job they expect as soon as they get off the plane, train or bus just isn't there. Of course they blame Alberta if that's the circumstance. They praise us if they happen to get a job. If they can't get a job they either go back or wind up in the department of assistance. That's much regretted. The increase in the last two years has been significant. It's been increasing very much, from under 1 per cent in 1971 to as high as 3.5 to 3.7 and 4 per cent now.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, while the minister might not want to be critical of Canada Manpower, I wouldn't be as reluctant. I think frankly Canada Manpower are leading on an awful lot of people [with] the idea that they come to Alberta and automatically have a job. It seems to me this government might be well advised to run some sort of program, at least in Ontario, pointing out that there are job opportunities in Alberta, but listing the kinds of opportunities.

From the standpoint of plain common sense, we would be far better to do that and save some of the

money we are going to be handing out through the department of social assistance to people coming here who aren't skilled at all. In some cases we are not that fortunate in getting them into the job market on a longer term basis.

I would really say to the minister that I think two things should be done: you'd better be a great deal firmer with Canada Manpower. Secondly, I think if the figures of the kind of increase the minister has indicated are accurate — and I have no reason to doubt them — which is four times the increase in the last four years, then some steps had better be taken about telling our Canadian cousins in central Canada where and what kind of opportunities there really are. We do no service to them or to ourselves in Alberta by relying on the good will of Canada Manpower to simply straighten out this situation. As I understand it, it has been going on for some time now. I suggest that the minister become a darned sight more forceful with Canada Manpower, and seriously consider doing some advertising along that line.

DR. HOHOL: The counsel is well taken. I just want to assure you, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and all hon. members that we are doing those things. We will review our programs and step up the notions we have talked about here.

But we have taken a very firm and stern position with our counterparts in Ottawa. When I said I wasn't critical of Canada Manpower, I said I wasn't negatively critical, but critical in the sense . . .

MR. CLARK: What in the world does that mean?

DR. HOHOL: Well, they just aren't doing their job. We have shown them options. We have told them some of the positive, reasonable, and helpful things they could do which would not lead anyone down the garden path. Mr. Chairman, there is such a thing as positive and negative criticism. What I am saying is: just to say they are not doing their job is of no help to them or to us. But what we are doing — and we are doing plenty — is along the lines you have talked about.

We will review it and step up the work. But certainly it is serious and important. There is nothing more to disillusioning than expecting the street to be laid out with gold and [having] your choice of jobs, and winding up on welfare.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, a number of people I have come in contact with haven't come because of the advertising of either the provincial government or Canada Manpower. A young man in eastern Canada who doesn't have work obviously looks around to find out where he can find work, and Alberta seems to be the spot in Canada today.

But I would also like to suggest that they don't all come west. Quite a few of these men are coming east, from British Columbia. At least half a dozen I have run into the last short while are from British Columbia. They're here because they want to make some money.

One young man I happened to sit beside on a plane last fall was on the way home. He told me he came to Alberta to get work. He worked all summer. He said this was the only way he could afford to pay the insurance premiums they levy in British Columbia.

That was the reason he came here.

So I can't blame them. I like to see a fellow industrious and so on. But it is pretty frustrating when they arrive and then can't find work. I think that is a point we certainly have to look at.

But I don't know how you can stop people from coming to Alberta. If I were in New Brunswick today and without work, I think I'd be heading to Alberta too, just as my dad did many years ago. But maybe the prospects today are not as good; maybe they are better. They take their chances.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Chairman, I pose just one brief question. Could the minister give us some information with respect to the federal immigration program and whether we are required or requested to take certain quotas of new immigrants from various countries?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, the new immigration act just received second reading a few days ago in the House of Commons, and it is quite certain that the bill will go through. The bill is very brief. It's simply a framework of propositions with respect to the duties of the minister, a statement with respect to consultation with the provinces, and outlines certain basic notions like settlement services, for example. The rest will be in regulation and order in council.

The federal minister is empowered to set the quotas for each year. I've discussed this with him and felt that a five-year period, with some room for modification each year, would be more reasonable. He agreed. The consultation clause is the one I discussed with him in particular. He agreed on the nature and the technique or strategy for negotiation and consultation. We did not get to the propositions of quotas. We talked about them generally, about source countries, numbers, placing them in the context of manpower.

I think it's important to note, Mr. Chairman and members of the Assembly, that the immigration act is very much in the context of manpower, so that people who come here or elsewhere have, if not assurance, a fair shot at making a living.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, can I raise one other point? There is a federal/provincial program of some type — and I can't recall the particular name. The people of Cluny brought it to me because it said that they could hire their local help, if they secured the consent of the manager of Canada Manpower in Calgary. I wrote to the manager in Calgary — I haven't yet had a reply — but apparently under this program if they receive his consent the people there can hire their own help. I understood it to be students. They would like to hire people who are going to live in the community and who will take a pride in doing the work.

I'm wondering if the hon. minister has any comments on that particular program?

DR. HOHOL: No, Mr. Chairman, I'm not familiar with it, but will become so.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Mr. Minister, can you give us orally now or written very soon, a breakdown of the variety of summer employment programs?

DR. HOHOL: Yes, I can. Initially when we came into office, we estimated the costs of summer and winter programs from the unemployment figures. The winter program was PEP, and the summer program was the Summer Temporary Employment Program. At that time, as you recall, they were high and we budgeted as high as \$12 million. What we have taken as a government policy position with respect to employment is to look at the actual circumstances in view of the fact that unemployment has dropped steadily, and has been low both in terms of proportion and percentage, and very high — the highest in Canada for several years — in terms of participation rate. More Albertans per thousand work than in any other province. The labor force continues to grow, so that at the moment we're something of an island in the circumstance of economics and employment.

The Summer Temporary Employment Program has been approved by Executive Council. The universities are just concluding their work, the high schools will not for quite some time. We expect the students to make a real effort — I think it's part of the training of how to do a job — to try to get a job. Then we will look at how things are in the unemployment and employment circumstances, and draw special warrants. We feel this is fair and reasonable use of a special warrant because we do not know what the job circumstances will be.

We've heard some predictions of doom and gloom on the unemployment circumstances for youth. I do not share them. I think that we will be able to place many, many students in jobs in Alberta. Industry, commerce, the trade unions, the institutions have been extremely effective and responsive to young people. We have six elements, most of them in government which have specific appropriations for employment of young people. The Department of Agriculture has. We have the Hire-A-Student program — which goes into effect soon, probably this week or next — which has an excellent record of hiring people. This is manned by university and other students and is jointly sponsored by Canada Manpower, Advanced Education and Manpower, the Chamber of Commerce, and the institutions of education in Alberta. I might say, Mr. Chairman, [it is] not something ornamental but something which is a fact, and we're really proud of this here in Alberta. This was intended to be a nation-wide program, because it involves Canada Manpower. I can report to you, and I regret this, that the other provinces haven't taken advantage, or couldn't make it work. It's working successfully only in Alberta, and very successfully.

These are our plans for the summer. To the extent that students need the help, this government will be responsive.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, do I take that to mean that the program under Agriculture will be available for students this summer? When will the announcement be made or has it been made already? When will the applications be out and available and so on?

DR. HOHOL: I'm going by memory on this, subject like most memories to some margin of error, but I seem to recall having sent out the information to municipalities this week with respect to STEP. I will reserve my recollection with respect to the particular element of agriculture, but will check tomorrow.

Agreed to:

Vote 4 Total Program \$7,404,974

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just before we finish, could I ask the minister where we find the money in his estimates for the university internship program for education students? The negotiations are ongoing. I understand that the universities now — and I assume they are pretty well completed and finalized. I understand there's about \$1.5 million involved as far as the government's contribution to this extended practicum is concerned. The negotiation is between the ATA, the ASTA, the universities, and the government. Where do we find the money in here? Last week the president of the ASTA indicated that arrangements were pretty well completed, that the program was going to be going ahead, and it was simply a matter of tidying up the loose ends and so on. Perhaps the minister ought to take this opportunity to announce the program and where we'd find the money in the estimates.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, I can't take responsibility for what the president of the Alberta School Trustees' Association says. He has to. I responded during the question period in the House that negotiations were proceeding. That's the extent of the situation with the extended practicum. Because negotiations and arrangements were not completed when the estimates were put in place, they're not in the estimates. Should that program go — and I can't say that it will or won't — I would have to make the case to my colleagues in Executive Council that the program is of the kind of worth and virtue that they should respond favorably with the special warrant. The money is not in the estimates because the negotiations are still proceeding. It simply wouldn't be fair or reasonable — it wouldn't be accurate — to place money for a program not in place. Not of that consequence; not of that amount.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. We hold with bated breath until the announcement because I think the minister is playing a little cat and mouse with us and it won't be very long before the announcement will finally be made, albeit a couple of years late, that an extended practicum has been worked out.

DR. HOHOL: I hope you're right.

Agreed to:

Vote 1 Total Program	\$73,400
Ref. No. 2.1	—
Ref. No. 2.2	\$7,690,700
Ref. No. 2.3	\$6,152,000
Ref. No. 2.4	—
Ref. No. 2.5	\$21,157,000
Vote 2 Total Program	\$34,999,700
Ref. No. 3.1	\$5,080
Ref. No. 3.2	—
Ref. No. 3.3	—
Vote 3 Total Program	\$5,080
Vote 4 Total Program	\$26,386
Department Total	\$35,104,566

DR. HOHOL: With the minute or so left — I hadn't anticipated the time to be so precise — I have a list of people throughout the province I wanted to commend and acknowledge: the volunteers, Opportunity 45, Over 45, Hire-A-Student — so many people who are doing a great job for Albertans. Also in my own department, my ministerial staff and the Students Finance Board, and my colleagues in the cabinet and caucus. I'm sure no one will mind if I make special reference to my honorable colleague the member from Calgary who — with the university there, SAIT, the college, the AVCs, and all kinds of institutions we support — has been of tremendous help to me.

MR. CLARK: So you finally found out something.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, I move the resolution be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. HYNDMAN: 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 the following resolution, reports same, and requests leave to sit again:

Resolved that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1978, amounts not exceeding the following sums be granted to Her Majesty for the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower: \$5,083,978 for departmental support services, \$311,350,999 for assistance to higher and further educational institutions, \$17,160,898 for financial assistance to students, \$7,404,974 for manpower development.

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, this evening the two subcommittees of the Committee of Supply will meet: Subcommittee A, Hospitals and Medical Care; Subcommittee B, Recreation, Parks and Wildlife — both of those departments to continue.

On Wednesday we would anticipate bringing to Committee of Supply the subcommittee completion of the following departments: Social Services and Community Health, Transportation, and Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, depending on time.

I move the Assembly adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

[The House adjourned at 5:34 p.m.]