

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Friday, April 14, 1978 10:00 a.m.**

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill Pr. 5
An Act Respecting
The Royal Trust Company and
Royal Trust Corporation of Canada

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being Bill Pr. 5, An Act Respecting The Royal Trust Company and Royal Trust Corporation of Canada.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 5 read a first time]

Bill 249
The Environment Statutes Reform Act

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 249, The Environment Statutes Reform Act. The provision of Bill 249 would be to remove the certificates of variance which were contained in the 1976 Environment Statutes Reform Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 249 read a first time]

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this morning to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, an invasion from the city of St. Albert — 120 grade 5 students from the Sir Alexander MacKenzie school. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Peters, Mrs. Cooper, Mr. Lof, Mrs. Weber, and Mrs. Ferguson. They are seated in both the public and members galleries. I'd ask that they stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**RITE Telephone System**

MR. CLARK: MR. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the minister responsible for the RITE telephone system. In asking the question, I'd simply remind the minister that for two years now we've pursued this question of the monitoring of telephone calls which come to MLAs' offices. Can the minister assure this Assembly that his staff, who administer the RITE telephone system, have stopped the practice of asking the names of people who call MLAs' offices?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, first of all, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition would check *Hansard* of last year, I said we would give consideration to having this practice stopped. In fact, at the time I advised the staff exactly to do so.

In the meantime I have reconfirmed this instruction that no name or telephone number is asked of any person calling an elected official. Two days ago in fact, I extended this instruction to cover also the chairman of the Human Rights Commission as well as the Ombudsman. However, if there is a case where an MLA, an elected official even such as yourself, Mr. Speaker, would be asked for a telephone number and/or the name, I would appreciate that it be drawn to my attention.

Also, Mr. Speaker, may I say I extended this instruction insofar as before, if someone from the public would call an elected official and would say, I would like to speak to Mr. Clark, the RITE operators through their luncheon sometimes have a replacement, and these girls probably may not have been aware who Mr. Clark is. So I have provided them with a list so they can check against it if the person called for in government is an elected official, and hopefully these mistakes will not occur again.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the minister's comment, would the minister please explain to the House why a Mrs. MacTavish, who is responsible for the operation of the RITE system and who I've had correspondence with the minister recently, as late as two days ago advised my office that it was still the practice of the RITE system to ask for the numbers for all calls that went to MLAs, including my office.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I had Mrs. MacTavish in my office right after the question period when the Member for Clover Bar asked the question whether these calls were still monitored, and was assured that this was not so, and the only mistake possibly made was the one that I just explained. However, I think I shall call Mrs. MacTavish again and ask her why she would make a different statement to you than she has made to me.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Could the minister also explain why the news director of one of the radio stations in this province had his call monitored in the same way within the last 10 days? [interjections]

MR. SCHMID: Again, Mr. Speaker, I checked into the matter immediately when I was made aware in this House by the Member for Clover Bar, and I was again given the assurance that instructions had gone out to the RITE operators not to ask for a telephone number or name if a call was placed to an elected official.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the instructions the minister has now given to his staff, I guess for the second or third time, is the minister prepared to give an assurance to this Assembly that this kind of monitoring of calls coming to elected officials, the Ombudsman, and the Human Rights Commission will cease once and for all? [interjections]

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I can give the assurance as far as I am personally concerned, excepting of course human mistakes. Then, of course, should I say that certain instructions will definitely go out that this question, "Who is the person calling?", will cease once and for all — excepting of course, as I have said before, human mistakes, which there still may be.

I would appreciate it if, as I have said before, any of the elected people here would let me know if this does happen, so I can have a monitor on it myself.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, would the minister be prepared to table in the Assembly the instructions he has given to the senior responsible officials of the RITE system with regard to the monitoring of calls to elected representatives? [interjections]

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I have given these instructions. And since I have given these instructions not only to the lady called Jillian MacTavish but to my deputy minister and assistant deputy minister as well, I think it should be sufficient that I have given these instructions, and that these instructions have in fact, I understand, gone in writing to the RITE operators.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, will the minister explain to the House why he will not table in this Assembly the guidelines he has given to the officials of his department about monitoring of MLAs' telephone calls?

MR. SPEAKER: Absolutely out of order. [interjections] If the hon. leader wishes to debate the topic as to whether or not a document is to be tabled, that may be achieved by putting a motion for a return on the Order Paper.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, the question to the minister is: why will the minister not table it?

MR. SPEAKER: Exactly. The answer to the question "why" . . . [interjections] Order please. The answer to the question "why" involves the giving of reasons.

MR. CLARK: He has none.

MR. SPEAKER: The giving of reasons constitutes debate. If the hon. member wishes to have a proper opportunity to debate the matter, that can be done by means of a motion for a return on the Order Paper, which, as the hon. member knows, are all debatable.

The parameters of the question period simply do not permit the Chair to allow debate. I realize that, as has happened with this series of questions we've just heard, there is a debating overtone to them, but insofar as I'm able to in a practical way I'm obliged to abide by the orders of the question period. They are that the question period is for the exchange of information and not for the purpose of debate. If the Assembly wishes to change the purpose of the question period to allow debate, I'm at your service.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister indicate if there is a set period, say a monthly period, when the minister or someone in the minister's department asks for a survey to find out to which departments the calls go?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, a record was being kept as to the number of calls being placed to specific departments, in order to find out the workload that is being applied to the different lines and whether or not additional lines would be necessary. However, since the — one could call it survey, one could call it establishment of the workload on lines, I felt could also be a count that could be misconstrued, I have also given instructions that this kind of accounting of the number of calls going to different departments be also discontinued.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. If any citizen doesn't want to come under the general rules of the RITE system, is there anything to stop them from paying for their own call?

MR. SCHMID: Certainly not, Mr. Speaker. Any person who wanted to call anywhere in Alberta to their government can of course use the DDD system of dialing directly, or specifically here in Edmonton access the telephone number of any member directly.

MR. GOGO: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. As the RITE system is unique to the province of Alberta, I wonder if the minister could indicate whether the RITE system is capable of keeping up with the number of calls, and are there plans for expanding it in the near future?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, due to the overload of the RITE system, we are presently considering measures that would either alleviate the overload or restrict the accessibility to the RITE system, in other words to the government departments called from outside the city area.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. I wonder if the minister has ever considered having all calls to MLAs made collect rather than through the RITE system, which would be the normal practice.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, this is exactly one of the points and considerations we are presently looking at, because again it is felt that probably the way the RITE system is set up, needing in fact additional equipment which already may be placed within the AGT system, that we might have to look at a different avenue we might explore in order to improve the RITE system, and at the same time of course, keep the privacy that everyone here intends to have sacred.

Highway Debris

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Having regard for the ditches along our primary highways where seismic companies have had permits to carry out seismic work, and the conditions these companies have left the ditches in — and I'm talking about large mounds of dirt and other debris — will the minister make representation to the companies to have them clean this up?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if companies are not reclaiming areas sufficiently, I'd certainly be pleased to look into it. Obviously the hon. member feels he knows of some, and I'd appreciate his giving me the

information as to where. Perhaps in co-operation with my colleague the Deputy Premier and Minister of Transportation responsible for highways, we can make sure they are adequately cleaned up.

MR. PURDY: Supplementary question to the Minister of Transportation. Will the minister undertake to have his department assess the damage done to road crossings and uprooting of grasses, and make representation to the seismic companies? I'm talking about Highway 16, west of Edmonton. There are some problems there.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, that matter is already being assessed, and I expect a report on it in the next few days. One of the problems is that some of the so-called dirt is in fact ice and snow that hasn't melted. I think we'll know better in a few days just what the situation is.

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

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I was looking across at the opposition in anticipation of some good questions this morning. I think you interpreted my look of anticipation as that I'd like to ask one. But I really don't have a question. [laughter]

MR. CLARK: The best speech you've made in two years.

MR. SPEAKER: I promise to be more careful in the future in interpreting any look of puzzlement there may be on the hon. member's face.

Handicapped — Income

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health, and ask the minister where things now stand, as far as the government of Alberta is concerned, with respect to a guaranteed minimum income for the physically and mentally handicapped in Alberta?

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. member is assuming we should have a pension plan or income supplementation plan, which was part of the discussion going on with the federal government over a number of years. That particular section of the Canada Assistance Plan, as proposed by the federal government, has now been abandoned by them, mostly because the majority of the provinces were not in favor of that approach.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. A year ago in a similar series of questions, the minister indicated that the government of Alberta was reviewing the B.C. GAIN plan, which is essentially a guaranteed income for the handicapped, but tied to whether they need it, similar to the assured income. My question is: has the government completed its assessment of the B.C. GAIN plan?

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't say the government has, because I have not placed an analysis

of the GAIN plan before my colleagues. The department certainly will have had an assessment of the plan, because we have an ongoing review of most provincial plans to see how they operate, and assess whether they should be part of Alberta's policies and whether they fit into our long-range goals. I've never placed a position analysing the GAIN program in front of my colleagues, so the government *per se* has not done an analysis.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Again a year ago the minister indicated there was some difficulty arriving at the number of people who would be eligible for guaranteed income for the physically and mentally handicapped. Have instructions been sent out to the department to develop eligibility guidelines and to assemble the information in the remaining year to determine how many Albertans would in fact be eligible, so the government could give consideration to the numbers and costs?

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has mentioned one of our very real areas of concern in attempting to arrive at some possible budget. It's simply our inability to know for sure how many people in the province are handicapped to such an extent that they might qualify for a guaranteed income.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In this intervening period of time has the department developed any eligibility guidelines, for want of a better expression; that is, the boundaries of handicap that would qualify under such a scheme — for example, the rules that B.C. has to apply for the GAIN program? Has there been any nailing down, if you like, of these eligibility ground rules?

MISS HUNLEY: There has not been a "nailing down", because that sounds pretty specific. But a considerable amount of work has been done within the department in that particular area.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question for clarification to the hon. minister, flowing from her original answer. Is it the view of the Alberta government that at this time it does not approve in principle the concept of a guaranteed income for the physically and mentally handicapped? Or is it essentially a quest for more information before a decision is made?

MISS HUNLEY: I would suggest that the latter part of the hon. member's question is the correct assumption. Unless we have some rather firm figures, it's very difficult in the budgetary process and in making an analysis, which is what we attempt to do in a proper manner. We can estimate, of course, but that's not exactly the way we budget. I think it's necessary for us to have more definite information, which we're compiling at the present time.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of the fact that this assembling of information has been going on for some time, is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly what

time frame she has given to the department in order to obtain the necessary information, so that her colleagues and the government can make a decision?

MISS HUNLEY: No, I am not in a position to advise the Assembly of that today.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Where do things stand with respect to the request of the physically handicapped people for appliances, such as wheelchairs and other items, that would be available to the physically handicapped, but those people not on social assistance?

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, we have the same problem with that as I've outlined earlier: our inability to determine exactly how many people there are and what their needs might be in order to assess properly the dimensions of such a program.

RITE Telephone System

(continued)

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. I would like to ask if it is possible for the hon. Leader of the Opposition to repeat the substance of his first questions which involved an employee of Government Services, a lady by the name of Jillian MacTavish. Since her career is obviously at stake, I would like to ask him to repeat — if I understood correctly, he said that Mrs. MacTavish called his office, or was in touch with his office, or indicated to someone two days ago that the calls were still being monitored.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in responding to what the minister has asked, the point I made is that the day my colleague Dr. Buck raised the question in the House, my office contacted Mrs. MacTavish and she advised my office that she had instructed her people to continue to ask the numbers and names of people who were calling elected officials, including my office. I should say that we had to get Mrs. MacTavish at home that day, because she wasn't in the office.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, in other words it was not, as I had thought, that the hon. Leader of the Opposition said two days ago; it was 10 days ago.

MR. CLARK: It was the day my colleague raised the issue in the House.

MR. SCHMID: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I understand that. But in other words it was before I again gave explicit instructions telling my staff to discontinue asking for the names and telephone numbers. In other words it was on April 5, not last Wednesday, April 12?

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. After the minister has had a chance to check with his staff, is the minister now prepared to table the documentation he sent to his staff? [interjections] What are you afraid of? Well then, table it.

MR. SPEAKER: Since there is no motion by the hon. minister with regard to the point of privilege, it may not be necessary for me to pursue the matter further. It would appear to be a point that might more closely involve a member of the government staff rather than a member of this Assembly.

But I should say that when a line of questioning leads toward possible or obvious criticism of a public servant, I think it's understandable to hon. members that the Chair becomes extremely uneasy, because these public servants, not being in the Assembly, do not have the opportunity to defend themselves here. It is otherwise when the matter is raised on the Order Paper by means of notice in the usual way.

Crown Counsel Hiring

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Attorney General. Could the Attorney General indicate how his department compiles statistics with regard to the number of experienced Alberta lawyers hired as Crown counsel in Alberta?

MR. FOSTER: I'm not sure I understand the question. Could you give me a little more information, please?

MR. MANDEVILLE: Could the Attorney General indicate how his department compiles statistics with regard to hiring Crown counsel? What procedures do you go through when you appoint Crown counsel in the province?

MR. FOSTER: The process of hiring Crown counsel, Mr. Speaker, and how we may compile certain kinds of statistics — I'm not quite sure what statistics — I don't see them as being related. Again, I'm sorry; I don't mean to be difficult. I'm just not sure I understand what you're getting at. [interjections]

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Attorney General indicate what steps are being taken by his department to attract Alberta lawyers to work as Crown counsel?

MR. FOSTER: Before we get to the supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to get the first question straight, because I think there's a misunderstanding here. If you want me to comment briefly on how we hire lawyers, we put ads in newspapers across Canada and let the word out that the Crown is looking for experienced counsel and we are prepared to interview all comers, in short. But I'm really kind of confused over this reference to statistics. What's the hon. member getting at? Can he help me?

MR. MANDEVILLE: How do you determine the qualifications? Do you go to the Law Society? Do you have an input from the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member and the hon. minister please use the ordinary parliamentary form of address.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Does the minister compile any statistics on the qualifications or the competence of Crown Counsel in the province of Alberta?

MR. FOSTER: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I don't understand what the hon. member's getting at. We have statistics about Crown counsel: how many we have, how old they may be, their years at the bar, et cetera. When we place ads for our requirements, we perhaps indicate the kind of background or experience that may be preferable. But when a lawyer writes to us and says, I may be interested in working with the Crown, he or she normally indicates where he or she took their legal training, perhaps their standing, their background experience, if they have something more than a baccalaureate in law, perhaps they have a master's, what that may be, references, et cetera. It's the usual kind of communication from a prospective employee.

I'm sorry, I would very much like to dispel any misunderstanding about statistics. I just don't understand, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member is getting at. I would really hope he can clarify it.

MR. MANDEVILLE: If I could accept that as a question, Mr. Speaker, could the hon. Attorney General indicate what steps are being taken by his department to attract Alberta lawyers to work as counsel in Alberta?

MR. FOSTER: I think I've answered that. We've simply let the word go out to the legal profession generally, to bar associations. We put ads in newspapers, not only in this province but across Canada; obviously we don't hire in the United States. That's how we try to attract members to Alberta.

Obviously we have contacts with departments of the attorney general in other provinces. In our inter-provincial meetings sometimes people say: any possibility of coming to work in Alberta? That's becoming a more and more frequent kind of discussion, fortunately. We've been very, very successful in getting people to come from other departments. We don't go out and seek them, because I don't want to be accused by my colleagues of raiding other places. But we have hired counsel and some senior counsel from departments of the attorney general in other provinces.

I'm concerned about this question of statistics because I fear it may have something to do with a suspicion that we somehow grade our Crown counsel statistically on how they conduct certain prosecutions in the courts. If that's what we're getting at, it really does upset me. If that's the allegation from the opposition, let's have a good debate about that in this House. My estimates will be up shortly; we'll get into it. That may not be it. That's the only thing I can think of, and I wish I could get some clarification.

MR. CLARK: Perhaps I might pose one supplementary question to the Attorney General. Is there discussion between the law societies in Alberta and other provinces with regard to the hiring practices the AG's department uses in Alberta, and when lawyers from outside the province are being considered for hiring by the Attorney General's department?

MR. FOSTER: I'm not aware of any concern by the Law Society about our hiring practices. The only thing we hear from the Law Society these days — and this is no criticism — is that there are many articling students looking for positions, and would we

and other employers of lawyers in the province please co-operate and take as many articling students as we can. So I'm not aware of any particular difficulty or problem with the Law Society, or communication on our hiring practices.

For sure, we want to know whether or not there are any complaints of professional misconduct with a law society, perhaps touching upon any applicant who may want to come to us. If, for example, a lawyer from Nova Scotia or Ontario were to write to us and say that he'd be interested in coming, we would check with the Law Society of Upper Canada or the Law Society of Nova Scotia to ensure that in fact his record there is not clouded in any sense. That's the normal kind of checking we would do with a law society.

I do that same kind of check with respect to QC appointments made by the Executive Council, and with respect to members of the bar who may be considered for appointments to the provincial court. I'm sure the federal government must do the same when they consider such appointments. In my judgment, that's only common sense and prudence.

Maybe I'm overreacting, Mr. Speaker, but I'm not really aware of what the concern of the opposition may be. Is there a problem you'd like to bring to my attention?

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I'm referring to a speech the Attorney General made to the Kiwanis, where he indicated: "Almost no experienced Alberta lawyers have been hired as Crown counsel for provincial courts over the last few years". I was wondering: in the past, has he been hiring lawyers from out of Alberta for counsel, or has he not been able to get lawyers from it?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, for heaven's sake. If the hon. member of the opposition wants to know what I said in a speech to the Kiwanis club, why didn't he say that 10 minutes ago? I could have answered him. [interjections]

DR. BUCK: We may have another Laycraft.

MR. FOSTER: Well, you know, I love this style, Mr. Speaker. I love this style of fishing out a few questions that don't mean . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. With great respect to the hon. Attorney General, the hon. Member for Bow Valley was being very proper in not asking a minister to confirm a press report.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting he should come in here waving his press report. But it seems to me very simple to put the question: is the Attorney General's Department having difficulty hiring lawyers in the province of Alberta? [interjections] I'll answer the question. Yes, we are having difficulty hiring lawyers in the province of Alberta. The simple fact is that the lawyers in the private bar are doing so well financially that we're having a little difficulty attracting them to the Crown with the current level of salary we pay. That's no secret. That's been a prob-

lem in this province ever since this government was elected, and I'm sure it will be for some time longer.

We are hiring most of our lawyers from outside the province.

DR. BUCK: PC lawyers.

MR. FOSTER: PC lawyers? I don't know what their politics are; frankly I don't care. I haven't hired any Social Crediters, to my knowledge. I'm not sure there are too many left, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am continuing to do what I can to keep salaries of Crown counsel reasonably competitive with the private bar. I'm not embarrassed to say that we're having difficulty attracting lawyers from the Alberta bar. The Alberta bar is doing very well, and it's difficult to get them to come with the Crown. We have been successful in having some people, and we're very pleased with the quality of staff we have.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER: It would appear that we have more than exhausted the topic. But if it will permit of a further brief supplementary and a brief answer, perhaps we could . . .

MR. NOTLEY: Brief answer?

MR. YOUNG: I'll try to be brief, Mr. Speaker. In view of the comments by the hon. minister, will it be one of the policy considerations of the government with respect to professions and occupations that professions not be permitted to prohibit the advertising of services by their members?

MR. FOSTER: Oh, Mr. Speaker, that's a lovely question. That's the whole question of advertising by professionals. At this moment the lawyers in this jurisdiction, and indeed I think in most in Canada, are turning somersaults over this great difficulty. I know there have been panels . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Time.

MR. SPEAKER: The question was whether the hon. Attorney General had in mind any remedy in this regard. If he wishes to deal with that, perhaps we could deal with it . . .

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, if you want to know my personal opinion — this is not a government position, and I'm sure my colleagues will back me up, whatever I say. [interjections] I thought I'd put out that disclaimer to begin with.

Personal opinion: I think the legal profession could go a good bit farther along the road of informing the public as to the kinds of skills and abilities individual lawyers have, in order that the public can make a better choice.

Drivers' Licences

MR. DONNELLY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Solicitor General. Mr. Minister, I understand the measurements of the applicant on the new drivers' licences are in metrics. Will the minister be hiring new or additional staff to do the weigh-in

and measurements of the new applicants, or will they be expected to provide this information themselves?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I hope and expect and presume that all civil servants having to deal with this conversion to metric will have easy conversion tables ready to hand if somebody asks them a question. I personally, not being very quick at arithmetic, would find difficulty giving specifics without one of these conversion tables. I will check to see if they are available in all motor vehicle branches.

So far as private citizens are concerned, I understand that people like the Royal Bank and so on have been putting out conversion tools with advertising on the back.

MR. DONNELLY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Solicitor General. Will every police officer be provided with conversion tables in order to ascertain whether the individual in possession of the driver's licence is indeed the person described thereon?

MR. FARRAN: Well, I'll have to look into that too. But I can assure the hon. member that there's no problem with the radar traps.

Credit Information

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Attorney General follows up the question I asked . . .

MR. NOTLEY: That should take the rest of the question period.

DR. BUCK: . . . at the end of March on the credit information service industry in Alberta. Has the minister had an opportunity to respond to a letter that he received from the industry this past week or so, in relation to the section where the minister said there was a lack of trust and quarrelling amongst the industry itself? Has the minister had an opportunity to respond to that letter?

MR. FOSTER: I don't think I talked about quarrelling among the industry. I think what I said was that the industry may be having some difficulty arriving at a consensus about being able to put one person, a contract person or an employee of the industry, in the courts to provide this information. Now, if I gave anybody the impression that I'm talking about quarrelling, I think that's too strong a statement. If I used the words "lack of trust", which I don't recall using, I don't think that was the intention. I don't think it's a question of trust. It may be a question of confidence among the industry in agreeing on one person. I don't know that that is a fact. I am simply reading between the lines and sensing that that may be a fact.

I don't know whether I've got that letter or not. I've got my departmental file in front of me; it's about half a foot thick. Whether that letter is in here, I don't know. I haven't seen it. No doubt it will come to my attention in the next little while.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question . . .

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet and on that subject, a meeting was held, I think last week, between the industry and our officials . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. With great respect, possibly the hon. minister might defer supplementary answers until supplementary questions are asked.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, he anticipated very well. That was my supplementary question, so the hon. minister can just keep going.

MR. FOSTER: You see, Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. Member for Clover Bar rather well, so I thought I'd just deal with the supplementary at one time and save the House a little time, since I'm inclined to go on at length.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. FOSTER: We had a meeting last week between the industry and my officials. I have asked for a report on the results of that. I haven't got it yet; therefore I don't know the results. But I'll be happy to report to the House when I get them.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It's quite obvious that lawyers charge by the hour; the longer you talk, the more you get paid.

Can the minister indicate if the deadline of April 30 will be met, or will the minister or his department require more time in his negotiations with the industry?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, with respect to that cheap shot about lawyers, if I thought I could get paid more by talking more, I'd be talking all day in this Assembly. [interjections]

Rubbish Burning

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Is the Department of the Environment now permitting municipalities, under certain specified conditions, to burn such items as wood, rubbish, et cetera?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, they are, Mr. Speaker.

Log Houses

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Associate Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Recognizing that an increasing number of Albertans are either building or wanting to build their own log houses, and that the source of timber in this area, at least, used to be the Whitecourt forest area, which is now primarily under lease to a major operator, my question is: is the minister aware of any suitable areas of convenient access where people can pick out and cut their own logs?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, special permits are still available to those individuals who wish to avail themselves of the logs in regard to building. My suggestion would be that if an individual were to contact the forestry office for the area he was interested in, it

could indicate the availability, the areas that would be available, and the provision of the special permit.

MR. CHAMBERS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I presume these logs could be cut. The applicant would pay normal Crown dues. Is that correct?

MR. SCHMIDT: The obligations of the individual, Mr. Speaker, would be set out at the time of the issuance of the permit. I also understand that at the present time there are some commercial outlets where individuals could purchase building logs.

Western Premiers' Conference

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, like the hon. Member for Calgary Bow, I have been sitting in anticipation all morning expecting a question of importance to be asked of the hon. Deputy Premier as to the very significant attendance he had at Yorkton, Saskatchewan. Before I ask the question, I wonder if the hon. Deputy Premier would nod his head as to whether or not he was there in fact. Yes. May the *Hansard* show that the hon. Deputy Premier was there, Mr. Speaker.

On that basis I would like to ask the hon. Deputy Premier whether or not it is the position of the western premiers to contact the Premier of the province of Quebec to endorse the position that Premier has taken relative to the budgetary measures that have been announced by the federal government, considering that their positions seem to be very similar now.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. Premier will be able to answer that much better than I at the start of next week. However, I would point out that in the communique issued yesterday in Yorkton, the four western premiers underlined that the practice the federal government used in its budgetary measures didn't help national unity.

MR. GHITTER: A supplementary if I may, Mr. Speaker. Then might I ask the hon. Deputy Premier whether or not there were meetings relative to the acceleration of the recommendations of the Hall commission report, in order to encourage the federal government to get something done in that particular area?

DR. HORNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday afternoon was allocated to the ongoing problems of transportation in western Canada, and a communique will be issued this morning from Saskatoon covering the results of the discussions we had yesterday.

MR. GHITTER: A final supplementary. I take it then that the hon. Deputy Premier cannot advise the House at this particular time as to what will be in that communique?

DR. HORNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can advise that the communique initially will cover the request again for improved and increased action on the recommendations of the Hall report. It will cover other matters that are also in the Hall report but were specifically touched on, having to do with rehabilitation of rail lines, the extension and expansion of port facilities at both Prince Rupert and Churchill, and the improved

port access in Vancouver. It will also touch on the question of the expansion of domestic air line charters so Canadians can visit one another. I expect it will also have something in it about the Canadian Transport Commission moving ahead and modernizing the regulations with regard to belly cargo as it affects passenger charter planes.

MR. GHITTER: If I might, Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Deputy Premier, who is certainly providing us with some very important information this morning. I wonder whether the province of Alberta made any commitments to the western premiers relative to the assistance of the financing of the port facilities at Prince Rupert, or whether that was discussed.

DR. HORNER: That matter was discussed, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as the negotiations are continuing and no final arrangement has been reached, all I could do yesterday was to apprise the premiers of the state of those negotiations, and of course outline to them the very major benefits to western Canadian farmers of any increase in shipment of grain through west coast ports.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Deputy Premier. Has the department been able to do an evaluation at this point as to the impact on the Hall commission report of the tax changes announced in the federal budget with respect to trackage and rail line modification?

DR. HORNER: No, Mr. Speaker, but we are working on it now. I'm trying to get more definitive information from Ottawa as to how it may in fact speed up the rehabilitation process and, indeed, how it may affect any new building of railways in Alberta.

Yellowhead Highway

MR. ZANDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Transportation. Somehow or other the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo asked a similar or the same question I intended. However, has the minister some understanding or agreement with the federal department on sharing the cost of upgrading the Yellowhead Highway?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, the representations have been made by the Yellowhead highway association, and these representations have been endorsed by the four western provinces. But the federal government has not to date accepted the Yellowhead Highway as a designated road to which they would contribute funds. They did contribute some funds in Saskatchewan relative to the oil tax money, and are contributing some relative to the oil tax money in Alberta as well, and they are designated in the throughway program.

MR. ZANDER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Are there any indications by the federal ministry that at some time in the future they are going to four-lane the Yellowhead Highway through Jasper National Park?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, they've had some discussions relative to four-laning through both Banff and Jasper. I would suggest that the major priority has to be in Banff, because of the nature of the traffic there. That's about as much as I'm aware of relative to the federal government's position in that matter.

Automobile Insurance

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Solicitor General. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether he's developed an airtight mechanism or changed the policy to assure that all car drivers in Alberta are now insured, especially with regard to using insurance agents, regarding monitoring of those who have cancelled their car insurance?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't pretend that any policy is absolutely airtight, but we think the situation has improved. You will recall that last fall the act was amended to place a responsibility on insurance agents to give information to the police on request, also delegating my powers to seize licence plates from uninsured vehicles. The police are following through rigorously on inspecting the validity of pink cards. I would expect that the season for most activity would be three months from April 30, the end of the licensing year — three months and six months respectively, on the assumption there might still be some people who take a very short-term policy in order to buy their plates.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the minister indicate to the House whether there is a definite policy or direction from him or his department that insurance agents must report cancellation of policies to the department or to whomever?

MR. FARRAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It's not only a policy; it's the law of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: We've run slightly over the time for the question period. But in view of the time taken up on the point of privilege, if the Assembly would agree, I would recognize the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who has indicated he would like to ask a further question.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Public Accounts

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, is the Treasurer in a position to indicate to the Assembly when we'll have volumes three and four of Public Accounts?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I haven't got that information yet. I hope to have it by Monday.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Before we go into Committee of Supply, would the Assembly agree to revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**
(reversion)

MR. HARLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and hon. members. There is in the members gallery a group of students from my constituency. They are a group of 40 high school students from Gus Wetter High School at Castor. I wonder if I could ask them to rise and receive the welcome from the Assembly.

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: We will continue with the estimates of the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower. We had completed most of our list. I believe we had only one member who wished to speak, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. Do you wish to continue?

MR. NOTLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to continue. But as I recall our discussions on Wednesday, I think the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood still had several questions. I would defer to her questions, if she wishes to complete them, then I have a few comments I'd like to make.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Chairman, I was going to change the tenor of my remarks and questions into different areas, which would not be a continuation of Athabasca University. This would lead the discussion into an entirely different area, so if the hon. member wanted to continue or start on other questions it's perfectly all right. I don't wish to monopolize the floor.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Minister, I'd like to raise several issues. I did raise one or two of them on Wednesday, and I want to come back to them. First of all I'd like you to outline to the committee what changes, if any, have been made as a consequence of the meetings that occurred after the debate we had in the Legislature. I recall the Premier's speech on March 15. As I recollect his comments he indicated that the government would be prepared to take a second look at the utility question as far as universities are concerned. There had been very substantial increases in utility costs for postsecondary institutions throughout the province, but in particular the University of Alberta had documented the increase. Very specifically, Mr. Minister, I wonder if you'd respond on that question, whether there will be any change in funding vis-a-vis the utility issue.

Secondly, I would like to say to the government that it seems to me we should be moving away from the type of system we have seen in place for the last

several years, and return to a formula grant system. It seems to me that would be generally a better, more workable system for the universities. I would argue that it should be tied to a period of time, so there can be advance planning instead of the year to year uncertainty of the present arrangement. We've argued this in the debate, and I suppose there's not a great deal of point in arguing here again over the whole restraint program. I see that the restraint program will have some impact on whether or not you could move toward a formula grant system. But in my judgment that would be a more workable arrangement for our postsecondary institutions in the province.

The second thing the Premier made reference to during the course of his remarks on the fifteenth was to take a look at student finance. As I see it, Mr. Minister, we should be completely revamping the approach we take to student finance. At the present time we have a remission system. But as I understand the regulations of that system, there are all sorts of problems that the student has to face. For example, if a student doesn't earn a certain specified amount during the summer, he doesn't qualify for the remission.

As a matter of fact, another point I want to raise is the whole question of what one might call the age of independence. I've had brought to my attention a number of cases of young people who are going on to university but aren't able to get assistance from home. But because of the regulations, the Students Finance Board says: well, just a minute; your parents are earning X amount of money; under these circumstances we are not in a position to make a loan available to you. Mr. Minister, we all know it would be very nice if we had happy family units. But there are times when, for one reason or another, young people break with their parents. As I view the regulations, it seems to me that this whole question of the age of independence is something we have to take a look at.

Now I want to tie that to the larger question of student finance. Can I suggest to the government that rather than this present arrangement of remission after the fact, it would be a more workable arrangement to have a combined system of grants and loans during a student's university education. I submit that that would be a more workable arrangement.

When I attended the University of Alberta almost 20 years ago, we had the system of grants and loans. In principle I think that is a better system than a remission concept afterwards. I'd like the minister to comment on how he sees the options and whether or not the government is giving any thought to reassessing the grant/loan question.

Mr. Chairman, moving on from the issue of student finance. I was rather surprised in looking over the figures on STEP, Mr. Minister. Even though unemployment in Alberta isn't as bad as it is in most other parts of the country, there has been an increase relative to other years. I look at the figures: in 1976 we allocated \$6,200,000 for STEP; last year, \$4 million; and this year, an allocation of \$2 million. I realize we can always beef that up through special warrant if we need to. But I say to you, in presenting a budget to the committee and to the Legislature: based on what happened last year, why do we not budget that addi-

tional amount of money rather than having to go the route of a special warrant?

The figures I've been able to get from Manpower, albeit these are figures from last year, indicate a range of between 8 and 12 per cent in student unemployment. I have no idea of what it will be this year. It could in fact be somewhat higher. But it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the STEP budget is lower than it should be.

Mr. Chairman, there's one other area with respect to the whole university operating field that troubles me somewhat. During the debate on March 15, a lot of emphasis was placed on the salaries of some of our professors at the universities. I would say to this government quite frankly: if the Attorney General can rise in his place this morning and make a very strong appeal for salaries that will attract lawyers in the private sector to work as Crown counsel, by the same token we have to recognize that if we're going to retain competent, qualified academics the range of salaries for professionals in Alberta is going to put a larger strain on the budgets of our universities than at universities in the Atlantic region of the country or some of the slow-growth areas of Canada.

I raise that in defence of the academics, because it's very easy to jump on them and single them out for criticism. I think we have to look at it as objectively as possible, keeping in mind that we're dealing with people we want, in most instances anyway, to retain at our postsecondary institutions.

The specific reason I wanted to get into this, Mr. Minister, was to raise the problem of the teaching assistants. Most of our debate in the Legislature last month focused on the professors, the associate professors, and the assistant professors. It seems to me that one of the yardsticks of a first-class university has to be the postgraduate program. If it is to be successful, the postgraduate program has to be tied into the role of the teaching assistants in terms of income for the postgraduate students, research that goes on at the institution, and qualified teaching of undergraduate students.

The difficulty I see with our present program is that we now find the money available for TAs in very short supply. Mr. Minister, the increase this year is still leaving these people at a level I don't think any member of this Legislature would tolerate. So I make the plea: we have to beef up TA funding if we're going to retain teaching assistants, and underscore the importance of that particular program at the universities.

Mr. Chairman, I've brought a number of these issues together because I have another engagement, and have to fly up to the Peace River country to meet with some reeves and mayors. So I've attempted to crystallize the questions into one speech. I would ask the minister to respond point by point.

Last Wednesday I raised an issue with respect to the scholarship question as a consequence of a young chap in my constituency, a very brilliant student who had an average of 80 per cent or thereabouts in high school. As I see it, he should have qualified for the scholarship, but doesn't because of the regulations. I say quite honestly that scholarship regulations should be based on the competence of the student, not on where the student attends, whether it's in a university facility here or elsewhere in the country.

Mr. Chairman, the final point I'd like to raise on postsecondary education — I want to say something about manpower in a moment — is the student housing problems. I realize the minister did spend some time answering my questions on this on Wednesday. But as one reviews the student housing situation in Alberta, an awful lot is to be desired. For example, according to information brought to me, I understand we have some very serious problems at Lac La Biche. The facilities there are, quite frankly, substandard. There's even some problem with fire regulations. Private, affordable housing in our major facilities is diminishing. I'm not saying it doesn't exist, but it's diminishing.

Twenty or 30 years ago when most of us were at the University of Alberta, it wasn't very difficult to get off-campus housing — basement suites, if nothing else, and little garrets in some of those old houses. But most of them are torn down. We have nice, shiny, new apartments. You don't get the little garret and the basement anymore. In my view, Mr. Minister, there is a problem of affordable housing for students.

I want to move from advanced education and, in doing so, to say I was very pleased with the announcement at Fairview College. I commend the government for moving on that. I'm very pleased to see that \$2 million commitment this year. It will be extremely helpful as far as our college is concerned.

I want to move to the overall issue of manpower requirements in Alberta. I think it's probably fair for the Alberta government to make it clear to other Canadians that Alberta — or Saskatchewan, which has a very low unemployment rate too — is not the land of milk and honey for every person to come here if they don't have skills. Accurate information on the job market in Alberta is very important if we are not to mislead other Canadians. In my judgment, there is something rather sad about an unskilled, unemployed person from Cape Breton Island, travelling 2,500 or 3,000 miles across the country to become an unemployed, unskilled person in Edmonton or Calgary. So we have to provide accurate information on the situation in the province.

Having said that, I want to take this opportunity in committee, at least as far as the party I lead is concerned, to dissociate myself completely from one rather unbelievable proposal made last fall concerning work permits. This proposal wasn't made by the present government. It was made by another political party not represented in the Legislature. I think it is an absolutely incredible proposition that any person in public life in this province would be advocating a system of work permits within Canada.

We have to be honest and fair in terms of information. But if people decide they want to move from Newfoundland to Alberta, or from Alberta to Newfoundland, or Quebec to the Yukon, or the Northwest Territories to British Columbia, that's up to them. In my view the idea that we would have a six-month waiting list, a work permit system, is completely wrong. I raise that because I know that as unemployment begins to creep up in Alberta, you're going to be under some pressure from many people who will say, well, let's keep other Canadians out of Alberta.

I'm not known as a great booster of this government and, in the next six months, I'm sure I will

retain that reputation. But I do want to underscore the importance on this issue, that we shouldn't be playing around with our country's future. I hope and assume that the minister's answers last fall constituted the official policy of the government of Alberta. If they do, Mr. Minister, I just want to tell you that you have my support on that score.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May the Member for St. Paul have leave to revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**
(*reversion*)

MR. FLUKER: Mr. Chairman, this morning I am honored to have in our public gallery some 64 students from the Glen Avon School in St. Paul. They have with them their teachers Mr. Zukiwsky and Mr. Malech, and their bus driver Mr. Barlao. I would ask this House to recognize them in the regular manner.

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

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Chairman, I have a few comments to make to the minister regarding the student loan situation. I have been asked about this on various occasions. I wonder if the minister would consider re-evaluating the whole proposition of student loans. We have many students who, for one reason or another — their parents either don't consider higher education necessary or in some way want to block higher education. After being in the loaning business for a number of years, I consider we should make any loans available on a universal basis — maybe not make any money at it.

I also question the whole idea of the rebate depending on the parents' income and so on. Once a student has gone through university or a secondary educational system, he should be in exactly the same position as any other student, regardless of the amount of money the family may have had when they entered into that. It's on that balance that I question why a student, because his family may have been reasonably well able to pay, should be paying for an unfair relationship, as compared to another family.

I certainly believe we should probably set down one rate, one system, and monitor a little more, probably have the students contribute a little more in some instances, and then put a ceiling on it, on the basis of the educational program they're in. In other words, if a student receives a degree in law, that we not go on and pay more so he can go on and take another degree in something else and build up letters behind his name.

MR. YOUNG: Just a very brief comment to the minister about a concern I have. I'm not sure it's well founded or otherwise. But I did see a report about some charges being laid, I think over the misuse or inappropriate use of student loans. I'm not sure whether or not that was a correct report. What concerned me was that it seemed to be of a nature

which could jeopardize a professional's future. I wanted to offer my concern that if in fact we are tightening up, which maybe we very well should, I would like to see us do it on a "this day forward" basis, rather than start looking through loose files to see if we can find people who have abused the program in a manner which wasn't anticipated.

I think fair warning should be given. Presumably they've always had it. But from what I have understood, it has not always been observed. I would just like to say that if we're going to do that, I'm all for it. But let's do it on a "this day forward" basis, rather than do anything which would jeopardize a career.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman and members of the Assembly, I was going to suggest that any questions or statements having to do with the subject before us, universities in particular, might be completed before I respond. A great deal would depend on the time the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has before he must leave the Assembly. If he has to leave within minutes, in fairness to him I would respond to his questions in particular. He has made an important and indeed significant contribution to the discussion of the estimates of our department, and I would wish to respond. If he has more time, I would entreat you, sir, to let the questioning on the universities go. I would respond at one time. But I would be guided by the response of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. NOTLEY: I have about half an hour, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Chairman, in the House the other day when I spoke in the budget debate, I mentioned I had real concern about the lack of technicians and tradesmen in the province of Alberta and the manner in which our province was progressing, particularly in the petrochemical field. I was wondering if the minister is prepared to put some additional courses in, say, the University of Calgary. I've had concerns expressed to me by the surveyors' association of Alberta that they have made a recommendation that they'd like to have a course starting possibly in September 1978. I wonder if the minister could elaborate on this.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure I'll be able to contain all my remarks with respect to universities prior to the minister making his response. But I would like to make a good start on them, then we can perhaps take a second or third opportunity to continue.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview raised the matter of student finance and program support in housing. I'd like to make just a few comments on that, then have the minister provide us with information as to his views and considerations and information available to him and the department in this regard. I know that currently it appears in reports that the student federation intends to pursue through the courts the matter of this government's decision to put in place a differentiation of student fees in regard to foreign students and Alberta students.

I think there was a reasonably good debate in this Assembly when this subject was before us a year ago. I think a pretty significant indication had come forward as to the public's view of the whole matter of

student fees for university entrance and the matter of differentiation and increase in fees for foreign students. In the past I think there was discussion and consideration of the matter of foreign students coming to this country and to this province for their education, and then perhaps the requirement that they return to their own country to assist in the development and progress such third world countries make. That was totally different and apart from a responsibility of an individual university or particular province to carry in total — on its back, so to speak — the responsibility of educating such students for the benefit of other countries. In fact the issue of whether the students return to their own countries is a matter of question, in relation to the support being given.

I would like to indicate my feelings and my views, as I have read them from my constituents and other constituents in the province, in regard to foreign student support. I think the matter of students attending the various universities across this country is more appropriately considered under the federal jurisdiction insofar as immigration is concerned. I think it is important that the responsibility of support of this nature, which can in fact be termed international aid in financing, is quite properly considered under the federal government.

I know that in addition to foreign aid the federal government provides, the provincial government has an international aid program, specifically and exclusively of this government, for which the contributions are out of revenues from citizens of Alberta, matched with support being given by various agencies from the private sector.

I think it is essential to recognize it is possible that if there were a very real need and a program were put forward for specific foreign student aid, surely a plan could be worked out and put in place. Whether there is one now is not a matter of question, but whether there is the flexibility in the programs in the aid that is being provided internationally, whether there is such flexibility to consider that aspect of support in foreign aid.

My information with regard to programs and the positions foreign governments take with respect to the education of their students — particularly those who wish to go abroad to one of the countries and provinces, maybe Canada and Alberta — is that a mechanism is available within the structure of the governments of the third world countries to assist those students if they are not able to provide such financial support out of their own family resources. A mechanism is available, and whether some of the funds provided in our international aid programs, vis-a-vis provincial programs and federal programs, could not be directed by the governments of those countries in question who wish to have students go abroad to be educated and come back and assist in the development of their own countries. Surely the governments of those countries should be and are capable of making those decisions and those allocations. I would hope the minister might confirm or enlighten us in that very area in his response.

Further with respect to student fees, the question raised very recently by the march on the Legislature and the debate pursued thereafter, and the representation time and again, even after the submission of facts with respect to the funding that has been made

available to the university and the student finance programs that are available — although those, I would suggest, should and are continuously being monitored and reviewed as to whether they are adequate to meet the needs in the changing times. Nevertheless, the constant representation on the part of the universities and the students that this government has pulled back its funding support is . . . There are some very real terms that could be used, which I will refrain from using, with respect to the criticism of such representation to the public. It's misleading to the general citizenry of this province to say that this government has cut back. Surely there must be a very clear understanding that a cutback is a decrease in the amount of support from a level which previously had been provided. Surely that is not the fact.

When there is an acknowledgement by the universities that they are receiving an additional 8 per cent over and above what was received last year, how on earth can they continue to represent to the citizens of Alberta, and be credible — to say this government has cut back on what it had been providing in support? I have to question the institutions of higher learning and the direction they are going, and the expectations that the general public — the support it is giving both in funding and otherwise — how they expect to maintain their credibility. I think the responsibility is greater than the performance that has been indicated to this time.

I would like to go into a number of other areas with regard to the universities, and they have to do with sabbatical leaves, with faculty salaries. I am not sure if the hon. minister would wish to respond to the many issues that have been raised to this point. In view of the consideration that has been asked by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I will hold back on the matter of tenure, sabbatical leave, and so on.

I see that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview is not in his chair. Perhaps I will continue with just a few more remarks: the whole question of university staffing, the percentages of staff in relation to students, the ratio that exists. We have varying ratios presented to us. Yet when we look at the numbers of staff on the payroll, the information surely doesn't seem to be consistent with the real numbers that are available to provide the instructional services which they are on record to provide. When we look at the percentage of faculty on sabbatical leave at any one time, surely that has to have a bearing on the operational costs of the university.

Surely the university board of governors and the entire university plant has a responsibility to examine the application and distribution of the funds it receives in support of its operation. If they are asking for continued autonomy, surely their performance has to be greater than it has been to date for the public seriously to have the trust they are asking for.

Mr. Chairman, for a number of years I have read on the matter of tenure within educational institutions. People prepare themselves for various professions, for whatever career they select. I'm not sure there is in any other career a guarantee of employment irrespective of performance. Surely one has to say that the only guarantee one can have in any career must be the competence and performance they provide to that particular position.

It would seem to me that no institution or university would release any employee or individual who has

contributed extensively to the improvement, the betterment, and the continuation of a level of learning that would gain and continue to hold respect across this country and internationally. Surely there should be no fear that that individual would not have tenure in that sense; tenure in performance, but surely not tenure with respect to simply having a piece of paper that says there are no circumstances under which I may be released from my job except in the instance of breaking the law. I think that is going far overboard.

I would like the minister to give his views on this matter and very seriously consider whether that is not an issue, and whether the boards of governors of universities and institutions should not have a real examination and reconsideration of the matter of tenure, at some point indicating that that has not a proper place in our universities.

I see the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview is back in his seat now. I'll give the opportunity for the minister to reply to some of the issues raised there, and I would continue with some questions later.

DR. HOHOL: I appreciate the consideration of the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood. I should like to comment in two ways. First, in large measure the discussions today, as on Wednesday, were expressions of position, of principle, of assessment of the services, programs, and performance of our department. I hope hon. members who have contributed today do not feel in any way that I am going past a point or a question if I don't deal with it specifically. I have taken note and for the most part find myself in agreement. So it would likely be an improper use of the time of the House if I were to deal with every one. But let me deal with those in which questions were explicit or even implicit.

With respect to the matter of utilities, drawn to our attention by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, the Premier and I did say in our discussions on a Sunday afternoon with the leadership of the University of Alberta, and it was reiterated by the hon. Premier on March 15 here in the House in the debate on financing of postsecondary education, that we would take a look at the cost of utilities and see if it places undue and improper pressure on postsecondary institutions. There's no question, Mr. Chairman, that utilities are a normal cost of doing business, whether in the home, a church, a store, or an institution. At some point it could be inordinate, and I believe that's the case the University of Alberta, other institutions, and several hon. members are making. That is the point we are re-examining.

The Premier and I had asked the leadership of the University of Alberta to present the case specifically. I mention this because the hon. member said that in fact the University had done that. I have to say it hadn't. We invited it to do so, and I take this opportunity to ask again that the University of Alberta make the case.

What it has done, not just this year but last year and the year before, is ask to be exempted from the system put in place by the government through the Minister of Utilities and Telephones. But we do not believe that is where the case lies. The case lies in the inordinate use of money for a utility, therefore deflecting dollars from educational use. I believe the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview would agree with me.

When we get the case in that sense rather than as an exemption, it would be my personal view — and I have not yet made this as a recommendation to government, but will — that all institutions in post-secondary education be assessed in this way. It's clear at this point that only the University of Alberta would benefit, because of its size and the many buildings in its plant.

With respect to funding, I think the formula approach may well be the best way to go in the long term. I'm certain the implication has to do with the number of students in one institution in contrast to another. It has to be an important factor in formula funding, but not the sole one. The hon. member who raised the question and others would recognize that things like research components, development money, start-up money, special program funding, and other kinds of factors would go into the formula, including the differences in and amongst the institutions. No two are alike. No two have a similar function. I have a real feel for some kind of factor to go into the formula that says this institution is different; it has a different function and is meeting it, and therefore should be earning additional revenue for it.

I should like to comment briefly but importantly on the matter of student finance, important in the sense that as many members as can, who are concerned and want to take time to take a look at some of the points made here today by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking, and others, should write to me or talk to me and advise me. In general my response would be that we are going to take a look at some possible short-term changes and, secondly, that we will take a look at some possible long-term changes. The short-term changes will have to make sense; they will have to stand the tests of reasonableness and economics in both ways, for the public and for the students, keeping in mind in particular the student and the tax-paying public. So those are the two commitments we made with respect to utilities and student finance, and we will attempt to respond.

But as the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview mentioned, there is a longer term aspect to the student finance situation. I will look at that in a different context. Certain matters like remission, whether you do it at the front end and call it a grant, or at the back end and call it remission, are important questions. On balance, remission appears to be a good way to go. But it may have served its time. We're not certain. It's a complex one, I agree, and we'll certainly look at it.

The age of independence is certainly an interesting one. Right from the cradle we talk in our families, schools, and communities: stand on your own feet, learn how to look after yourself. The age of independence appears to fly in the face of this. We'll be looking at it.

I could go on on each element. I'd like to know how people feel about summer earnings. They're an important part of the program, and students should earn and save. When they can't, there are exemption procedures. But maybe there is a more holistic approach, somewhat as the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking was drawing to our attention, a program and application with close monitoring.

With respect to the comments on universities by the hon. members for Spirit River-Fairview and Ed-

monton Norwood, I simply have made very close notes. There is little I have in the way of disagreement. That debate was held on March 15. Nothing has occurred since then, not because the mind is closed or the ears are shut tight but because nothing has come to my attention that would cause me to change the funding from 8.25 to 8.26. So the only two areas of possible modification — it wasn't a commitment to change; it was a commitment to look to see if we might change — would be in the area of utilities and student finance. In the area of looking at students' applications, I will respond to the hon. Member for Jasper Place that certainly his point was well made. There is no intention by the board or the government to begin a hunt to ferret out people who may have given improper information, knowingly or unknowingly. But The Students Finance Act is a statute of the government. The applications that support it are legal forms, and the information that goes on them has to be accurate and proper.

With respect to the question on scholarships, inquired about on Wednesday — and the specific case is helpful, because it places the matter in context — generally speaking, as we have it today . . . I'm taking the example of marine biology, our students in British Columbia. These are supported with all benefits in the third and fourth years, Mr. Chairman, when they actually enter the major studies. The way The Students Finance Act reads, if a program cannot be obtained in an institution in Alberta, but can be elsewhere, the student can then qualify for student finance. The fact is that the first and second years of most baccalaureate degrees are common. They are the science, arts, or whatever, and those can be obtained at Alberta institutions. But as the hon. member properly pointed out, the major studies cannot be; that is to say, the third and fourth years. In that case the student should have qualified. If that has not been the case, I would wish it to be drawn to my personal attention, and I would give it that kind of attention.

With respect to housing — my colleague the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works was in the House until just a few moments ago. Now that the freeze has been taken off, we're going to look in a global way at student housing. For the information of the House, we are constructing in Vermilion and Fairview; we have constructed at Lethbridge Community College. Our policy for student housing is part of a larger policy on housing. We have been fairly open about the private sector building in the area of student housing. But likely they don't find it profitable, and private business doesn't stay in business very long if their projects are not profitable. It is interesting to note that Lister Hall — and I'm subject to correction here, but I believe I'm accurate — for the first time is not fully occupied this year. That doesn't mean somebody else, like the University of Calgary, doesn't need student housing.

We are pleased to continue the discussion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. You recall that in my earlier remarks I dealt with the question of assistance to higher and further educational institutions. I have the element book now, Mr. Minister. I wonder if you could make available to me the 1977-78 estimates for the various institutions

under: Provincially Administered Institutions, Public Colleges — Operating, Private Colleges, University — Operating, Public Colleges — Capital, and Universities — Capital. Mr. Minister, my reason for asking for the budget of a year ago — and I don't need it right today — is to compare apples to apples rather than apples to oranges as we compare the estimates of last year to the estimates of this year, because that's what the House approved a year ago.

The second point I would like to raise, Mr. Minister, is: how does your department relate its manpower projection work to the universities, and what kind of mechanism is established to take the information your department acquires, I understand, as far as future manpower needs? How do you translate those, and how does the university use them to make decisions with regard to job opportunities and educational opportunities?

DR. HOHOL: I'll postpone the first question for another time. It is in fact in the documents, but I'll draw to the attention of the hon. leader where it is and how it is documented.

The other one is a very, very complex question. I want to deal with it very carefully, because while the projections and the predictions with respect to manpower needs are a significant part of the work of the planning secretariat — and they're doing it very well — what is done with the information is completely at the discretion of the consumer or the user of that kind of information.

The institutions, for example, the universities — let's take a specific example. Engineering, which has been a matter of discussion before the House on Wednesday in question periods, is a proper one. The institution itself feels the pressure of qualified student applicants, and I presume the university looks at the projections as we have them. The projections are based on specific ways of computing them. That's technical, but it's not unrelated to another set of projections that have to do with the social and economic indicators of how Alberta's going to be in the years to come. The institution then — the same thing with high school counsellors — is in a position to counsel or advise that yes, if you want a career in this occupation and if you are qualified, in the long term it appears you can have a career. It's important to say this, Mr. Chairman, because if qualified and there's no prediction that there will be a career because it's of a short-term occupational nature, students properly should take care about moving into that particular kind of enterprise.

Another illustration is the really spectacular rise in the number of apprentices in Alberta in the last half-dozen years. So Alberta, with a near 8 per cent population, within the national figures, was around in excess of 25 per cent of apprentices for the whole nation, an increase of about 7 per cent back in 1971. Mr. Chairman, the reason is simply this: not that there weren't opportunities before, but there had not been a clear indication there would be a need for apprentices in the long term. That being the case, no one is going to invest four years of hard work to become a tradesman who may not be needed after a year or two, if at all.

So it was an economic circumstance that placed a demand on NAIT, SAIT, and other places. In that type of illustration, it is safe to say that institutions other

than technical ones like the universities, the colleges, would respond to our figures in terms of how they read the total economy. Their mandate in many cases is education for its own sake, unrelated to the economy; in other cases, to respond specifically to the individual who wants to be a particular professional or occupational kind of performer; and in some measure to respond to the institution's capacity to read Alberta as it's going to be in the years to come. Certainly the institutions must be protected to educate for education's sake.

I believe in that proposition and am a strong supporter, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition must be. But at the same time, I do not feel that to read the promise and to predict its capacity in the years to come is foreign or alien to the nature of an institution of advanced education. The two are different and separable, but they're not so disparate that they should not be a function of any one institution in the province of Alberta.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Mr. Minister, I admire your agility, but let's get down to the specifics. Does the minister sit down with, let's say, the president or representatives of the universities, the president of NAIT, SAIT, and the colleges once a year and say, now look, from our manpower people these are the kinds of projections we see for the next five years?

I recall very well when the hon. minister was the Minister of Manpower and Labour, and at that time we heard in rather glowing terms about how the manpower work was going to enable our postsecondary educational institutions to better reflect the priorities of the province. So what I'm trying to get at is specifically, when does the minister sit down with the universities, the colleges, NAIT, and SAIT, and talk about the manpower projections and how we might fit them into the priorities of the various educational institutions? Because if we're not doing that then, from the standpoint of much of the area of postsecondary education, we're simply not making use of that information. I'm not advocating that the universities educate people solely for jobs. That is one part, though, of the university's mandate, and an important part of it.

But, Mr. Minister, I get the impression from your comments that your department does not specifically sit down with the senior officials, the chairmen of the boards, or the presidents of the institutions once a year and talk in terms of manpower projections for the next five years. I'd like the minister to confirm that, and then indicate what happens specifically as far as NAIT and SAIT are concerned, because those are provincially controlled institutions.

DR. HOHOL: I'm very pleased not to confirm but to correct any misunderstanding I may have left. I said I'd be careful, and it's not to withhold any attitudes or activities, but to make certain that the rather surprising notion is still abroad in the province, particularly in some of the institutions, that putting together the departments of manpower and advanced education was very specifically to tool and retool the occupational needs of the province through the manpower division. That is not the case. But what the hon. Leader of the Opposition says is the case.

While I don't personally sit with sheets of figures, I

do meet with the chairmen, the presidents, and other constituent groups, and we talk about policy. From time to time we talk about the very matter under discussion today. But I have to be very clear that the projections would simply be foolhardy if they were not used in terms of being interpreted and explained to the institutions, and for them to know the meaning, design, validity, and reliability. That's not the case. Our senior officials are in constant touch, and in meetings with the senior officials of institutions on all matters. Certainly this is one of them. It would be blindness to have reliable and valid information — and we're at that stage where it is — and withhold it from the people who do the training and preparation of people for occupations and professions. The institutions have ways of testing the data they have, and a good number of them do. The engineering departments, business administration, and nearly all the professional and occupational groups try in their own ways to maintain a catalogue of the people they will need and can handle, because it relates to their capacity and need for professors, space, equipment, and a whole host of things.

I want to be very clear, certainly in our own provincially administered institutions which try specifically to respond to the Alberta circumstance, that information is very much a part of how, when, and why they make decisions. It's shared with institutions that have boards of governors who manage the affairs of those institutions. But that information is also there, and there isn't any doubt that, while it doesn't completely and entirely navigate the institutions into one direction or another, they cannot help but make judgments based upon inclusion of a host of other information on predictions with respect to manpower needs in the next decade.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a number of other points. Although I know members are perhaps anxious to get going on the vote, I think it's important that some of us reflect, during the estimates, upon the points that are burning us through the period of time. There doesn't always seem to be appropriate time to raise the issues. I think this is probably as excellent a time as any.

I have made a number of remarks with regard to universities. I would like to make a few more in that regard, and also have the minister make some comments with respect to immigration.

On the matter of the postsecondary institutions, I'm sure each and every institution has a certain mandate. From discussions with citizens and my constituents, it appears to me that they are no longer very clear as to what the mandate is with respect to many of the institutions. What is the direction in which they are going? What is the competence or the excellence they are to provide? I wonder if the minister might cover that area sometime before the close of the estimates.

Let me just draw one or two examples of what I'm enquiring about or commenting on. More and more I think we are finding the various groups of professions and occupations — each and every one perhaps for prestige and other reasons — are attempting to get recognition and support that their course of studies and educational training should be obtained and recognized through the university system, rather than the colleges or any other postsecondary institution

we have available.

I think there perhaps needs to be a redefining of what the primary role of the universities should be, and what in fact is the primary role of the colleges, the AVCs, NAIT and SAIT, and to re-examine whether in fact there hasn't been a greater degree of — I'm not sure whether the terminology is correct — but let us say the encroachment or the infiltration of courses from one level of institution to another where there really perhaps ought not to be. That is, are we providing or placing into the course content or the university faculties training and courses which probably are more properly in place in our college system, to a point of granting a degree or certification? I think the cost between one level of institution and another is very significant. I do not wish that remark to have a connotation that one level of institution should have less significance than another, but simply the role it is designed or desirable for it to play.

I would also like the minister to make some comment with regard to the funding or financial support between the public colleges, the provincially administered institutions, and the universities, and how the ratio compares. Has each been equally supported, or is there perhaps some basis for criticism that one is treated with more favoritism than the other in the sense of funding?

I think the minister indicated some time back that he was giving consideration to working out a plan for a school of optometry in western Canada. I wonder whether there is any advancement in that consideration amongst the three or four western provinces; whether the minister has some feeling that perhaps the more significant and appropriate location might be the province of Alberta; what the relationship of funding then might be amongst the other provinces; whether they are supportive of establishing a school of optometry. I think it's significant, Mr. Chairman, to recognize there is a very real shortage of manpower in optometry in this province, and no doubt in western Canada. I think the percentage of manpower to meet the needs of the citizens of an area always has a great determination in the cost of the service. That should not be taken in isolation, but certainly should be relevant, as the overwhelming factor in the service that can be provided to citizens; then the cost of that service and whether citizens are able to afford that kind of service if it is not covered under a national or provincial health scheme.

I know that time and time again the issue of coverage of dental services under our Alberta health care plan has been raised. I think it's appropriate to raise that issue here under these estimates, because I have no doubt that the decision with respect to the capability of including that type of service under our current health care plan has a great deal to do with the manpower in this particular profession. I think that if one wishes to have appointments for dental work, generally the waiting time is lengthy. I think the people in the profession are overtaxed with the number of patients they must service. Of course all that is relevant to cost, the amount of adequate time that is spent with patients, the real nature and quality of the service. That remark is not being made to be critical of the members of the profession. It is simply the possibility that they are able to cope with the kind of demand and pressure on them with regard to the service required.

I hope that the minister might make some comments with regard to apprenticeship in this province, some of the requirements under our current legislation and in practice with regard to the manpower needs in the areas where there are shortages in service; whether there is some examination as to the standards required where apprentices are being taken on by the private sector. Is there an examination of altering those requirements? Or is there in fact a need? From information that has been provided to me I feel there is a need to alter the standards, not to weaken the quality of service but to alter the magnitude of standards.

Recently we've had some remarks with regard to the number of students graduating from universities and not being able to get employment. I bring that point up because it has been a concern of mine over a number of years. Perhaps the universities are not paying significant enough attention to the changing needs and times, the changing manpower requirements, with respect to the direction in which this province is heading economically. Are they streamlining their courses effectively enough? Are they giving some counsel to applicants, to students registering at the universities, or providing some counsel in the way of information to the high schools as to the areas where there is a longer projected manpower need, bearing in mind the period of time it requires to educate or train students or people into certain professions and careers?

I recognize that some of these areas are certainly totally within the jurisdiction and competence of the university to make. Bearing in mind the kind of autonomy that the universities and postsecondary institutions are striving to maintain, I feel there should be a proper and adequate dialogue between the minister and these institutions, bearing in mind that part of the minister's portfolio is that of manpower, that certain information would be available and possible. Are the universities requesting and having the kind of dialogue that is necessary to keep them up to date on the kinds of internal decisions and examinations they must make to be effective, to meet the changing needs of this province and this country?

We must recognize that not all the students who will be trained and educated in our institutions are going to remain here. Certainly there will be exchange, there will be some export and import of students. But bearing in mind the ratios or percentages, from past experience we certainly have been able to predict the numbers who leave and the numbers who stay, and what our needs are. Is the university really geared to meet that kind of requirement? I know I've had representations time and time again.

I'm not saying I totally agree with my next point, but I have made a commitment to citizens who have raised this issue with me that I would raise it on estimates and bring it to the attention of the minister, although I know he is currently in advance of and well informed on many of these areas. I am continuing to have an increase of pressure on the part of citizens that because of the total autonomy they have, the universities appear to indicate to the public that they should not be touched or examined in any way with respect to the manner in which they govern and allocate the funds that are being provided to them; that in fact they really do not have to answer very

directly or clearly to the public to that extent; that the public simply should accept that they are all responsible people and would do what is in the best interests of the public.

I don't quarrel with that. They are all very responsible people. But sometimes I think there is a great truth in the saying that one is so close to the forest one can't see the trees. That can also be true within any institution. It seems to me that if there is this kind of questioning from the public, the university should take that kind of criticism seriously to their own examination, and try to provide the kind of performance that would overcome that criticism. I'm not indicating the accuracy of it here. The point is that if the citizens at large are simply asking those questions, then that requires an examination.

Before I conclude my remarks I would again like to ask the minister to cover the matter of immigration of unskilled workers to this country, the degree to which there has been discussion with the federal government with respect to immigration, whether the federal government is going to use a formula of allocation, and the requirement of each province to take a certain percentage of people, or what the status is in that regard. I think there has to be real concern that we do not allow a situation to develop of simply bringing in a lot of people without some sort of graduation, creating problems with which we could not cope within a specified time frame. I'm not suggesting we shouldn't welcome people to this country. I'm simply suggesting a gradual growth of development and welcome of people to this country. It is important to maintain a proper balance of development and assistance, to have a logical program, and not allow hardship to continue. I'm not sure where the minister stands on this issue, and what representations he has made on behalf of this government. I would be very pleased if he would provide that information at this time.

Thank you.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman and members of the House, I should like to respond briefly, but hopefully accurately and concisely, in terms of the half-dozen or more excellent points made by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood.

The point about professions and occupations is a complex and intriguing one. No doubt some occupations would feel more professional if their training were assigned to universities than to some other institution. But that's likely a marginal problem, in particular because the program services division of our department does an excellent job. I recall again to the House that we're the only province that has this kind of capacity: to approve or disapprove, put in place or withhold new programs at all institutions including the universities. The hon. member has placed before the House a real restraint and constraint on the subject. My response is: in my view and the view of the leaders of institutions, the program services division deals with this very effectively in firm, friendly, and frank work with the institutions.

I should mention to the hon. member and for the record that some college programs cost more than at universities. That's for a whole host of reasons: the number of faculties, the number of research capabilities, the library. The number of faculties is so much greater at universities than at colleges that if you're

going to a new program in a college you pretty well have to set up everything the particular program needs. On that basis it would cost more than the same program at the university — just as information, because there's often the myth that college education is of lesser quality and cost. It's a myth in both circumstances. The quality is outstanding, and the cost is often commensurate with the quality. And that's how it should be.

With respect to the question on how we fund institutions, universities, public colleges, and provincially administered institutions, I believe it was a question asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition on Wednesday, and was attempted to be asked during the question period on the preceding Monday. I should like to respond, but the only information that I think is fair and reasonable, Mr. Chairman, is to compare enrolment increases with increases in the allocation of money since 1974-75. That's a reasonable period of time, long enough to remove any kind of one-year, unusual circumstances. There are other reasons to choose this particular date.

I would then present these two sets of figures from 1974 to 1975. With respect to public colleges, Mr. Chairman, the enrolment increase from 1974-1975 to 1978-1979 was 28 per cent. The amount of increase in the money allocation during the same period was 82 per cent. Please appreciate, as I'm sure you do, this is a cumulative, roll-up figure in both instances. In the case of provincially administered institutions, or PAIs as popularly referred to, the enrolment increase during this time was 33 per cent, and the allocation of funds during this four-year period was 97 per cent. In the case of the three conventional universities, during this four-year period of time the student enrolment was 7 per cent and the allocation of money was 72 per cent.

It's fair and proper to ask, are we favoring our own children? That's not unusual in any family. But it's not the case here, Mr. Chairman. It's clear that with a 7 per cent increase during a four-year period in the universities, and a 72 per cent increase of money during the four-year period, that particular level of institution in our system of advanced education received the firmest and the most generous — generous in the sense of more in proportion — than other institutions. Then came the provincially administered institutions and the public colleges.

In the case of optometry, I should like to speak merely as an individual, but an individual minister who has spent a great deal of time on the subject, had meetings with the Canadian association, the Alberta association — with the latter several times. Our people have done manpower studies, and on manpower alone, who knows? The hon. member and the associations make the case that we need more. I'm prepared to take their word because I'm a generalist and have to take the word of people, if I can use the term, "in the know".

It goes beyond simple manpower needs, important as they are. The same point was made in the context of dentists. It goes beyond that. It goes into the area of research — the study of optometry: how to do it differently; how to do it better, information-sharing in the schools and with the public generally, knowledge about eyes and eye care. So for me as a generalist, manpower figures are extremely important but they don't make the whole case. It goes into the whole

area of a profession professing not only its activity with respect to eyes but educating the public how to look after their eyes — if I can use that term; I had not intended to use it in that way.

But I think it's important we know how to look after our eyes. My hon. colleague the notable Minister of the Environment, an architect, is agreeing with me. He says he can see me. I'm pleased about that. So if I'm reflecting a positive, supportive ministerial attitude, I'm reflecting an accurate attitude because I hold it.

I recall when Saskatchewan obtained the veterinary college — nothing against Saskatchewan except the nature of the party in office now, and I'm quite certain that will change in the next election. But with Alberta being the number one province in agriculture in the nation, and one of the greatest in all the states in North America, not to have put the veterinary college in place here in Alberta . . .

I was a private citizen at that time — not in office. I was dismayed and angered. I had long conversations with the Member of the Legislative Assembly who represented me in this House. He was a fine man and a real gentleman, but I guess he couldn't be heard by the ministers of the day, as are our Members of the Legislative Assembly, because most of what I say, and most of what my colleagues the ministers say, is the result of hours of discussion, instruction, and direction from the members of this Legislative Assembly. But that didn't happen when the veterinary college was placed in Saskatchewan of all places.

In the case of optometry, it's not a matter of keeping it from some other province. The hon. member asked how the other provinces feel. They feel like, after you Alphonse. If you have it we'll send you the students and a few bucks along with them. If it has to be that way, fine. We've gone alone on things before; we may have to do it again. But I believe the case for an optometry school or facility in Alberta is becoming more and more impressive in the evidence to support it.

With respect to dental services I will simply make this comment: it's an example of the constant pressures through representation to the officials in my department, to Members of the Legislative Assembly, and to me, to increase, extend and develop additional services in the existing professions as well as adding new ones. That's as it should be. But no one should have the view that these things are easy; they're complex. Because if we need more dentists — and we have certainly had representations from the universities both of Alberta and Calgary that we need to extend their dental programs.

With respect to apprenticeship, the examination of standards is constant. I'm sure the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, as she said, would not want us to sacrifice quality but to examine the components to see if certain ones can be reduced in time or telescoped because of better ways of teaching technological ways. The system of teaching and learning has come a long way. This is being done constantly as part of the work of the apprentice. I want to say again that our apprentices are regarded as the best on this continent, not just the best in Canada.

The employment of graduates: certainly universities, in their dual role of education for the sake of learning and of occupation, must be sensitive to the

point made by the hon. member. There is no such thing as absolute autonomy for any institution, if for no other reason than that public opinion and things like the inability of any institution to get all the money it would wish to have are two notable examples of constraint on the attitudes and performance of universities. Certainly ours are impressive and outstanding institutions, as universities go, across the nation and elsewhere.

I'll close on a brief comment with respect to immigration. A great deal of comment was on detail, and I can supply it in the form of a memorandum or through other ways. But as for a global statement, the new federal Immigration Act is clear on the proposition that immigration will evolve about two circumstances, manpower in Canada, and labor: manpower with respect to shortages in certain professions, occupations, trades, and so on, and labor being the unemployment figures. So just recalling from my files, the 1976 immigration figures were much lower than they were in 1975. I'm assuming that the '77 figures are lower than in '76. That is not a comment on the fact that there should be fewer or more, but simply to recall actual figures in a general sort of way.

With respect to consultations, these are extensive. This is one area in which we have taken an assertive position. Our officials have met with their counterparts many times. In the last two years I have met with the Minister of Employment and Immigration on at least three and probably four occasions, and will continue to do so. We may enter into a written agreement with respect to certain matters and functions having to do with immigration.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. CHICHAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would wish to touch on and have the minister comment on just two more points, because they are not specifically in the votes. That is with regard to the two areas under his jurisdiction or responsibility: science and research, and the matter of professions and occupations.

I'm not going to put any extensive questions except to say I would like the minister, if he is able, to indicate, with regard to professions and occupations, where he is at regarding the release of a position paper with regard to a report concluded several years ago, and whether he is able to indicate to some extent some of the areas that will be dealt with, and generally what might be covered in the policy position.

The other is on science and research: the extensiveness of that, where the minister is with regard to any planning or programming, and what the overall direction or goal is in this area.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, with respect to professions and occupations, in fairness to anyone who may have forgotten the dates or the document, there is a significant document, the report on professions and occupations, which was tabled in the House in 1973 and was chaired by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood. Because the Premier has assigned the work on professions and occupations to me, I have become very familiar with it, though I had been before that time as well. I want to say for the record, and to make my assessment for the House,

that it is an outstanding document. It is being used across this nation in the governments of all the provinces and beyond as a basic textbook or document on the matter of professions and occupations. I want to pay tribute not just to the chairman, but certainly to her and all the members who turned in one of the outstanding reports.

Since then a committee of ministers under the chairmanship of my colleague the hon. Attorney General, a committee on which I also sat, backed up by a committee of deputy ministers — I was going to say, who have shaken down the report — but worked it through into a working document. At that stage it was reviewed by cabinet, although the report itself had been also. But the working down of it was reviewed by cabinet and caucus and then assigned to the department in the portfolio sense. So we have that responsibility at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, we are completing a paper which has a set of policy statements. These will go out as a public document, and I will table it here in the House. We will of course have an opportunity to discuss it and deal with it. So that's the position we are in with respect to professions and occupations. Literally days away, maybe weeks, but certainly within a month we will make public a policy paper with respect to professions and occupations.

On the matter of science and research, Mr. Chairman, there is a cabinet committee which I have the privilege to chair. We also have a committee of officials chaired by my deputy minister. We're working on the logistics of trying to get a handle on the research being done in Alberta and somewhat beyond, to make certain we don't have any notable omissions and that we do in fact know what we're doing, what has been done, and what it's costing, to see if we can improve the quality and reduce the cost. So with that modest statement on science and research, that would be the end of my remarks.

I'm not taking for granted that there will be no other questions or comments, but in case there are not, Mr. Chairman, while I'm on my feet I just want to say how pleased I am with this outstanding, excellent discussion on the estimates of Advanced Education and Manpower. It will have an influence on our policies in the department and therefore in government. I look forward to hearing from members on any part of the estimates we have discussed. Someone who wants to follow up on them would be most welcome. I can't tell you enough how much we in the department — the senior officials are all here, the impressive group to the right of the pillar in case you want to embarrass them by gazing at them. I see one of them blushing already; he's 37 years old and he still blushes. He's just like that.

Thank you, sir, for the way you have managed the estimates. I've enjoyed them a great deal.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I wonder if he could just supply information in three areas: first of all with regard to the uses of the recreational facilities at NAIT. Is the department presently out soliciting in the community for the community at large to use those recreational facilities? If the minister could supply us with that information later on.

Secondly, Mr. Minister, when might we expect a decision on the Grande Prairie student residence? Could the minister advise us in writing of that

information?

Thirdly, Mr. Minister, if my memory is accurate, two years ago in the Speech from the Throne there was a commitment by the government that there would be a science policy paper. When do we expect that paper? If you could just give us . . . July 1 this year, that would be quite all right. Then we can move on with the estimates. I say that, Mr. Chairman, because it's our intention to move a designated motion on Thursday dealing with some aspects of postsecondary education. So it's now our intention to move along to the estimates very quickly.

DR. HOHOL: With respect to the question on NAIT, yes, we are making known to the community the facilities at NAIT and inviting them to participate. With respect to Grande Prairie, I'll have to take that as a question.

On science and research, I have attempted to say something about it. We're concerned with how to implement a vehicle that will describe and define what is being done, what might be done, and how much it costs. There will not be — and it was likely the use of language — a policy position. Things are happening. AOSTRA and the Alberta Research Council are in place, but to suggest that we can reflect a policy . . . Our policy, of course, is to have the best kind of research, the most functional and usable, for the least money possible. The policy is to make certain we don't waste money and talent, and that we attract the best talent we can get. That really is the policy. Our concern is how best to effect it. This is what we are working on at the present time.

Agreed to:

1.0.1 — Minister's Office	\$147,951
1.0.2 — Minister's Committees	\$175,560
1.0.3 — General Administration	\$4,888,330
1.0.4 — Planning and Research	\$409,549
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$5,621,390
Total Vote 1 — Capital	\$73,400

Vote 2 — Assistance to Higher and Further Educational Institutions:

2.1 — Program Support	\$13,354,573
2.2 — Provincially Administered Institutions	\$67,678,455
2.3 — Public Colleges — Operating	\$46,264,000
2.4 — Private Colleges	\$1,553,000

2.5 — Universities — Operating

MR. CLARK: Mr. Minister, when I look at the estimates last year for the University of Alberta, it was estimated at \$113 million, and I see that this year we're budgeting \$111 million — that's the estimates of last year to this year. Mr. Minister, I don't expect an answer now, but could you indicate in the form of a memo what happened in the course of the year, that the anticipated \$113 million the Legislature approved last year was down to \$102 million, so the estimates this year are really less than the House approved a year ago for the University of Alberta.

The same thing, Mr. Minister, with regard to the University of Calgary: the estimates this House approved last year were \$63 million; the estimates for

this year are \$63 million. Also with regard to the University of Lethbridge: this House approved \$9.6 million for the University of Lethbridge last year; some \$9.4 million are being asked for this year.

If the minister could outline to us in the form of a memo the things that took place during the year that changed the estimates we approved last year so the spending pattern of those three institutions was changed substantively, that would enable us to carry on with the estimates.

DR. HOHOL: I could comment at this time, but I don't think we'd have the time, because we'd have to discuss it.

Agreed to:

2.5 — Universities — Operating	\$191,915,000
2.6 — Public Colleges — Capital	\$14,595,000
2.7 — Universities — Capital	\$31,823,000
Total Vote 2 — Assistance to Higher and Further Education Institutions	\$367,183,028
Total Vote 2 — Capital	\$52,282,000

Vote 3 — Manpower Development and Training Assistance

MRS. CHICHAK: Under Vote 3, I notice in the summary there is an increase with respect to permanent full-time positions. However, under 3.1, there appears to be a percentage decrease of 7.3 under the 1977-78 forecast. I wonder if the minister can give us some clarification on that.

DR. HOHOL: The two elements are really separate. The summary of manpower authorization is for the whole department, and I can give you a breakdown of the 31 positions involved there.

With respect to 3.1, that element has to do with manpower development, and the minus 7.3 — if that's the concern of the hon. member — has to do with a different approach to accounting for our expenditures with respect to STEP. This year we allocated \$2 million to which reference had been made. Last year we did not allocate in the budget but used the special warrant approach, so that two years ago we had a zero estimate in STEP. Last year we had \$4 million, this year \$2 million. This locates the minus 7.3. In fact when you adjust for the different way we have accounted for STEP, the increase in 3.1 would be 16 per cent.

Agreed to:

3.1 — Manpower Development	\$10,435,034
3.2 — Training Assistance	\$7,720,836
Total Vote 3 — Manpower Development and Training Assistance	\$18,155,870
Total Vote 3 — Capital	\$33,730

Vote 4 — Financial Assistance to Students

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just one question to the minister. Mr. Minister, could you supply the basic information with regard to the repayments, with special interest naturally in the area of defaults? If the minister could make that information available to us by means of a memo, that would be quite agreeable.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 4 — Financial Assistance to Students	\$11,295,162
Total Vote 4 — Capital	\$7,100

Capital Estimates;

Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$73,400
--	----------

2.1 — Program Support	\$5,000
-----------------------	---------

2.2 — Provincially Administered Institutions	\$5,589,000
--	-------------

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the minister: can you also give us a breakdown of, for example, where you expect the \$5.8 million, at which institutions, and the same thing with regard to the public colleges and universities? If we do it in the usual manner, we could move ahead then.

Agreed to:

2.3 — Public Colleges — Operating	—
2.4 — Private Colleges	—
2.5 — Universities — Operating	—
2.6 — Public Colleges — Capital	\$14,595,000
2.7 — Universities — Capital	\$31,823,000
Total Vote 2 — Assistance to Higher and Further Educational Institutions	\$52,282,000

3.1 — Manpower Development	\$33,630
----------------------------	----------

3.2 — Training Assistance	\$100
---------------------------	-------

Total Vote 3 — Manpower Development and Training Assistance	\$33,730
---	----------

Total Vote 4 — Financial Assistance to Students	\$7,100
---	---------

Total Capital Estimates	\$52,396,230
-------------------------	--------------

Department Total	\$402,255,450
------------------	---------------

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, I move that the estimates of the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower be reported.

[Motion carried]

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolution, reports the same, and asks leave to sit again:

Resolved that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1979, amounts not exceeding the following sums be granted to Her Majesty for the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower: \$5,621,390 for departmental support services, \$367,183,028 for assistance to higher and further educational institutions, \$18,155,870 for manpower development and training assistance, \$11,295,162 for financial assistance to students.

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

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 1 o'clock.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 12:45 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]

