

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Wednesday, November 18, 1981 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me today to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, the four founding directors of ballet in Canada, seated in your gallery. These four very remarkable women have had a most profound effect on the dance world. As part of the celebration of the 15th anniversary of the Alberta Ballet Company, these four women have been brought together in honor of their anniversary and in recognition of the company's growing stature in the international ballet community.

Gwenneth Lloyd and Betty Farrally brought their vision of dance to Winnipeg in the late 1930s. Celia Franca, after beginning her dance career in England, working with the Sadler's Wells Ballet and the Metropolitan Ballet, came to Canada in 1951 as the founding director of the National Ballet of Canada. Mme. Chiariaeff brought a unique blend of the Russian ballet tradition from Europe to Montreal in the 1950s, at which point she formed and directed Les Grands Ballets Canadiens. I cannot say how very pleased we are today to have in your Assembly these four ladies representing the very heart of Canadian ballet.

Also seated with our honored guests are Dr. Lloyd Sutherland, chairman of the board of the Alberta Ballet, and Mrs. Caroline Davies, president of the Women's Guild in Calgary.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that our guests rise and receive the very warm welcome of this Assembly.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 241****The Environmental Impact
Assessment Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 241, The Environmental Impact Assessment Act.

This Bill makes environmental impact assessments mandatory for any development having a potentially negative effect on the environment. It will also provide for public hearings and financial support to interveners as a matter of course. There are provisions for the establishment of a board of inquiry with power to order the tabling of evidence as required to assess the impact of a development.

[Leave granted; Bill 241 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Section 14(4) of The Legislative Assembly Act, I wish to table four copies of the regular annual report of payments to MLAs for the year ended March 31, 1981.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file a booklet called Bookkeeping for a Small Business in Alberta, the eighth in a series printed by the Department of Tourism and Small Business. It was distributed to all Members of the Legislative Assembly on September 1 last.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, on Monday my colleague the hon. Minister of State for Economic Development — International Trade was in Bahrain. I'm not sure where he is today, but we do know that he's not in Alberta. So, on his behalf, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 27 grade 6 students from Avonmore school. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. John Ray, and are seated in the public gallery. I ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Edmonton Annexation**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, if I could ask the first question today. It's not with my good judgment that I ask the question; it's that I lost the toss. [laughter] On the other hand, my leader is going to get a talking to when he gets back, because it's taking him longer to commit \$60 million to the municipal convention than I thought it would. I thought he should have been back.

Mr. Speaker, my first question is to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, who thinks I'm from Bow Island. I would like to ask if he has met with TOP SOIL, the association involved in the recent annexation northeast of Edmonton. They are concerned about the 6,800 hectares of agricultural land recently annexed by Edmonton.

MR. MOORE: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not met with that organization. I believe I met some individuals on the executive of that association in years past, when they spoke to me in other capacities. I would only say that I am familiar with the objectives of the organization, and I fully support their basic objectives of preserving very good topsoil in whatever way possible. If they so requested, I would be pleased to meet with the organization at any time to assist them in their basic objectives.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Several members of Edmonton city council have recommended that they put this agricultural land into an agricultural reserve. Does the minister agree with this concept?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it would be appropriate to suggest whether I agree or disagree. I can say that on making the Edmonton annexation decision, we were very concerned about the use of good topsoil. At that time, I did suggest that we would be taking certain steps to ensure that valuable top soil could not be buried

under urban or industrial development but must be utilized by being moved to other areas, in the event it was essential that those areas be used.

In my view, it will take some time for the city of Edmonton administration, elected officials, and mayor to determine the pace of development throughout the newly annexed areas. The Minister of Environment, the Minister of Housing and Public Works, and I will be working with the city of Edmonton during that process, to ensure that the objective of saving the better topsoils and better farmland within the annexed area is met to the fullest extent possible.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate how many acres or hectares of land that could be used for agricultural production are involved in the annexation?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, as I said in the middle of June when we announced the annexation decision, the agricultural lands that surround the city of Edmonton in almost every direction are in the top 20 per cent of all agricultural lands in the province of Alberta. That simply means that very few lands in the entire 80,000-odd acres annexed to the city of Edmonton are not capable of sustained production of cereal crops on a regular basis, using good cultural practices.

In short, the answer is that virtually no lands are being annexed to the city . . . For that matter, the entire city is built on lands which will sustain regular crop production because of the climatic conditions, rainfall, and heat units available. So I can't say anything more than that. Some lands are better than others, but certainly the city of Edmonton, as are many other cities in Canada and Alberta, is built in an area of good agricultural soil.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One final supplementary question to the hon. minister. Several years ago the Land Use Forum recommended that the provincial government bring in a firm policy as far as preserving our agricultural land in the province, saving it from urban sprawl, is concerned. Is it the intent of the government to bring in any legislation or policy in this area?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will recall that in 1977 my colleague the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs brought into this Legislature The Planning Act, 1977, a new planning Act that has provisions that require every municipality in Alberta, including cities such as Edmonton, to have a land-use planning by-law in place by the end of 1980. Some municipalities took an extra amount of time developing those very comprehensive land-use by-laws and, by ministerial order, I extended that time frame to the end of July 1981, I believe. It is safe to say that virtually all of Alberta's 350-odd municipalities now have a land-use by-law in place.

Mr. Speaker, that land-use by-law is very specific in every case, in terms of identifying good agricultural land and placing reservations, if you like, on those lands for agricultural use only. I don't believe there has been nearly as good recognition throughout the province of the work individual municipal councils and others have done in putting those land-use by-laws in place. Mr. Speaker, it is fair to say that they can be altered by the local municipal council. But thus far, the experience has been that councils are very reluctant to alter them in a way which would use good agricultural land in a way that's detrimental to

the future of agricultural production.

I'm confident that that system put in place by this Legislature in 1977 will serve Alberta much better than the province unilaterally declaring from Edmonton that we know exactly what every land-use policy should be throughout the entire length and breadth of Alberta. In my view it's just not possible, in a province as large as this, to make those decisions from here. We correctly placed them in the hands of local municipal councils, and I'm satisfied with the excellent work they're doing.

Rental Investment Incentive Program

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works. It's with regard to the rental investment incentive program the minister put in place in 1980, whereby you can get a 5 per cent tax incentive program for housing. Could the minister inform the House whether he's going to continue this program? I understand there's a possibility the program might be discontinued at the end of 1981.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, it was a two-year program which would normally terminate at the end of this year. About all I can say is that there are a number of considerations to take into account, such as what's been happening with regard to MURBs and so forth, and that that item is under consideration.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate, in ballpark figures, the number of apartments that have been built under this program and the number of units put in place in the province of Alberta under the program?

MR. CHAMBERS: I don't have the exact numbers at hand, Mr. Speaker, but I'd be happy to provide that information. It has had considerable take-up, though, and we consider the program to have been successful.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister indicated that they were taking a look at renewing the rental investment incentive program. At present, is the minister looking at any other programs to promote or give an incentive to putting more rental units in the province of Alberta?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get boring, in terms of reciting all the programs we have in place and the very large investment in housing the government has this year. However, we're always looking at evaluating different programs and the effectiveness of those programs.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A supplementary question. Mr. Speaker, on the rental incentive program. Given that that program, as I understand it, was frequently taken up in conjunction with the MURB program under the federal regime, as a result of the termination of the MURB program as of December 31, is the minister giving some consideration to expanding the parameters of that rental incentive program beyond the five per cent limitation presently imposed?

MR. CHAMBERS: As I said, Mr. Speaker, we are evaluating that program in terms of its effectiveness and what might be done with it. But I should make it clear that the program that is really necessary in order to create

rental housing for not only Alberta but Canada is the MURB program, because we're talking about federal income tax. The opportunities in the Alberta rental investment incentive program can only apply to Alberta tax. So in my view, the MURB program is extremely essential to the production of rental housing all across this country.

Constitution — Charter of Rights

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Premier for a matter of clarification dealing with Section 28 of the Charter of Rights. And just to be clear that the Premier is clear on the section I need clarified, I'd like to read it:

Notwithstanding anything in this Charter, the rights and freedoms referred to in it are guaranteed equally to male and female persons.

There seems to be some confusion as to just what that clause means. I wonder if the hon. Premier could make that clarification for us.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to respond this way. That clause, and I'd quote from the words used by the federal member for Kingston, Miss Flora MacDonald, when she introduced it as a proposed amendment: "provides for a straightforward unequivocal statement of purpose that all rights apply equally to men and women."

While I'm on my feet, I would like to confirm again that the position of the government of Alberta is that Section 28 should not have any overriding provisions or qualifications to it, and it should stand as was provided for in the resolution before Parliament this past spring. Accordingly, within the last hour we have reconfirmed our advice to the federal Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Tasse, to the effect that that is the case for the province of Alberta on Section 28. Section 28 should stand in the resolution being introduced in the House of Commons today, without qualification, as it was originally prescribed, for the purpose I have mentioned.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question. I believe the Premier mentioned that the resolution is being introduced today. Is the Premier able to report to the House whether there has been consensus among the other provinces with respect to Section 28? Has the Premier been given the advice from the federal government that in fact Section 28 will be introduced as it originally stood, not subject to the notwithstanding clause?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, all I can say to the hon. member is that I hope so. Obviously, these matters of interprovincial communication and federal/provincial communication have been going on for the past number of days. When that resolution is introduced today in the House of Commons by the federal Minister of Justice, I hope it will in fact provide for an unqualified Section 28, which is the position of Alberta.

Odyssey Project

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. It deals with the Cline River project. On page 1411 of *Hansard*, the minister is quoted as saying:

Certainly concerns were expressed by the wildlife division, but these have been resolved by the proponents of the Odyssey proposal sitting down with

our staff.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. minister refers to just what response the fish and wildlife division has had to their concerns expressed in a memo of April 13, 1981, entitled Fish and Wildlife Review, Environmental Report, Cline River Development Co. Ltd. The fish and wildlife people outline some 30 major concerns with respect to the proposed Odyssey project. Is the minister prepared to table the response of the fish and wildlife branch to the EIA, with respect to the concerns expressed in this document? Is the minister satisfied that all 30 of those major objections have in fact been met by the proponents?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I haven't got that in front of me at this time. However, I would like to report that a meeting was held on November 13 this year. It was attended by Mr. Fennell, Mr. Marsh, Dr. Garbutt, and Fritz Kamprath, from the Cline River Development Company, along with members of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources: Mr. Benson from forest land use, Mr. Thompson from the fish and wildlife division, and Mr. Facco of the lands division. In that meeting, they discussed the various concerns which had been brought forward by the fish and wildlife division, as well as the lands and forest division. I'm pleased to report that the meeting was very successful and that agreement was reached on the issues.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. With respect to this particular memo, which details some 30 objections, is the minister prepared to table in the House the response of the branch to these concerns, as a consequence of the meeting which he alluded to and which he assured the House has satisfied the government?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if there was a written response or just a response that was agreed to, and the issues were settled at the meeting held on November 13.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. The memo I referred to makes it clear that the review of the fish and wildlife branch says:

It is clear that this proposal, before approval, should be examined within the context of a detailed Integrated Management Plan for the entire area.

My question directly to the minister, Mr. Speaker: is the minister in a position to explain to the Assembly this afternoon how this concern has been resolved, in view of the fact that no integrated management plan for the area is completed at the present time?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, when the Cline River development proposal was first brought forward, a preliminary disclosure was agreed to. The plans were drawn up, and these plans had certain conditions laid out which expressed certain conditions which were of concern to the various departments, including the Department of Environment and fish and wildlife. In the meetings that have proceeded since that time, these concerns have been dealt with on an ongoing basis. The plans are being modified to accommodate the conditions as laid out by the various departments.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Just so there's no misunderstanding in the minister's

mind, I'm talking about the concern — and I'll quote from the memo again:

It is clear that this proposal, before approval, should be examined within the context of a detailed Integrated Management Plan for the entire area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one has not been completed at the moment. My question very directly to the minister is: what has the department done with respect to this concern expressed by the fish and wildlife branch?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I believe I adequately answered that question when I said that they sat down together and resolved their differences.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. minister could enlighten the House as to what resolution of differences led the government to conclude that it was no longer necessary to have an integrated management plan, in view of the fact that this was one of the major concerns expressed by the fish and wildlife branch?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, maybe I should point out that the management plan is entitled the Rocky-Clearwater Management Overview. It's been divided into four parts: the Rocky-North Saskatchewan, the Chungo-Cline-Nordegg integrated management plan, the Brazeau-Pembina plan, and the Rocky-North Saskatchewan plan. These plans are all being worked on, and information is being gathered. I should point out that the whole Cline River development does conform to the Eastern Slopes policy we've laid down. These plans are being worked on.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's all well to say that these plans are being worked on, although in the case of the plans the minister alludes to, there's a good deal of work to be done.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member a question.

MR. NOTLEY: Yes I do, Mr. Speaker. My question to the minister is that the government's position — fish and wildlife's review — makes it clear . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I fail to conceive how that statement can end with a question mark.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, just wait a moment and it will. [interjections] The question to the minister is: on what basis has the government concluded that starting on a management plan is adequate, in view of the position of the fish and wildlife branch that in fact one should be completed and in place?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, as I've pointed out, in the meeting where members of Cline River Development sat down with people from the department, these concerns were adequately dealt with.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me go on to another aspect of it, and just simply make the observation that that still leaves a great deal to be desired.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other concerns in the fish and wildlife overview is:

The company must be bound to an acceptable plan, otherwise the pressure for new developments will continue. A public policy statement should . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Surely the hon. member can ask a question simply and directly, without quoting at length from a document. I have a further concern. I understand the hon. member's questions are based on a document with some 30 conclusions or representations. I'm wondering whether we are due now to deal with each of the 30 in turn.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, we aren't, but several major concerns are expressed in this memo. On a point of order: with great respect, sir, I would say that considering your judgment of a few days ago, wanting the details of any reports being alluded to in the questions, I want to be fair to the minister and quote exactly what the report says, so there's no misunderstanding.

The question is: what steps has the government taken to develop such a plan and policy statement as called for in the memo I alluded to, particularly with respect to a public statement that would limit further land uses in the area?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the Odyssey proposal has been ongoing since the late 1960s. Here we have some businessmen in Alberta who are prepared to provide tourist accommodation, and all we get is roadblocks put in their way. We feel that this is a very positive project, one in which we have total integrated management, with the department sitting down with these developers to try to come up with something for all Albertans.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. The question very directly to the minister is with respect to the fish and wildlife branch position. Is this government prepared to make a statement with respect to the concern of the fish and wildlife branch that there could be population pressures on the area, and that "a public . . . statement should limit [further] land uses in the area." That's quoting from the government's own position paper. Is the minister prepared to stand behind it or not?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, as I've pointed out in this House before, we are not prepared for a Coney Island atmosphere to be developed in that part of Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: I certainly welcome that.

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Environment. Again, with respect to this document, the overview of the fish and wildlife branch indicates that: "we find the document to be seriously deficient . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have sufficient respect for the ability of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that I know he can ask questions directly, without basing them on quotations and getting comments concerning quotations. Would the hon. member please come directly to the question.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question directly to the minister — and again to be fair, I think the minister should know what the document says. I don't want to mislead him at all.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, the important thing is for the minister to know what's in the question.

MR. NOTLEY: Yes it is. Therefore, it's important to quote from the document so that he knows specifically

what's in the question, Mr. Speaker. I think that to be consistent with your ruling of last week, one has to be fair. That's why I want to quote from the document.

Will the minister detail for the House what steps have been taken to resolve the deficiencies in the environment impact assessment, particularly with respect to the concern expressed in this document that the EIA is "seriously deficient"? What steps have been taken by the department to rectify what is considered to be a serious deficiency?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, it's starting to sound like Coney Island in the Legislature.

The department has made quite clear that there are deficiencies. I think I've said in the House that insofar as Environment is concerned, it deals primarily with the water and sewer. Deficiencies that are pointed out by another department are really the responsibility of the department concerned. Through our EIA process, we refer those problems that have been specified to the respective departments for their response and reaction.

Education Planning

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. It's a follow-up to questions I asked the minister some 10 days ago dealing with the stakeholders' meeting on education. My initial question: did the minister have a number of students, or at least student representatives, present at the stakeholders' meeting held last weekend? Secondly, what was the result of the secret ballot taken at the meeting to help the minister determine the educational priorities for the next five to 10 years?

MR. KING: First of all, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question of student attendance at the last meeting, I may have been laboring under a misapprehension. We didn't consider it was possible, subsequent to the question being asked, to arrange student representation at this last meeting. The question of student representation at subsequent meetings was discussed and agreed to, at least with respect to specific issues that would be of direct concern to students. We were not satisfied to rely upon representation from the university community — as was suggested by the hon. member, who thought that students' unions from universities might send representatives to these stakeholder meetings — for the obvious reason that those who go on to postsecondary education are only a small proportion of the number of students in the high school system and may not be representative of the total range of interests of high school students.

With respect to the ballot taken in June, I am chagrined to report that we're not able to find the record of it. I made an undertaking to the hon. member that I would provide it to the House, and I will, I hope shortly.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Are we to take from the minister's remark that at a stakeholders' meeting of leading educators in the province held last weekend, the minister can't remember the top four or five issues as to the educational priorities for the next five to 10 years, as recommended by the people at the meeting?

MR. KING: I'm sorry, I thought the hon. member was referring to a ballot taken at the June 10 meeting six months ago. In that case, I can advise the hon. member

that we changed the agenda and did not have the ballot that was alluded to.

MR. R. CLARK: Then to the minister. Ballot or no ballot, what in fact were the major recommendations that came to the minister from this group? I ask the question in light of the commitment the minister gave the House some 10 days ago that in fact the minister would indicate the priorities that came out of the stakeholders' meeting.

MR. KING: Again, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to have to reread the *Hansard* of 10 days ago, because my understanding was that it referred to the meeting of June 10.

Nevertheless, I can say that the issues under discussion at the meeting last week included the delivery of alternate education programs; planning in the field of education; the relationship between trustees and the Department of Education; the relationship between parental interests and community expectations — and that of course touched heavily on the role of private schools in the province; the future of the high school program in the province, with particular regard for the transition from vocational to apprenticeship programs; and one other which escapes me at the moment. I'll check, and I will provide that to the hon. member tomorrow.

With respect to the outcome of the meeting, minutes and notes are being compiled at the present time. I would prefer not to describe that until I have the benefit of those notes.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. What opportunity is there for parents and others — I'm thinking primarily of parents, because parents have made representation to me — to have access, at least in a general way, to the priorities which come out of a meeting such as this?

As the minister explained to us in the House last week, if my memory is accurate, we're talking here in terms of priority education for not just the upcoming few years but the next five to 10 years. What opportunity is there for parents — whether their children are in the public, separate, or private systems in this province — to get the benefit of the information that came out of the meetings, and to have input into them?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, in a very narrow sense, the opportunity for both access and benefit would lie via the Alberta Federation of Home & School Associations, because the federation had members at the stakeholders' session. To the best of our knowledge, that is the only province-wide organization of parents of school-aged children. If the hon. member is aware of any other, I'd be pleased to have under consideration future participation at such meetings, if they were held.

I appreciate the opportunity, provided by the hon. member's question, to explain what may be a misconception about the nature of the meeting. It was organized by the office of the Minister of Education, and invitations were extended to individuals who have been active in a variety of different educationally oriented organizations. But the people attended the meeting as individuals, not as representatives of any particular group, be it the Teachers' Association or the School Trustees' Association. Under the circumstances, it was seen as an opportunity to exchange information and understanding of situations.

While I have said that we have to develop a plan for education in the province, I don't propose it should be done using the vehicle of these meetings. It will have to be

done in a more formal way that involves the organizations as such, and clearly in a way that involves the public very generally.

Liquor Control Board

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Solicitor General. In light of the positive response to a motion presented in this Assembly by the hon. Member for Calgary North West, can the Solicitor General indicate if the government is considering making the Alberta Liquor Control Board a Crown corporation?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I think all possibilities are looked at continually. I can't say that there's been any decision or even thoughts along the lines suggested.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the Solicitor General indicate if he will give consideration to this important topic in the near future, and report back to the Assembly?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, all matters such as resolutions of this Assembly are considered by the government.

Research Funding

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to either the Premier or the Treasurer. It deals with the allocation of provincial resources in the area of research, especially high technology research. What guideline does the province try to follow regarding the percentage of the provincial government budget that would find its way into the broad area of research?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'll try to answer that question. To this stage, we haven't reached the conclusion that it's in the public interest to allocate a specified proportion of funds, either within a given department or overall in our budget, to the area of research.

The reasons for that are twofold. Number one, we believe that our research thrust should be directed in a number of different facets throughout the government, starting of course with the Alberta Research Council and their budget. Their budget should be looked at precisely in terms of their priorities and objectives. In addition to that, in other departmental budgets where there are elements of research, we have tended toward the view that to a fair degree they should be project- or program-directed, rather than merely a sum of money or an envelope of money, to use the modern parlance, that could be applied to research.

Secondly, it's our view that what is more important than the allocation of funding is to develop an overall strategy from the research and science cabinet committee led by the Alberta Research Council and involving the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority, the Medical Research Foundation, and various other government activities in research, and combining that with the allocation of funding we now have in the capital projects division. So at least to date, we haven't really used what tends to be an envelope type of approach to research funding, I would presume by the hon. member's question.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, either to the Premier or the minister responsible for Alberta Government Tele-

phones. What is the practice within AGT, with regard to the allocation of a portion of AGT's budget for high technology research? I raise the question in light of the fact that here's an area where Alberta has a unique opportunity. What's the policy of AGT? Is there in fact an envelope, to use the term, in the AGT budget that would meet this criterion?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, before the Associate Minister of Telephones responds, I should supplement my earlier answer. Quite properly, the list of organizations within the government involved in research should have included the Alberta Government Telephones in my first answer. I refer the second question to the minister.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the hon. member that there is a potential for many opportunities to develop high technology in the area of telecommunications in the future. The policy of AGT is that they will consider going into projects, on a project-by-project basis. Again, there is not a certain percentage of the budget annually committed to research. AGT has become involved in a number of projects in the last several years, and intends to enter into projects in the future. They are currently addressing the problem of how best to do that. Hopefully, within the next several months we will determine whether to continue it on a project by project basis through AGT itself, or whether it should be through some form of subsidiary. That whole issue is being looked at very closely.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, either to the minister or the hon. Premier. Has the government given consideration to the proposition that some money from general revenues be made available to AGT as an incentive for high technology research? Frankly, I think it would be difficult — and justifiably so — to get that kind of money past the Public Utilities Board as a call on the users of AGT? Has that proposition been seriously considered by the province?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be fair to say that to this point it hasn't been, for the reasons expressed by the Associate Minister of Telephones. But it may be timely to do so, particularly in view of the report by Foster Research, tabled and made public, and the emphasis in terms of high technology. It may be that the potential that could flow from research being done by Alberta Government Telephones would warrant some reassessment of the nature of funding of research within that entity. We would be prepared to give consideration to the thoughts expressed by the hon. member.

Utilities Legislation

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the hon. Government House Leader. It's with respect to Bill 92, the Electric Energy Marketing Act, a rather far-reaching piece of legislation. I gather it's the intention of the government to proceed with it this fall. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly when the government proposes second reading of this Bill?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I can't be precise. It would not be this week, so that leaves us with Monday next week, at the earliest.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Associate Minister of Telephones, in the absence of the Minister of Utilities and Telephones. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly what consultation took place with the union of REAs on this Bill, before its introduction?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice.

Home Mortgage Corporation Loans

MR. R. CLARK: I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. Has the four-week to two and a half month delay in approval of loans at the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation offices in Calgary been drawn to the minister's attention? If the minister is aware, what steps have been taken to deal with the problem that if applications are in today, approvals cannot be granted until after the 1st of the year?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I think it's only fair to point out that the corporation has had an extremely heavy demand on its services this year, from the fact that we added another \$200 million to the budget as of October 1. This has put very difficult strains on the members of the corporation. I think they have done very well. I would dispute the time frame of the delays that my friend from Olds-Didsbury has laid out. Certainly it was longer at first, and it's improved appreciably over the last several months. The alternative would be ...

You know, we're talking about one of the biggest mortgage corporations in this country now. We've tried to minimize the growth of staff. I think it's very important that we don't have to increase the size of the staff dramatically in order to accelerate the mortgage time. Hopefully, the private sector will be back in in a large way in due course and, therefore, the mortgage corporation's involvement wouldn't be so heavy.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, would the minister undertake to check with officials of the corporation in Calgary, and indicate whether four weeks to two and a half months until loans can be approved is in fact accurate, as to what is being told to builders now? If that is the case, will the minister attempt to take some steps to speed up the process?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the difficulty we've had, as I've indicated. We're working on it in the very best way we can. I believe the time frame for the processing of documents has been accelerated significantly in the past weeks and months, and I'm looking forward to continued improvement in that area.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then I ask the minister: what does the minister regard as a reasonable turnaround time for an application going into that office in Calgary?

MR. CHAMBERS: That's a difficult question, Mr. Speaker. Of course, it depends on the nature of the financial transaction and the difficulty in assessing income requirements and guidelines and so forth. So it will vary from client to client. I'm hopeful that the turnaround time — in fact, it has been accelerated significantly. I think it will continue to improve. Frankly, I'm proud of the work members of the Home Mortgage Corpora-

tion are doing, considering the very large volume of demand they've had.

MR. R. CLARK: Can I put this question to the minister: does the minister consider a target of a four-week turnaround for, let's say, an average application? From the time their application goes in, is four weeks a reasonable period of time for citizens of the province who are trying to acquire their first home to expect, on the assumption the application is completed and is not complicated? Can't people expect that they can get an answer within four weeks?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, a lot depends on how fast people prepare documents, the time it takes to process the legal work, and so forth. So it's difficult to put an exact time frame on it. I think four weeks would probably be a minimum time that one would expect anywhere, whether it be in the private sector or through the Home Mortgage Corporation. After all, we are dealing with public funds and with very, very large subsidies, so these applications have to be checked. However, I think a lot of applications are being processed in as short as four weeks. Again, considering the very large volume of transactions handled, I think the time frame is being improved rapidly and that the corporation is really coming to grips with a very difficult problem.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister has opened up an office in Medicine Hat, and I'm certain that's relieved pressure on Calgary considerably. But has the minister considered decentralizing and opening up more offices in some of our smaller centres in the province?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, until you have a certain volume of transactions, it's not really optimum to have an office. But as the need arises and the volume of business occurs, then the corporation opens another office; for example, the recent opening in Medicine Hat.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

(reversion)

MR. ISLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to members of the House, 54 grade 9 students from Grand Centre junior high school, located in the town of Grand Centre in Alberta's leading lakeland constituency. They're accompanied by three teachers: Mr. Ron Young, Mr. Ken Loose, and Mr. Denis Dery; and three parents: Mrs. Drake, Mrs. Danforth, and Mrs. Evans. They're seated in the members gallery. I request that they stand and receive the welcome of the House.

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

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following Bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried]

		Moved by
78	Petroleum Incentives Program Act	Koziak [for Leitch]
87	Mines and Minerals Amendment Act, 1981 (No. 2)	Koziak [for Leitch]

Bill 88
Natural Gas Pricing Agreement
Amendment Act, 1981

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I move Bill No. 88, the Natural Gas Pricing Agreement Amendment Act, 1981.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the minister where the government sees the funding coming from for the incentive money to be used in Bill 88. Frankly, I raise the question because there's some confusion within the private sector itself. Does the government expect that money to come from the flowback or, in fact, from provincial coffers?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, might I close debate?

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. KOZIAK: In closing debate on third reading of Bill No. 88, and responding to the question raised by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, the money would come from the flowback. So it would be shared proportionately by producers in the province and the province on the royalty basis.

[Motion carried; Bill 88 read a third time]

Bill 93
Energy Resources Conservation
Amendment Act, 1981

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I move Bill No. 93, the Energy Resources Conservation Amendment Act, 1981.

[Motion carried; Bill 93 read a third time]

Bill 50
The Colleges Amendment Act, 1981

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 50, The Colleges Amendment Act, 1981.

MR. R. CLARK: I didn't have the opportunity to be in the House when the Bill was in committee, so I'd like to make just one brief comment to the minister. If the concern I raise has already been raised in committee, then I would simply take the information from there.

In the last two days, I've had representation from representatives of Olds College, dealing with the portion of this Act that deals with the bargaining unit and the fact that under the legislation, members of the board of

governors or the administration would be able to determine what positions would remain in the bargaining unit and what portions would come out. The concern expressed to me, admittedly by members of the academic staff there, was that this decision should be made after there had been discussion and some kind of agreement between the board on one hand and the faculty association on the other hand, as opposed to the way it's interpreted by members of the academic staff that it becomes a unilateral decision of the board.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. minister conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HORSMAN: Dealing with the matter of the designation of academic staff, during committee study I pointed out that the Act as amended will provide a process of requirement for consultation between the board of governors and the academic staff association at each institution. No mechanism was provided in the amendments for the arbitration of that issue in the event the parties were unable to agree to that matter. Indeed, in the final analysis, it still remains the responsibility of the board to designate academic staff.

As I indicated in committee study, the Act has worked very effectively over the past 10 years or so it has been in existence. If I'm not mistaken, I believe the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury was the minister who introduced The Colleges Act in its initial stages. What is now being added is a requirement for consultation between the parties as to that process. I expect that addition will satisfy most parties. However, as I indicated in committee study, it won't satisfy everybody. But in large measure we expect that the consultation process will be sufficient to provide the same type of general agreement that the parties have been able to achieve over the last several years that The Colleges Act has been in existence.

With those words, Mr. Speaker, I again express my concern for and wish that that spirit of collegiality will remain within the colleges system, that spirit of partnership between the parties. The board of governors has faculty and student representation. Now, if this Act is passed by the Assembly, non-academic staff members will also be represented on the board of governors and, in so doing, will provide that board of governors' attitude which is so important to maintaining a spirit of partnership and collegiality in the colleges system in the province. That is our hope, and we are confident that the parties will be able to work out their collective bargaining processes within the framework provided in the amendments to the Bill.

[Motion carried; Bill 50 read a third time]

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following Bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried]

No.	Title	Moved by
51	The Universities Amendment Act, 1981	Horsman
52	The Banff Centre Amendment Act, 1981	Osterman
59	Alberta Insurance Amendment Act, 1981	Koziak

No.	Title	Moved by
60	Students Loan Guarantee Amendment Act, 1981	Horsman
62	Department of Government Services Amendment Act, 1981	McCrae
63	Land Agents Licensing Amendment Act, 1981	L. Clark
65	Expropriation Amendment Act, 1981	Hiebert
68	Lloydminster Hospital Amendment Act, 1981	Lysons
71	Summary Convictions Amendment Act, 1981	Koziak [for Crawford]
72	Consumer and Corporate Affairs Statutes Amendment Act, 1981	Little
73	Public Auctions Act	Zaozirny
74	Social Services and Community Health Statutes Amendment Act, 1981	Bogle
75	Agricultural Service Board Amendment Act, 1981	Hyland
76	Interpretation Amendment Act, 1981	Fyfe
77	Judicature Amendment Act, 1981	Koziak [for Crawford]

Bill 79
Regional Municipal Services Act

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 79, the Regional Municipal Services Act.

MR. R. CLARK: Just before third reading is called, Mr. Speaker, I want to report to the minister and to the Assembly that following the discussion we had in the House at some length during committee study of the Bill, I've had an opportunity to discuss the points I raised with a number of the municipalities directly affected in my constituency.

I simply want to make two points to the minister. In the course of discussions held between representatives of the government of Alberta and those municipalities, to the best of my information no indication was given to those municipalities that when a regional water board was to be established, that board would be anything else than a water board that would serve the towns of Crossfield, Carstairs, Didsbury, Olds, Bowden, and Innisfail. After the comments the minister made in the House, I checked that because of the impression I certainly got that there is a very great likelihood that those municipalities would find themselves as part of a far larger utility board which will be dominated by the city of Calgary.

During committee study, I asked if the minister could give a commitment that those municipalities in that area will not find themselves involved in a much larger system, at least until they are connected by means of the extension of the water or sewage lines. The minister would not give me that commitment. I expressed my grave disappointment to the House on that occasion, and I express it again today. In the course of third reading I ask the minister if he can, at this late time, give those municipalities a commitment that they will not find themselves part of a Calgary utility board, at least until such time as they are connected for either water or sewage.

Mr. Minister, I conclude my remarks by simply saying that last Saturday, when the Premier opened the new arena in Olds and representatives of the towns were there,

the individuals who sat on this provisional group that has got together indicated to me that there was never any talk with them about the possibility of their being part of a utility board that would be so large as to include the city of Calgary. I don't have difficulty supporting the legislation concept, Mr. Minister. But after hearing the possibilities outlined to us the other evening, I for one have some very real concerns about what can happen if that takes place.

I hope the minister can give that kind of commitment here this afternoon. If he can't, the people who have been involved in discussions with officials of the various governments in those municipalities are simply going to find themselves going back to square one. That isn't the basis on which they thought they were getting involved in this regional water board. I think that's really being less than frank with those municipalities in that area.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the hon. minister a couple of concerns I have. Unfortunately, I did not anticipate that he would have the Bill called this afternoon, and therefore do not have before me the notes on some matters I wish to put to him. I hope the minister might consider that rather than requesting third reading of Bill 79 this afternoon, he hold it for at least one day.

I think that some of the understandings I for one had were somewhat different from the powers being considered to be given to the regional board and the matter of setting the rates for purchase of water by the region, and what all that does to the city of Edmonton. I can't set those points out very clearly this afternoon because, as I say, I did not anticipate that the matter would be called this afternoon. I would like to ask the minister to seriously consider not proceeding with third reading this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. minister conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Might I simply ask if it would be possible, rather than the minister concluding the debate, for the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood in fact to adjourn the debate. If we adjourn the debate, the member will get to speak again. If that doesn't happen, the member has lost her opportunity to speak at some later date.

MR. SPEAKER: The point raised by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury is perfectly valid. Unless the Assembly agrees that she may adjourn the debate, she has spoken on third reading and won't be allowed to speak again if the matter is held over and comes up for debate again.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. As sponsor of the Bill, I would be more than pleased to see it held over. But I do think it important that at some point in time, members express their concerns. It won't do very much good to hold it over until tomorrow if I don't know the concerns. It may be appropriate for the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood to state her concerns, then adjourn the debate, and we would bring it back at some later date.

MRS. CHICHAK: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I indicated to the hon. minister that there were some concerns or differences of understanding in the manner in

which the Bill sets out the determination of water rates vis-a-vis the city of Edmonton and the regional board; as well, the manner in which the commission is being set up. I do not have the matter with me in the House, and I was simply requesting the minister to consider.

I've [asked] the minister for an opportunity to meet with him early tomorrow morning to discuss some of those matters. If those matters are clarified, I would have no difficulty. I have not had an indication from the hon. minister that he would not be able to meet to clarify a number of points early tomorrow. So I ask the House to permit me to request adjournment of the debate at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: On the motion by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood for adjournment of debate on third reading of Bill No. 79, would the members in favor of the motion please say aye?

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no.

[Motion carried]

No.	Title	Moved by
82	Mortgage Brokers Regulation Amendment Act, 1981	Koziak
86	Employment Standards Amendment Act, 1981 (No. 2)	Weiss
91	Legal Profession Amendment Act, 1981	Koziak [for Crawford]

head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Committee of Supply please come to order.

ALBERTA HERITAGE SAVINGS TRUST FUND CAPITAL PROJECTS' DIVISION 1982-83 ESTIMATES OF PROPOSED INVESTMENTS

Department of Advanced Education and Manpower

1 — Library Development

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, before we get into this, I wonder if we might get some clarification on the numbers in this particular vote. The amount we're being asked to vote is \$288,000. But looking back over the past years, in some of the other estimates as well — I'm not an accountant, but sometimes have been an economist working closely with them — there are red flag sort of things that you ought to look at.

I remember when I looked at the one for Recreation and Parks, they had votes that — well, here's one that amounted to \$12 million. But through all these estimates, this one came to \$12,395,117. Accountants sometimes get a little suspicious when they see amounts being voted for a total of \$73 million and it comes down to the last dollar. When you're talking about \$73 million, the question has to be raised: how can you estimate that right

down to the last \$100, the last \$10, and the last million? As we've gone through these estimates, we've seen that there are two different sets of numbers. The first set is that which has been estimated for the project in the initial stages and the total completion, and then the costs as they actually develop over the term of that project.

Looking at this one for library development. I note that the first estimate came up in 1979-80. There was an estimate of \$3 million, to provide funds for the initial stages of a multi-year program for the expansion of library holdings of books and research materials. But going from that first-year estimate, 1979-80, into the second year of the program, 1980-81, again another \$3 million is asked for. By going back through the records. I presume one could establish that as a three-year program, \$3 million each year. But the estimate for 1980-81 shows that the total actual expenditure to March 31, 1979, was nil. So the question that comes up right away is, what happened to the first \$3 million in the '79-80 project estimates? So we went from the first year, where \$3 million was voted, to the second year, where another \$3 million was voted. Yet there hadn't been any expenditure on the first one.

When we go to the 1981-82 estimates, there is an unusual number, \$3,288,000. That's where the accountant's interest comes into play. When you look at the '81-82 estimates, you see that unusual number of \$3,288,000, when previously there were just even numbers of \$3 million. Then the 1981-82 estimates show that the total actual expenditure to March 31, 1980, was \$2,712,000. The interesting thing here is that the \$712,000 of the \$2 million, and the \$288,000 of the \$3 million, add up to an even million dollars.

When we come to the 1982-83 estimates, the amount to be voted is \$288,000, showing up again. What it looks like is that there might have been a double entry somewhere in the accounting records. I'm sure I didn't have to bring that to your attention, Mr. Chairman. But perhaps I might pose the question to the minister and ask if there has been some sort of carry-over in one way or another with that \$288,000. The reason I bring that up is because when we've gone through the other estimates, we have found that there hasn't been a clear definition of the program; that is, a clear definition in terms of the total dollars allocated for it.

For example, some of the programs said that this expenditure or capital project would last X number of years and the expenditure would be Y dollars. But as we've gone through the votes year by year, we found that sometimes those X years had been superseded, and that the Y dollars had been exceeded as well. I think that those definitions of the program are put there in the first place for a purpose; that is, first of all, to guide the people who are expending the sums, once we've voted them to them, in their day to day decisions, so they know they have to make decisions within the parameters given to them by the dollars and the time.

Secondly, those parameters are there or the definition of the program is there so that when the end comes, when we come to that X number of dollars or that Y number of years, we can stop and review what has in fact taken place. Have we accomplished what we set out to do? In this case, the objective was to acquire a certain number of materials for libraries. Well, at the end of the period can we stop and say we did in fact acquire those materials as we set out to in the first instance? That's a measure of effectiveness of the program. How effective has the program been in meeting the objectives we set out in the first

instance?

The second thing is a measure of efficiency in meeting those objectives. How effective were we in doing it? Did we do it with the resources which were allocated to us, or did we exceed those resources first allocated to us? Of course, there's always the third possibility, as demonstrated to us by the Minister of Environment, that in fact we didn't even require all the resources allocated to do the particular job.

Now, there's no question that this is a worth-while program, as are all the programs under the capital projects division of the heritage fund. But one of the problems we have is in regard to accountability; that is, how have we done in regard to what we set out to do? This number here, although small, could be symptomatic of a greater problem within the accounting system. So I just ask the minister if, prior to going into other questions on this matter, he would direct his attention to the votes over the three years we've had them. I guess this is the fourth year now. When I go back to the annual reports; for example, the 1979-80 annual report, if I could just quote from page 10, where it describes the library development project:

This project, which provides grants to all public colleges and universities in Alberta, involves a commitment of \$9 million over a three year period.

Then it goes on to describe the objective, to expand and upgrade library holdings of learning materials.

The point is that here's a definition of the program. It gives specific parameters; it says it's a three-year program. However, as I look at this, it looks like we're into the fourth year of the program, inasmuch as this is the fourth year we're voting on this. That raises other questions as well. Are we going to exceed the three-year program? Has the program been so beneficial that it has become desirable to continue it? If so, how long will we do that? Will it be on an annual basis, or will we be asked to renew these things?

That's an important point to keep in mind as well. Because when members do vote on these things initially, they're voting on something specific. They're being asked to vote on a three-year program. That's what was approved in the first instance. However, we've now exceeded that. We're into the fourth year. Does that mean that the minister should come back here and get our approval over again or, taking an extreme example, would the Assembly have approved a program of four years, if it had known that was the case? They knew it was a three-year program, so they approved that, but would it have gone for four years? Would it have approved a program of indefinite length? Probably not. I don't think that would have been a serious concern in this case, because indeed this is a valuable program, and the Assembly would have gone on. Nevertheless, for other programs perhaps we wouldn't want to have the precedent set here where we give an open-ended cheque to a minister or department to carry on with a program indefinitely. There has to be some guideline as to how long it goes on.

So the major question I would like to address first of all in regard to this estimate is the accounting, not in a legitimacy sense but in a strict sense of financial accounting. How did we go from the first year of the project and not spend any money at all? Then somehow the records got changed around here, so we have what I'll call this funny number, \$288,000, carried over from one year to the next. Then we have an expenditure of \$712,000, which is perfectly complementary to that one, resulting in

\$1 million. I can understand there being an unused balance from year to year, but I'm not too sure how it relates to this, and what happens to it from one year to the next and where it goes. So perhaps I could ask the minister to address that accounting anomaly and then go on from there.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member has asked one question. That relates to why the figure being requested for the '82-83 estimates is \$288,000. That figure represents the balance of the commitment of \$9 million originally committed to this project. That is the answer, quite simply. I don't think I need go beyond that. All the money wasn't spent in the first few years by the various institutions, and that's the balance required to complete the grants we make to postsecondary institutions in the province to complete this three-year commitment. All the funds were not spent in the first three years, and the balance, adding up the figures that are available in all the reports, comes to a total of \$9 million.

MR. SINDLINGER: A supplementary, Mr. Chairman. I guess that's the point. Because the way these estimates are laid out, it doesn't come to \$9 million in total. It comes to \$9,288,000. I recognize the minister probably doesn't have the previous years' estimates in front of him, but I have excerpts from the '79-80, '80-81, and '81-82 estimates, and then this one. I appreciate the fact that the program probably does amount to \$9 million. I don't question that. What I'm questioning here is the way it is presented to us in these capital estimates. The way the capital estimates are laid out — if you look at not each one in isolation, but all of them in total — the total throughout the four years, not the three years, comes to \$9,288,000, not \$9 million.

So, on the bottom line, where the project is being presented as a \$9 million, that's probably in fact what it is. There's no question about that. However, the problem is the method of presenting these numbers. They're not consistent throughout the years. There's an error in there somewhere, and it's an accounting error. The question has to be: is the accounting error simply in producing these estimates, or does it come in the method by which the department monitors its program?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SINDLINGER: I would hope the minister might give us an undertaking to look into that method of presentation of the last four years. Because absolutely, without question, here is discrete and distinct evidence that in fact the system isn't consistent throughout the four years. I might add that this matter has concerned the Auditor General over the years as well; that is, the monitoring and accounting of heritage savings trust funds. Here is a very good example of it. I'm wondering now whether or not the government has a sincere desire to address this problem.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, it's very obvious that when one adds up the total actual expenditure to the end of March 31, 1981, the sum was \$5,712,000. When one adds to that the \$3 million allocated in the current fiscal year and the \$288,000 required in the subsequent fiscal year, the sum comes to \$9 million. That's what this Legislature is being asked to vote. It's as simple as that. All the figures add up to \$9 million. As far as I know, there's no question on the part of the Auditor General or

anybody else as to how the figure of \$9 million is arrived at.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to belabor that point. I do concede that on the bottom line, as the minister has indicated, the project does add up to \$9 million. Nevertheless, it is also accurate to say that when the numbers, the components of the bottom line are added up, they don't come to \$9 million. They come to \$9,288,000, which is an accounting or record-keeping inconsistency, in my judgment.

Nevertheless, going from that, I might ask the minister if he could give us some indication of how the expenditure of these funds by the universities and colleges is monitored by the department, to ensure that they go for the purpose for which they are intended; that is, for library materials, books, microfiche, or whatever the guidelines were in the initial instance, and to ensure that they weren't used for other things, such as salaries. What monitoring system did the department have in place to ensure the funds went for that which they are intended?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, that matter was reported to the committee on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund when I appeared before the committee earlier this year. We have commitments from all the institutions that they have spent the moneys on matters solely related to the acquisition of materials. I have an acquisitions report, which is complete until the end of June this year.

We will not have a final figure until we've spent all the money. That will be perhaps well into the '82-83 fiscal year. But each institution is required to provide the department with a statement as to what they have acquired. That material is available to any hon. member who wishes it. I'd be pleased to supply a copy of the acquisition report to each member of the Assembly, if that's desired.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I might ask the minister, if he would, to provide that material to the Assembly. I also recall the time he was before the committee and this matter was discussed, and a question of a regular reporting procedure came up.

The question also came up about the role the Auditor General played in the monitoring of acquisitions by the institutions using the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I have the transcript of that Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act, Wednesday, September 10, 1980. On page [142], the minister discussed various things and, among others, referred to evaluation and accountability. The minister went on to say:

... in each case, the expenditures of the individual institutions are audited by the Auditor General.

How was the Auditor General involved in the evaluation and accountability in each case? Did the Auditor General go to each institution, or did he just review the reports to which the minister has just referred?

MR. HORSMAN: Perhaps the hon. member might address those questions to the Auditor General. I don't have any control over how he operates, with respect to his procedures within the institutions. Those are all matters that are now required by legislation to be filed by me: annual reports, audited reports of each institution.

It seems a rather extraneous question to ask me, Mr. Chairman. But just to repeat what I said at the committee meeting, each institution is required to maintain its conditional grant in a special purpose fund and provide regular

reports to the department. Reports include progress made towards meeting the objectives of the grant, in addition to statements of expenditures and commitments. The institutions are expected to maintain at least the same level of expenditures on library materials from their regular operating budgets that they would normally have done, and not have these extra funds replace those normal library accounts. In other words, they are in effect for capital purposes. I can't answer any more than that, except to say there's been no indication in any way, either from my department or from the Auditor General, that the funds have not been properly allocated and used by any institution in the system.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I don't consider this to be an extraneous committee. I'm not sure if the minister is aware of this or not, but we in the opposition haven't been privy to all the reports by the Auditor General. We would not know whether he in fact reported on this matter. We haven't been able to get access to them. That's why I'm putting the question to the minister. I'm also putting it to the minister because he brought it up in the committee. He volunteered the information about the Auditor General in his opening remarks.

I might ask the question in another way. Has the minister received any reports from the Auditor General in regard to the evaluation and accountability for these expenditures on learning materials for libraries?

MR. HORSMAN: The annual audited reports of the institutions are filed with the Assembly.

MR. SINDLINGER: I'm not talking about the audited reports of the institutions. I'm referring specifically to the Auditor General. The minister said:

Of course there is evaluation and accountability, and in each case the expenditures of the individual institution are audited by the Auditor General.

The question is: has the minister received any of these audited statements by the Auditor General, not just the statements of the institutions?

MR. HORSMAN: Financial statements of the institutions are audited and filed with the Assembly. I don't know what the hon. member is getting at. They of course follow the event and, as a result of recent amendments to The Financial Administration Act, I believe, I am required to supply those on an annual basis to the members of the Assembly — which of course is part of my ministerial responsibility — as I have done and will continue to do.

MR. SINDLINGER: Just for certainty to clear this up, Mr. Chairman. I'm not too sure we're talking about the same thing. Understandably the generally audited statements of any institution are filed. I don't know how they are or through whom. But in this case we're talking about a specific audit by the Auditor General of the expenditures and acquisitions using this Heritage Savings Trust Fund money. I guess the most precise question I could put to the minister is simply: has the minister received any statements, reports, or letters from the Auditor General dealing with the accountability and evaluation of these expenditures?

MR. HORSMAN: I repeat, the audited statements of the institutions that receive these funds are received by the Assembly via my department. They're not, as I under-

stand it, separate reports relating to this particular grant made by my department through the heritage fund to the various institutions. They're part of the overall audited financial statements. They will be available to all members of the Assembly. I have nothing more than that, to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, when the minister says the audited statements are received by this Assembly, does he mean audited statements done by the Auditor General?

MR. HORSMAN: The financial records of the institutions are now required to be done by the Auditor General, or examined by the Auditor General in any event, and are tabled annually with the Assembly.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, then the audited statements we're talking about, those which are prepared and presented to the Legislative Assembly — to my understanding by what has just been said — are completed by the Auditor General and presented to the Assembly. But there are two parts to those. One is just the financial record that says the auditing tests were conducted in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards and fairly represent the balance sheet of this company, institution, or agency, at this particular point in time. The other part actually deals with the management and accounting procedures and assessment of the situation. Could I ask the minister if he has received any of those reports, apart from audited statements that say generally accepted accounting tests were applied to this particular agency?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would appear that the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo has asked the same question in a number of forms. I believe the minister has replied to it in a manner from all the information he has available. I think he's answered it sufficiently, and perhaps we should go on to another question.

MR. SINDLINGER: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Going on with evaluation and accountability, could the minister please indicate to the Assembly what type of materials have been acquired with the moneys so far expended, and perhaps not only describe the nature of them, but give an indication of the quantity; that is, were there one or 1 million books acquired?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I have already indicated that I have an acquisitions report to March 31, 1981, for the universities, and for the colleges up to the end of June, which is their fiscal year, which I will circulate to all members of the Assembly. I'll make that available. I don't think it would be useful to read it into the record. I'll circulate copies of it, and perhaps get them run off now for members of the opposition who are in the House.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be very useful to have that. We must bear in mind that this is a checkpoint. The Minister of Environment brought that up before. We're here to review what has gone on in the past and, after having made an assessment of that, determine whether we ought to go on into the future. For example, to use an extreme illustration, if we have already spent whatever it is, \$9 million today, and we have bought only one book with that, then members in their

judgment might say that maybe it isn't a good idea to spend any more money on this program. If, on the other hand, the expenditure of that \$9 million had acquired 90 million books, the people in this Legislature would say this is a very good program, and rather than just voting this \$288,000, why don't we vote something more than that to keep the program going a little bit longer. Perhaps while we're waiting for that to be reproduced and distributed to the members, we could go on to another question and come back to it.

What was the process for allocating the funds between the libraries, colleges, and other institutions? What method was used to determine how much money should go to the libraries, how much to colleges, and then how much to each of the colleges and libraries within those two categories?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I've reported at length on that matter to the committee of which the hon. member is a member. The processes have not changed since that time. I don't see that it would be particularly useful to repeat the whole method, except to say that there has been extensive consultation with the universities' co-ordinating council and with the colleges. In each case, after considerable discussion on the allocation, agreement was reached, with the universities receiving 62 per cent and the public colleges receiving 38 per cent of the distribution in each of the various years. I should point out that Banff Centre, of course, is contained within the universities component.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I'm not completely certain that it would not be particularly useful to describe the process for coming up with the 62:38 split. The minister has indicated it would not be particularly useful, because he has already given that information to the heritage fund committee. And quite rightly, he's pointed out that I am on it. But I think we ought to bear in mind that there are only 15 members on that committee, and there is a total of 78 members in this Legislature. Although, in the minister's words, it may not be particularly useful to define that allocation process, on the other hand, it might be a matter of courtesy to indicate to the other members of the Legislative Assembly how we did in fact come up with 62 per cent of the allocation for the universities and 38 per cent for the colleges.

Was it based on a geographic breakdown, a per student breakdown, a per program breakdown, or on the needs of libraries of colleges as opposed to the needs of libraries of universities? Was it based on programs yet to be implemented, as opposed to those already established? It seems to me that quite a few different types of criteria could have been used to determine that 62 per cent of the allocation will go to universities and 38 to colleges. So rather than getting into some detailed explanation of the calculation, perhaps the minister could give us an idea of the theory or philosophy underlying the decision to allocate 62 per cent one way and 38 per cent the other.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Actually, I think we're deviating here in the matter of relevancy. Maybe the member could be more specific in the actual question as it relates to this particular vote.

MR. SINDLINGER: I think it's all related to the same vote. It's a four-year program now, actually. When we started out, we were told this was a three-year program, but it's a four-year program. So, obviously, all these

numbers have to be relevant, one to the other. And all of the decision-making has to be relevant, one to the other. I can't understand how we would say that any of this would be irrelevant.

If the chairman would like us to define our comments to this particular vote, we might ask: if this vote is for \$288,000, is the same portion of that going to be allocated to universities and the same portion to colleges: 62 per cent of the \$288,000 for universities, 38 per cent of the \$288,000 for colleges? Now I think that's an important question. If we look back at the earlier years, we'll find that in the first year none of the \$3 million was expended. From what I can recollect, it seems to me that in the second year, the colleges were not at all in time with the universities. That is, the universities had expended their moneys, their grants for that particular year, before the colleges had even gotten together and decided whether or how to spend theirs. So there is a difference in phasing and timing. We might now ask if this \$288,000 is somehow in sync, so that we can still maintain the allocation of 62 per cent for the universities and 38 per cent for the colleges.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, the \$288,000 being requested from this committee and the Assembly will ensure that the distribution of the \$9 million between the colleges system and the universities is 62 per cent to the universities and 38 per cent to the public colleges, which has been the amount determined by my department after extensive consultation, which I reported to the select committee.

It may be that the remaining amount may be required in some different percentage for the colleges and universities. However, as I indicated, this is to ensure that the balance of the \$9 million commitment required will be allocated on the basis of the 62 per cent to 38 per cent distribution agreed upon between the colleges and the universities in the process of consultation. Quite frankly, at this stage it would be impossible to go back and change the criteria of the distribution. What we are asking for is just the balance required to complete our commitment, which this Legislature has determined to be appropriate in previous years.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, in view of the success of this particular program, I might ask the minister whether he will be recommending that it be continued for another year or become a permanent program in the years to come.

MR. HORSMAN: This is it, Mr. Chairman. This is the last of the \$9 million.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, in regard to the initiation of the program, was the program's first intent to meet a deficiency or satisfy a need? That is, after its completion, will this program have met a deficiency in the libraries' learning materials, or was it intended to put the libraries in a position where they could meet the needs over the coming years, say over the next 10 years. And then, perhaps in the next 10 years, will we have to stop and assess whether the libraries are meeting the needs of students of that particular time, and perhaps consider reintroduction of a program such as this to meet a deficiency or need in the future? I guess the simplest way to put that question is: has the program, in its entirety, prepared the university and college libraries to the extent

that they can meet all the needs of all the students from now until, say, 1990?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the objects of the program, I would refer the hon. member to the *Hansard* record of the institution of this program by my predecessor. I know that the hon. member was not a member of the Assembly at that stage, but the record is there. There has been a consistent approach throughout, no new element has been added to the \$9 million commitment, and the record speaks for itself.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I was there. In fact, the minister wasn't there either. I think the minister was sitting in the second row back yonder when the \$9 million fund was started.

MR. NOTLEY: Talking about erecting statues, as I recall.

MR. R. CLARK: I wasn't going to mention that, but now that you have . . .

Seriously though, the point made by a number of members at that time . . . There were different views from the two sides of the House. When the government brought forward the \$9 million universities program, it was seen by some of us as a means of picking up some of the slack in funding for universities as far as postsecondary education was concerned, specifically in the area of libraries. At that time, the point was made that we should be very careful about using Heritage Savings Trust Fund money which really was in fact part of what should be the normal operating budget. Now, Mr. Minister, three or four years down the road, we're in a situation where the universities and colleges are used to spending at a certain level as far as library budgets are concerned.

The first of a number of questions I have: over the three years, what impact has the \$9 million had on the percentage of university budgets that goes into libraries? I raise that question from this point of view: if the universities have used a smaller portion of their operating budget for university supplies, now that the Heritage Savings Trust Fund money has dried up, we have three choices for the future. One is for the government to make additional sizable grants to postsecondary education and earmark them for universities, which basically has been against the approach the department has taken. The second approach would be for the universities to have to cut back their funding to a very great degree as far as libraries are concerned. The third approach of course would be for the government to start a new program.

So there's no misunderstanding about the questions, they're really twofold. One, what has happened to university/college spending as far as libraries from their operating budget? Secondly, what plan does the minister have to assure us that there's going to be a continuation of expenditure at about this level for library services within the system?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I really find the relevance of the comments relating to this particular request for funds, the balance of a commitment made some years ago, to be rather outside the terms of this particular vote. Because they really relate to the normal budgeting process of the department, which of course will be the subject of debate when the next budget is brought forward. I think it is clear to all hon. members of this committee that we are not extending the program beyond the origi-

nal \$9 million commitment. What we're asking for in this vote is the balance of those funds in the '82-83 fiscal year.

But by way of general information, I have been advised by my department and the institutions that the funds have been used properly by them to supplement rather than take away from the normal operating allocations to libraries within the system; in other words, to give that extra build-up to library systems at the colleges and universities, which was the original intent when this matter was first brought before the Assembly by my predecessor.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of comments and questions. I have to say to the minister that I'm rather disappointed for a number of reasons that this \$288,000 marks the end of the program. I say to members of the committee that the \$9 million over the last three years, including this fourth year of \$288,000, has been helpful in the purchase of books in the universities as well as in our colleges in the province. But what concerns me is where we go from here. As we look at this \$288,000 — and we have the minister telling us that this is the end of the road — I'd be less than honest if I didn't say that I believe the government should reconsider the program, and perhaps sit down with the universities and colleges and design a continuation of the program over the next number of years, perhaps somewhat greater indeed than the \$9 million allocated to date.

Mr. Chairman, as members of the committee are aware, I took the opportunity of holding public hearings around the province. While it certainly isn't my intention to detail all the submissions I received, I think it would be useful for members of the committee if I took just a moment to discuss the submission made by the Federation of Alberta Students on this very subject of the heritage library program. Basically their concern is that the libraries in the universities — first of all, there's the orientation of the program, which relates to acquiring books but not necessarily the administration of the libraries. You have to have librarians if you're going to have libraries. But what happens now that we've come to the end of this program?

Mr. Walker, representing the Federation of Alberta Students, pointed out that university and college libraries have really been in some difficulty, since the level of public funding available to them no longer permits maintenance of present collections, and the special heritage grants program will end this year. By the way, this is the submission of the Federation of Alberta Students. They're concerned that at the end of the program, instead of leaving the libraries ahead of the game, as we were told when this program was announced in the committee — with a good deal of fanfare and the support of both sides of the House, I might say. But at the end of the road, the Federation of Alberta Students is of the view that unless we reinstitute the program, our university and college library system is just not going to be able to keep pace with needs, and that in fact there will be an outright deterioration in the postsecondary library system in the province.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

Mr. Chairman, I think that point was also made by another person who made a submission. I'd like to quote from the submission of Olga Andersen, librarian and educator:

Prior to the institution of the Heritage Trust Fund

support to the province's library system. Alberta with an expenditure of \$1.25 per capita for books ranked last amongst all the provinces of Canada. Since the institution of the government support program we have only moved to the position of 8th, while our school libraries lag behind British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Ontario, the leaders in the country.

Then Ms Andersen argued that

the assumption behind the notion of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund is that Alberta already has a high standard of public services, including libraries.

But that in fact is going to be seriously jeopardized if the program comes to an end. Her recommendation was that we have a permanent endowment for providing adequate operating revenues for the province's library system, including the libraries at the colleges and universities.

Mr. Chairman, rather than ask questions on this. I want to make some observations. Because when we discuss the estimates, I think we have to discuss the choices that lie before the province and the government. At the present time, the federal budget indicates that some \$5.7 billion will be struck from the established programs financing Act, which is going to have a very significant impact on the funding of postsecondary institutions in this province. On Friday, I was disturbed to learn that the Provincial Treasurer has said there is no way there can be any guarantee the provincial government will take up the slack with the federal cutbacks. Well, I would just say to the government that I hope we do not make the universities and colleges, and in particular their library systems, casualties in yet another, I think, retrogressive move by the federal government. I think that if the federal government is cutting back, we have to fight that battle with Ottawa, but there must be a commitment by the province to continue the funding of universities and colleges.

Now, as it relates to the library system, the minister has said this is the end of the program. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I say that in discussing the matter we have to ask ourselves, is this the time to end the program? With the federal government backing out of its obligation, is this the time to say this is the end of the road as far as the heritage library program is concerned? If it had any value in 1977 and 1978, and it did in the last three years, surely we should have a commitment from the minister on behalf of the government caucus that we're going to develop a new program. Where are the universities and colleges going to get the money if we've got a cutback in federal funds and no commitment from the Provincial Treasurer that that slack would be taken up by the province?

And what's going to be cut? Let's not be naive about it. Regrettably, one area that will be cut will be the library system. That's a point the Federation of Alberta Students has already made. They said the one thing that has salvaged the library system in our colleges and universities has been the money from the heritage fund, the \$9 million. But we're now told that this is the end of the road; this \$288,000 will complete the project, and that that's it.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that we should have a commitment from the minister today that this is not the end of the road. If there was value in the program before, there will be value in a new program. I don't expect the minister to come before the committee and say we're going to announce another \$9 million, \$12 million, or \$20 million program. But I am saying that during discussion of these estimates, I would like to see a commitment from

the minister that he is at the very least prepared to sit down with the presidents of the universities and colleges in this province and frankly and honestly review the merits of a new program's being announced, so that we can carry this on. I think it could be argued in any case, but especially now as a result of the federal budget, that we have to have some commitment in this important area.

There's not much point in having a college system and a university system if the libraries are allowed to deteriorate. I needn't go over the fact that we've discussed this. All members have agreed on the merits of this particular sort of investment. But I just can't stress enough for members of the committee that if there were merits before when we had a fair arrangement on federal/provincial cost sharing for postsecondary institutions, then the merits of advancing this program into the years ahead are even more necessary and obvious.

There's little doubt that the costs of library acquisitions are going up. One of the interesting observations of the Federation of Alberta Students when they made their submissions to me, was that if you just look what's happened to the cost of books in the last few years, the cost of acquiring books has mushroomed. We all know that. All one has to do is go down to a bookstore; the costs have mushroomed. Until we had this heritage scheme, the dollars that had been made available for library acquisitions in our universities and colleges really hadn't matched the increases in the costs of acquiring volumes for our university and college library system.

Now, in 1981, we're going to say that the best we can do is complete a \$9 million program. Two hundred and eighty-eight thousand dollars will be allocated this year by this Legislature from a heritage trust fund of what, as I look at the most recent quarterly report, is something over \$9.5 billion. The best we can do is another \$288,000 and the minister says, I'm sorry, that's it.

Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, setting aside for a moment partisan differences between members of this House, I say that this is not the time to say, no, this is the end of the road. If we're serious about this important program, I urge that members of the committee make it clear that we want a new program developed. In developing a program to take up where this one left off, I would say that it would be well worth a commitment from the minister not only to meet with the institutional heads, but to include students and, I think, the Alberta library association too, so that we can have maximum input in designing a program which would realistically allow us to continue the work already begun.

Frankly, when one looks at the increased cost of books, I doubt whether \$9 million would be adequate for a new program to be comparable in terms of achieving the result. It may have to be significantly more than that. But the point is that whether it is \$15 million, \$20 million, or another \$9 million program, it is important that we begin the process of having the meetings and discussions now, so that we in this committee can see some commitment on behalf of the government that what has gone on for the last three years will not be the finish of the project. With Ottawa's moves in the last few days, this is doubly important.

I just do not see how any member of this committee could stand or sit in his place and not demand at least a continuation of this heritage program as it applies to libraries. If the minister can tell me that as a result of Mr. MacEachen's budget this is all going to be handled, and we don't need to worry — we're going to have all this

money coming through and there are no problems; the universities will be able to make those choices — then maybe that would reassure me. But we all know that isn't going to happen. We all know that the decision of the federal government to vacate \$5.7 billion is going to have very significant implications, and we already have the Provincial Treasurer on Friday of last week and yesterday hedging the position of the government in Alberta. Well, let's not hedge it at least as far as books are concerned in our university and college system.

Mr. Chairman, as bluntly as I can, if this is the end of the road, I would call upon the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower to outline clearly to this committee why it is. I would ask him what possibility, what preconditions would there be for re-establishment of this program, particularly in light of the federal budget. I would further ask him what assessment of the federal budget there has been in terms of the impact on the library programs of the universities and colleges in the province. I put those questions directly to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, because I think it is important this afternoon that we frankly assess whether this is the end of the road or just a pause before we get on with an important program.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the estimates of the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, the message seems to be coming from my right, which seems to be a little unusual, that the only funding done at university libraries and public colleges is that which we're dealing with today. I simply look at the estimates of expenditure under which the minister operates for the year and at the figure of \$611 million. Surely a fair amount of that finds its way into the libraries of institutions in this province.

The Member for Spirit River-Fairview continually mentions the federal government this, the federal government that. I hope we're all cognizant of the fact that if it wasn't for one Mr. Broadbent, we wouldn't be dealing with cuts of \$5 million-odd in EPF. Yet how often do I see the hon. member on television, albeit public television, the CBC, praising what his alter ego at Ottawa is doing? Surely, if he's got anybody to thank for the proposed cuts in EPF, it has to be his parent party in Ottawa. He has the nerve to stand here today and say that the only funding we're doing — as though it's nothing — \$9 million in the aggregate for libraries. I don't see many in the galleries; I don't know which grandstand he's playing to. I don't profess to be an expert in advanced education.

MR. NOTLEY: No doubt about that.

MR. GOGO: Who did his research? He refers continually to the great public hearings he had throughout this province with regard to investments by the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Ninety nine per cent of them talk about spending and not investing at all. Yet, and I don't want to be discourteous to him, he has the great — I'm trying to think of the appropriate term — to come into the House today to try to wreak havoc on the government with regard to making a measly \$9 million toward the libraries of our institutions of Alberta as being something minor.

In the same breath — and I have respect for the FAS as well — he says that because they say it's not enough, because they say it has been a successful program, and it happens to be concluding, the minister should reinvent

the system and spend another \$9, \$19, or I think I heard him say \$20 million. I would certainly ask members to listen carefully and read *Hansard*. Having done that — particularly if they've listened — they'll support the minister's position today and get this estimate through.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I just would like to respond briefly to the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

MR. R. CLARK: Not too briefly.

MR. NOTLEY: For a minute or two or three, maybe even more. Mr. Chairman, we had all kinds of comments from the Member for Lethbridge West. He finally got hold of a copy of the budget and pointed out that this money was being made available from Advanced Education, overlooking of course that under the established programs financing Act, a good portion of the money we spend out of Advanced Education comes from the federal government, and that's true also of health and medical care.

The concern of the provinces on this issue is that with the cutbacks, there will be some impact on the programs across Canada; less, I hope, in this province. As a matter of fact, there shouldn't be any cutbacks in this province, because we're in a position to pick up the slack. Yes, there are; the minister sort of nodded his head in disagreement. When one looks at all the programs available, especially when we're talking about our public college system, we're looking at manpower training programs and basic funding. There's a flow of federal and provincial funds which is quite complicated; nevertheless, it is there. The Member for Lethbridge West should realize that.

Where in heaven's name the Member for Lethbridge West got the idea that the federal leader of the New Democratic Party was opposed to cutbacks in EPF, I find incredible. If the Member for Lethbridge West had been at all alert and had watched the debate in the House of Commons, he would know that that is precisely the position the federal party has very much opposed. In 1976 and 1977 when the issue began, Mr. Douglas was one of the most articulate spokesmen on this whole business of cost sharing between the federal and provincial governments on the array of services which many of us take for granted. So I certainly welcome the opportunity to respond to the Member for Lethbridge West.

I come back to the point I wanted to leave with the minister. We had a program in place. That program will be expiring with the expenditure of the \$288,000. I'm not saying that the minister should come in today and give us a figure as to what a new program, designed properly, would cost. I am saying that the minister should come before the committee and give us an indication as to whether or not this government sees a continuation of the program. If he's prepared to do that and outline the kind of process that would be involved in designing a new program, fine, that's the sort of thing that would be useful for the committee.

But in my judgment, it would not be in anybody's interest, let alone the many thousands of students at postsecondary institutions, in both the college and the university system, for us as a committee to say this is the end of the program, that's fine. We can slap ourselves on the back and tell ourselves what a great job it's been, and this is it. So long, goodbye, it's over. It shouldn't be over. The Member for Lethbridge West would be the first one to

criticize the opposition, and rightly so, if two or three years down the road we asked the minister where the funds for library spending and investment were when we had an opportunity in this committee, when the program was expiring, to make the case for its continuation. That's the point I'm trying to underline this afternoon. We may not have the exact figures. Fair enough. But I think we need some indication as to what the government sees as the next step as far as heritage investment in the libraries of the universities and colleges of this province is concerned.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the debate between the hon. Member for Lethbridge West and the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. Enlightening as it may have been, it was not to the point at issue, and that is simply to vote the balance of the \$9 million commitment which was made. I did not say it was the end of the road, as alleged by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I said it was the end of the \$9 million. That doesn't necessarily mean the end of the road at all. I must say that I looked with interest at the recommendations of the select committee. I didn't notice anything there with respect to recommendations for continuation or replacement of the program. That I found of interest.

I can assure hon. members of this committee that the library system at the universities and colleges is very important. Established programs financing is very important. The whole question as to how it will affect Alberta postsecondary education is far from clear. It would be inappropriate for me in the debate on this particular estimate, in which I seek support of this House for the remainder of a \$9 million commitment, to engage in an extraneous discussion of next year's budget of my department, or indeed as to what recommendations might be appropriate for future consideration for maintenance and support of libraries within the postsecondary system.

I have listened with interest to the hon. member's concerns. I have heard them expressed by the Federation of Alberta Students, by the Universities Co-ordinating Council, by the council of the presidents and board chairmen of the colleges. No doubt, now that we have boards of governors at the technical institutes, I will hear similar concerns expressed, and I will listen to them. I'm always open to good advice. I thank the hon. member for his support of what has taken place in this \$9 million program, and now I would like to have the funds voted so that we may proceed with committing the balance of the \$9 million. That's really all I'm here to ask this committee to do today.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. One of the questions we've been asking other ministers is with regard to the departmental interaction with the various institutions or persons responsible for expenditure of the funds. For example, the Minister of Environment pointed out that funds were allocated to private groups in the Slave Lake area. They in turn were responsible, accountability was held through the departmental establishment. We also spoke to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, in terms of AOSTRA and other programs, as to what the accountability would be.

In terms of the books and funds allocated. I wonder what type of departmental interaction goes on with the various institutions we're talking about. Are funds just provided — basically a cheque is sent and then they spend it in any way they see fit — or are there some

parameters in terms of the expenditure? What assurance is given to the minister and to this Assembly that all moneys went towards books or learning materials? Can the minister enlighten us on that type of question?

MR. HORSMAN: I answered all those questions earlier today.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, my colleagues tell me that's not an accurate statement, in terms of answering the question. [interjections] The minister can . . .

MR. NOTLEY: If he wants the vote, he's got to answer the questions.

MR. R. SPEAKER: He's asking me to vote on something. I've come here to take on a responsibility of asking questions. The Minister of Transportation, your minister . . . [interjections] How do I know? He wants to vote on it. If you want to hold the vote, then tell me that. If you want to hold it, fine. If he wants to answer the question, fine. But if he's going to vote on it, and I don't get the chance to ask questions, then the big answer is like with our fellow friend Trynchy. He hides back in his office and won't answer any questions.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. R. SPEAKER: So here we've got the same situation coming up.

MR. NOTLEY: Let's have the answer.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to pose another question. We've addressed this subject earlier, but we haven't got an adequate response to it. Inasmuch as the minister has brought the subject into the open and addressed that, I think we ought to follow it up.

It's in regard to the \$9 million. The minister is saying repeatedly that this program cost \$9 million. I can understand that. But what I have trouble with is this estimate. If I could approach this from a different direction, the estimate says that the comparable 1981-82 estimate was \$3,288,000. If you take the comparable 1981-82 estimate and add it to the total actual expenditures to March 31, 1981, which is indicated in here to be \$5,712,000, you get \$9 million. That is, last year the comparable estimates were \$3,288,000. Add that to what had been expended before, \$5,712,000, and that's \$9 million. Yet we're now asking for another \$288,000, which brings the total to \$9,288,000. Those numbers do not say that the project is worth \$9 million; they say it's worth \$9,288,000.

The question is: do we really need this extra \$288,000, or are we voting it twice? Obviously, by what it says here, we're voting it twice. We're voting \$288,000 not only last year but this year too. That's over half a million dollars, almost \$600,000, if you add it up twice: \$288,000 times two is almost \$600,000. Obviously, something is incorrect in this estimate. Obviously, it has not been recorded correctly or properly. We have some double accounting here somehow. Either somewhere someone has put in a debit where they should have a credit, or vice versa.

Nobody is quarreling with the need for this program. The Member for Spirit River-Fairview has said this is a necessary program. I think we all agree that it's a good program. The minister has assured us that in the future there be consideration to additional programs of this nature.

But before we do that, before we get so, anxious and run away, we do have to assess what we have done in the past. Have we accomplished what we set out to do? I've heard all the members here say that this is a very integral part of our educational system in the province. There's no question about that. You don't have an educational system unless you have books. So this program is very well directed.

But the question we haven't addressed yet is how important a contribution this program has been to the university and college programs in their total? Nine million dollars is a lot of money. But what is their total program without that? Has it made a substantial impact in the library? I don't know if the libraries in this province have been expanded by 1 per cent or 100 per cent through the expenditure of these funds and the acquisition of the materials. Until we're advised otherwise, it may be that the \$9 million is insignificant. On the other hand, it might be very significant. If it is very significant, we ought to continue with it.

We have asked questions about this earlier this afternoon, and the minister has indicated that he has answered them. In my opinion, he hasn't answered them adequately or satisfactorily. I wouldn't mind repeating them, or having the minister take another chance at answering them.

The one question that has to be addressed and has to be resolved before we vote on this is the accuracy of these estimates. On the one hand, we have the minister saying it's \$9 million; on the other hand, we have these estimates that say it's \$9,288,000. Clearly, that's a contradiction. Until that contradiction is cleared, I don't see how we can vote on this estimate. It would be irresponsible for us to do so.

I challenge the minister or any member in this Legislative Assembly to get up and demonstrate to the satisfaction of all of us that in fact this is a \$9 million program, because it's not. It's a \$9,288,000 program. I just throw that back to the minister: what do we do with it? What do we do with the estimate when it's obviously inaccurate, when it's incorrect? I think the \$288,000 we're being asked to vote on here today was acquired last year.

MR. COOK: Why don't you let him answer the question?

MR. SINDLINGER: All right, I will. Mr. Minister, would you please address the question of whether . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo use parliamentary language?

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, could the minister please address the issue of whether this is a \$9 million project or a \$9,288,000 project? Would he please direct his response to the estimates, where we have the numbers in black and white, and reconcile those and move an amendment somehow so that this accurately reflects the project?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, it's a \$9 million project. The balance required to complete the \$9 million is \$288,000 in the fiscal year 1982-83. The estimates clearly state that to be the case. If the hon. member cannot see it, well, I can't help him any further than I've done today. I'm sorry.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, before we proceed any further. The minister quite correct-

ly indicated that the breakdown would be made available to members of the committee. I have not received a copy of the breakdown. I don't know if other members have. It's inconceivable to me that we would be voting in favor of the estimates, however worthy they may be, until we have the breakdown that was promised by the minister, because that's a fairly important ingredient in what we are voting. I would just like to know: perhaps the minister could advise where that sits. About half an hour ago the commitment was made that we would have the information.

An indication was made that we would have the information, and it is incumbent upon the minister, but it's also incumbent upon you, Mr. Chairman, as chairman of this committee, to insist that this information be made available to all members of the committee, at the very least to those of us who have questions on it. We can't ask questions until we have the breakdown that was graciously offered us by the minister. There's been a slip-up here somewhere. Someone should have done the xeroxing; it wasn't done. I think we should make sure the members of the committee have it.

I ask you, sir, not to just rush ahead with this vote. We can go on to another estimate. We've got lots of estimates we can deal with. If it's going to take a minute or two, we can come back to it. But we do have some other questions. Before we come to a vote on this particular \$288,000 estimate, I want to have the information that the minister indicated all members of the committee would receive. Obviously there's been some kind of problem in the administration this afternoon. But let's make sure we have that information before we go any further.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Chair has the acquisition report the hon. minister tabled some time ago. Is it the intention of the minister to have that xeroxed and passed around to members of the committee?

MR. HORSMAN: It was my understanding that that would be done. I'm surprised it hasn't occurred.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It hasn't been passed to a page to have it done. I'll have that done now.

MR. HORSMAN: Thank you.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I raised the question earlier about the department's interaction with the public colleges, the Alberta universities, and Banff Centre, with regard to book selection. One of the reasons I raised that question is with regard to content. The Minister of Education has made a great deal about Canadian, Alberta-type information being involved in school studies. If I recall correctly, the Premier has made similar statements over the years, that we want more Canadian content in our study material.

I wonder if the minister could indicate whether any parameters such as that are placed on the types of books or purchases being made, or are there none? Have any formal or informal discussions been held with the institutions to see whether they know the objectives of this government, in terms of book purchase and the type of knowledge that is to be transmitted to the various students? Or was there no intervention? I don't know whether that question is answered specifically in terms of Canadian or Alberta content, but I'd appreciate the minister's response.

MR. HORSMAN: The answer is no.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, is the minister saying no formal meetings have been held with the institutions, discussing the kinds of books or the objectives of the university or the government; that no discussions have been held; that it was a matter of sending the cheque and saying, go ahead and purchase books with this and use it? Is that what the minister is saying?

MR. HORSMAN: I'm saying exactly that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, the way the answers are coming back demonstrates the fine personality of this government. [interjections]

In terms of the accountability of this government in the expenditures, what type of assurance can the minister give this Assembly that all the funds expended to these various institutions up to this point, \$9 million of taxpayers' money, were allocated to the proper areas, in terms of learning materials? Can the minister indicate clearly to this Assembly and with all assurance that that's where the money has gone?

MR. HORSMAN: I answered that question earlier in the affirmative.

I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition is not suggesting that the government or this Assembly should direct the universities and colleges in this province as to what they're going to teach or what books they're going to use to do so. That would be entirely and completely out of keeping with the traditions of academic autonomy in this province. I for one would hate to ever have anyone stand in this Assembly and suggest that this government should censor in any way what takes place within the walls of the institutions. [interjections]

The hon. leader of the New Democratic Party laughs. Surely, he of all people with his usual gift for sanctimony would not want this government to direct the universities or colleges on what books, journals, periodicals, microfilm, microfiche, and audio-visual materials should be used within the institutions. It's shocking to have anyone even suggest that to this Assembly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, the only thing we can go on is convention and precedent of this government. In terms of the municipalities across the province, the counties, school systems, there is intervention, controls. There's a lot of precedent.

MR. HORSMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. R. SPEAKER: So in terms of my responsibility . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. Has the minister got a point of order?

MR. HORSMAN: On a point of order. I've given a very clear and direct answer. We're not discussing municipalities or other government bodies here today. Let's stick to the facts. Let's discuss the grant we are discussing and not be carried away into other fields. I gave a very clear and direct answer that we do not direct the nature of the acquisitions within the institutions.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I know the hon. minister wanted to make a speech to defend a position. The louder the speech, sometimes the less the trust. In

this government there is a lot of precedent in its action of intervening and doing things behind closed doors. We talk about our Heritage Savings Trust Fund — 88 per cent of the decisions behind closed doors that we don't know a thing about. We can't find information. That's the whole purpose of this exercise.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. We're getting away from what we're here for. We're here to vote on Advanced Education and Manpower library development. Members are straying off that particular vote. The rules are quite clear that in this Assembly and in committee, you have to be relevant to the particular subject being discussed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: The subject I'm discussing is the accountability of this government, how they spend money, and what they're doing.

AN HON. MEMBER: We've heard that speech before.

MR. R. SPEAKER: We want to know how they treat universities, colleges, and the Banff Centre in this province. We have had an answer from the minister. It's on the public record. Now we know. We have to accept those words, and we'll certainly do that at this point. With this government, it doesn't hurt to ask.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I finally have the acquisitions report. I regret we didn't get it earlier, because I think there a number of questions in it. It would have been more useful to have had an opportunity to review this report in some detail. I have a number of questions flowing from it.

But I must confess that I'm a little concerned with the minister's response a moment ago. I don't think anyone should be saying to the universities and colleges in this province that they must purchase Canadian books. I have always maintained that there has to be institutional autonomy. But the minister has already told us that he has met with the presidents of the universities and the colleges.

It would seem to me that in terms of designing the program, there might well be a voluntary effort on the part of the institutions themselves, where possible, to use this money in fleshing out the library systems. I say "where possible", because we all know it's just not practical in every event, nor would it even be desirable, to have an ironclad "you must purchase Canadian or Albertan books". I certainly would never for a moment argue that. But where there can be a reasonable preference, we have a publishing industry in this province and in Canada, and that publishing industry should be encouraged where it's possible to do so, without violating the principles of institutional autonomy or the common good sense of our library systems and the people who operate those systems at the postsecondary institutions in the province.

I might just say that I have a good deal of confidence in the people who are in charge of our library systems at the universities. I can't say I'm familiar with all the people at the colleges. I'm familiar, of course, with the people who operate the Fairview College library system. And I have a tremendous amount of confidence in the ability of these people I do know, to exercise good and prudent judgment in the use of trust funds through the heritage library grant program.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think the point has to be made that if there are reasonable grounds for Canadian prefer-

ence, that is not in itself the kind of horrendous proposition the minister tried to convey to the committee. I don't think the Leader of the Opposition, and certainly not myself, sanctimonious or otherwise, was trying to convey it. What we were trying to convey was that we're talking about \$9 million of public funds; an additional investment of public funds, we all hope, channelled through institutions that have highly competent people in place. And it would seem to me that you would get a very definite view on the part of the institutions themselves that, where possible, a preference for Canadian acquisitions should be considered.

For example, look at the money made available through the minister's colleague, the Minister of Education, and the Alberta heritage learning program. We're developing a set of books, going to the schools of this province and to senior citizens' lodges, that stress Alberta literature and the history of this province. I commend that, because it's an area that frankly hasn't been focused on enough.

Mr. Chairman, when we deal with the heritage library program, if there is one area that has to be concentrated on in our university system in particular — this is an area where I agree with the Premier — we're going to have to stress a greater emphasis on Canadian, Albertan, and western Canadian history. When we make funds available from this Legislature for a heritage series, it is not unreasonable for us — not to strong-arm the universities; you're not going to strong-arm the universities or colleges. Knowing the people involved, the minister isn't going to strong-arm them. Some of them are probably better politicians than he is. But it's not unreasonable to say that this is an area where some encouragement should be given. I think that is the point the Leader of the Opposition made and, frankly, I think it's reasonable.

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with the acquisitions report in a little more detail. For members who have the report, perhaps we could just go over it together. Several points are a little strange, in my view. For example, let's take April 1, 1979, to September 30, 1980, a period of approximately 17 months. The total number of volumes acquired by the University of Alberta in that period was 49,751; the University of Calgary, 97,196. I find that a little difficult, Mr. Minister, and I would ask you to respond. The 62:38 per cent ratio was intriguing. Here we have the University of Alberta, with a much larger library, a much larger number of students, yet approximately twice as many volumes were purchased by the University of Calgary. Now I wonder what kind of rationale would lead the government to that breakdown between the two major institutions? On the other hand, the University of Lethbridge, 2,020 volumes; Athabasca, 1,063; Banff Centre, 6,208. In the period April 1, 1979, to March 31, 1981, again you find a significantly larger number of volumes purchased by the University of Calgary.

To what extent, Mr. Chairman, was the heritage trust fund library development grant used as a catch-up? I think the Member for Olds-Didsbury raised this point. Was there that big a difference in the quantity of volumes? Let's deal first of all with the difference between the University of Alberta and the University of Calgary. Then we can go on to some of the others.

Was there that big a difference in the initial number of volumes at the University of Calgary that it was concluded that a significantly larger portion should go to a university with a significantly smaller enrolment? That relates right back to the point the hon. Member for

Calgary Buffalo made about the yardstick used. I would invite the minister to outline why the difference, and what the specific yardstick was, in the allocation of 49,751 versus 97,196, and the 78,117 versus the 104,427.

MR. HORSMAN: As a member of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund Select Committee, the hon. member received that information on August 21, 1981, a complete breakdown of the amounts made available to each of the institutions. The fact that the University of Calgary bought twice as many books probably means they bought cheaper books. The fact of the matter is that the allocations were set out in information supplied to the hon. member in August this year.

I think that a complete breakdown of the actual dollar allocations to each of the institutions more clearly spells out than the estimates do, why the additional funds are required for '82-83. And that, of course, as I indicated in an earlier answer, will make sure the proper percentage allocation between colleges and universities, at 62:38, takes place. Keeping in mind the fact, as I mentioned, that the colleges' fiscal year ends on June 30 each year, and the universities' fiscal year ends at the end of March each year. So really, the moneys required by this vote will be allocated to the colleges to make up the 38 per cent that will go to the colleges, and make sure the total \$9 million is distributed as indicated. It's all set out there.

The fact that the University of Calgary got more volumes than the University of Alberta is solely a decision of the institutions, and not the decision of the government in any way. The figures are all clearly spelled out. In fact the University of Alberta, because it is larger, received \$920,000 each year; the University of Calgary, \$740,000. That information was all made available to the hon. member in August.

MR. NOTLEY: Just to follow up the difference between \$920,000 and \$740,000, Mr. Chairman, I come right back to the point the Member for Calgary Buffalo has raised. What are the criteria? It can't be an enrolment criterion, because that's not the ratio of enrolment. The University of Alberta has a much higher ratio of students to the University of Calgary than a ratio of 7:9. Simply standing up and saying they bought cheaper books . . . Mr. Minis-

ter, you're asking us to approve your estimates. What were the criteria between \$920,000 and \$740,000? That is obviously not an enrolment criterion, it must be something else. What is it?

It seems to me that the figures for April 1, 1979, to September 30, 1980, are really quite startling, 49,751 compared to 97,196. Now, that's basically a ratio of 2:1. I think that raises the question of what kind of purchasing procedures are being followed. What are the criteria of the allocation of funds between the two universities?

MR. HORSMAN: The hon. member is surely . . . It would have been helpful had he read the material supplied to him in August, because it's all set out there. The fact of the matter is that the Universities Co-ordinating Council, which is comprised of all the institutions, made that decision and recommendation to government. That included the University of Calgary, the University of Alberta, and so on. That's the proper way to do it. If there's any quarrel with how the librarians then spent the money, I suggest the hon. member take that up with the librarians or the administration at the university. We never proposed to buy the books and distribute them to the institutions. We said we would give them grants, and that's it.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 5:31 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]

