

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, March 21st, 1972

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I have the distinct privilege and honour to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Legislative Assembly a group of Albertans and Calgarians who have come here this afternoon in a somewhat unusual way.

Because of their large numbers, we have this afternoon two shifts that will be coming into our galleries from the Golden Age Club of the City of Calgary. Sitting in the galleries this afternoon, at the present time, we have some 100 senior citizens of the Province of Alberta, and later this afternoon, an additional 62 will be here, Mr. Speaker, to see the proceedings of this Assembly.

May I say to all of them - and I know I express the viewpoint of all members of this House, and certainly those of us who had the honour to have lunch with the members of the Golden Age Club from the City of Calgary, including the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, the hon. Premier, the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, and the hon. Member for Calgary Millican; many of them live elsewhere than in the constituency of Calgary Buffalo, quite a number in the constituency of Calgary North Hill -- from our experience during the noon hour today, we can learn from all of you what vitality and what youth and expression really is. I congratulate each and every one of you for being here today, and I thank you on behalf of the members of this House for your attendance.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, it's a great pleasure for me this afternoon to introduce to you and through you to the members of this House some 40 to 45 women representing the Social Credit Women's Auxiliary who are sitting in the public gallery. I would ask them to stand and please be recognized.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, it's a real pleasure for me to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Legislature 55 bright-eyed and enthusiastic students from the Thomas B. Riley Junior High School in Calgary, in Calgary Bow, together with four of their teachers and their bus driver. The principal, Mr. Ken Hodgert is here, Mrs. Cooper, Mr. Len Kwan, and Mr. Dick Petrunia, plus the driver Mr. Larry Clayden. I would like them now to stand and be recognized.

14- 2

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, in response to the request expressed by many members of this Assembly in the first week, particularly during the question period, I would like to table for the information of all members of this Assembly the review of the financial position which was commissioned by our government, at September 30, 1971, by Touche, Ross & Company. I might also say that the front page of that report would be the Motion for a Return 110 requested under Orders of the Day.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I'd like to table Sessional Paper 108, which was ordered by this Assembly, and by way of explanation I would like to suggest that this involves the hearings held by the Environmental Conservation Authority on the Cooking and Hastings Lakes. I would like to suggest to the Assembly that there are five copies available of the transcript of the entire hearings only, at this time, but we do have a copy of the summary of the hearings for all members of the Assembly.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Federal-Provincial Relations

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. Did I understand correctly the other day when he said that he would be prepared to table the submissions that they had made to the federal government? I thought that you mentioned something about tabling some submissions.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, yes, we certainly will be prepared to do that. It was my intention to table them during the course of the debate, in addition to the document that was attached to the Budget Speech, which I believe is Appendix B. There are further documents and they will be tabled either in the course of debate or in the normal way.

Education Grants

MR. NOTLEY:

I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Education. Can the minister advise the House what the department is prepared to do with respect to the construction of St. Monica's School in Mill Woods?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I gather that this is the article in today's newspaper concerning that school, which is with the Edmonton Separate School Board. Certainly there has been no discrimination in any way, shape or form by the department. At the moment the position is that the School Buildings Branch has asked for further information from the Separate School Board. After we receive which we will study it

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 3

with a view to carrying out the best possible arrangements for the board.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government given any consideration to the brief prepared by the Alberta Catholic Schools Trustees' Association respecting the grant structure for the operation of separate high schools in Alberta? It's my understanding that according to the brief, the present grant structure discriminates against small rural separate high schools. They have made representation to your government. Have you, at this time, anything to report to the Legislature?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Nothing specific to report at this time, Mr. Speaker. However, all of the situations which may have caused problems financially for school jurisdictions, as a result of the plan which began in 1970, are being reviewed with a view, in future, to mitigating or eliminating those when a new financial plan is devised for 1973.

MR. NOTLEY:

Another supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As you review the grant structure, can the hon. minister assure the House that specific consideration will be given in the per capita grants for building schools, to the fact that it is more costly to construct schools outside of the two major metropolitan areas, and that there should be some formula in the grant structure to take allowance for that increased cost?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I think if it can be shown, with hard facts, that building costs are such as the hon. member describes -- and I wouldn't be prepared to accept it at this time, but there are variances -- without question we would try to do our best to take those into account, so that an equitable school construction financing arrangement would result.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Calgary North Hill followed by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, and then the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Medicare

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister Without Portfolio responsible for the Alberta Health Insurance Commission. If the wife and family of a senior citizen are under 65, are they covered for health insurance premiums, and do they have to fill in an application form?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, no, they do not have to fill in an application form. All dependents of a resident who is 65 are covered under the Alberta Health Care Insurance Plan.

MR. FARRAN:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the option cover ambulance, and does their birthday have to be prior to January 1st, or prior to any specific date in the year?

14- 4

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

MISS HUNLEY:

About their birthday, they are covered the first day of the month following their actual birthday. If their birthday is today, their premium would not be required after the first of April. What was the second part of your question?

MR. FARRAN:

Are they covered for ambulance?

MISS HUNLEY:

Yes. Ambulance is part of the optional service obtained through Blue Cross. There's a limit on it of \$100 per benefit year. And those who live in the city only get \$15 per trip or \$30 during the course of their treatment.

Crown Lands

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Premier a question. The policy of the former government was to maintain all Crown lands as the right of the people of Alberta, not sell the same. Will this also be the present government's policy?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I thoroughly understand the question. Crown lands in the sense of Crown lands other than those that involve minerals rights, or are you referring to those that deal with mineral rights?

MR. DRAIN:

I'm referring, Mr. Speaker, to the forest areas of the province and the areas are rightfully watersheds and so on.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to refer a question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to respond to the important question raised by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. As you know, more than one-half of the land surface area in Alberta is provincial Crown land. In addition, a considerable amount of the land surface of Alberta is federal in the sense of being in national parks. Our intention is to manage this particular resource in the best possible way, taking into account the various possible uses of the resource, including recreation in forest areas, as well as the possibilities of timber cutting, and wilderness and recreation parks.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary. My question, Sir, was, is there a plan to sell any of these lands?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, specifically to the hon. gentleman's point, there is no particular plan to dispose of certain specific lands; however, there are instances when it's very useful to dispose of Crown lands for agricultural use purposes, and to exchange Crown lands for deeded

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 5

lands in order to help a rancher rationalize the economics of his ranching operation.

MR. DRAIN:

I take it, Mr. Speaker, that there will be no general change or marked shift in policy insofar as Crown lands are concerned.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly will not promise that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, and then the hon. Member for Calgary West.

Capital Works Projects

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Public Works. Will the hon. minister be submitting a more detailed supplement on capital works projects to the information set out in the estimates?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, yes of course. This has been the tradition for years, and I certainly intend to carry it on.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary. Is this information available at the present time?

DR. BACKUS:

This information is in existence at the present time, and it will be released to the hon. members at the time we are discussing the estimates.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, further supplementary. Is there any other reason why that information, if it is available, cannot be released to the hon. members at the present time?

Day Care Centres

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Are there now, in the province of Alberta, any government subsidized or government sponsored day-care centres?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member's choice of language as between subsidy and sponsorship is important. There are government subsidized day care centres in the province, subsidized through the tremendous social services program, but there are not, to my knowledge, any government sponsored day care centres.

14- 6

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

MR. GRUENWALD:

Supplementary to that Mr. Speaker, I purposely used the word 'sponsored' because I wanted to make sure of that point. And there is another thing; do you intend to continue this as a matter of policy with the government? There have been applications made by people to the federal government under the Opportunities for Youth program to operate day care centres in the province which would give free day care centres to university students. If this were to happen, or when it happens, will this government and your department authorize it, and would you feel that this is a good policy? Would they work through your department to do this type of a thing?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think, as to the last part of the question, there are probably two matters to be considered. My first reaction with respect to federal type programs is that they tend to be short-term and not suitable for long-term adoption. I think also that if there are financial implications in the sense of applications for grants being made to the federal government, as far as the government is concerned, the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs would be more likely to be involved than myself. However, I don't have too much faith in the federal government getting into this particular field.

As to the first part of your question, the continuation of the receiving of applications for day care centres in Alberta, I would expect that to go on, although policy changes could be contemplated, based on briefs that are submitted from time to time. The present program is working satisfactorily within existing budget limitations.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Just one supplementary. Just a clarification, Mr. Speaker. You got from my question regarding the federal thing that this would be an Opportunities for Youth program. This is the thing that was concerning me. You were aware of that, were you?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is my impression of one of the programs; I admit to not being too familiar with some of the Opportunities for Youth programs. It would be sort of a short term goal and a long term problem, and may well not be suitable for this area.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Whitecourt followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Paddle River

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. We were promised a survey of the Paddle River flats some years ago. Can you tell me when the survey was started?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the Paddle River flooded nine different times in the last 27 years. A study was initiated in 1954 and subsequently some very minor work was done on this river, but this work wasn't very effective. The last major flood, of course, was in 1971 and as a result the government of the day considered it vital and necessary to undertake a fairly substantial program of widening out the river channel and undertaking additional studies in connection with managing the river in its total complexity.

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 7

MR. TRYNCHY:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can you tell us just what you have initiated and how long it will take for this program to be completed on the Paddle River?

MR. YURKO:

Perhaps the hon. member wants me to read the news release which I am prepared to do. Fine, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to table it for the information of the hon. gentleman.

Ombudsman

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Premier. How many cases, if any, has the Ombudsman heard on a circuit court tour of Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the Ombudsman is an office of the Legislature not responsible directly to the government, so I don't think it's appropriate to answer questions of that nature. I believe in due course the Ombudsman's report will be made available; then, if members wish the Ombudsman to appear before the Legislature, that is certainly up to the initiative of members.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, is it not your policy, or was it not your policy at one time, that in order to guarantee that citizens are not denied their right to a hearing that the Ombudsman would go on a circuit tour?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is something that we do want to review with the Ombudsman in relationship to the estimates. I think when we reach the item on the estimates regarding the Ombudsman that would be a very good time to raise it and we will try to have the specific information from the Ombudsman's point of view with regard to the validity of that suggestion that I personally have made in the past. I do want to make it clear, however, that the government does not answer questions relating to the activity of the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman is an officer of the Legislature.

MR. KING:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! Would you state your point of order please.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, in the light of the first question asked and supplementary questions that have been put, I would like your ruling at this time on whether or not it is in order to ask questions of ministers of the Executive Council about programs or operations which are not their responsibility to report to this House. I would cite for you annotation 171.

14- 8

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps it won't be necessary to rule on the point now, since we seem to have passed those questions.

MR. WILSON:

I had one supplementary question. I would like to know if the hon. Premier is satisfied that all parties wishing to have cases heard by the Ombudsman are being heard?

MR. SPEAKER:

I would suggest in view of the answer previously given by the hon. Premier that an appropriate time to deal with this question might be when the estimates with regard to the Ombudsman are under debate.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add an additional comment to that; I think the line of questioning that the hon. member is pursuing is a very important one. There is a difficult question as to the proper procedure for raising and dealing with these matters. The only suggestion that I can make is that when we are at the estimates and are dealing with the item of the Ombudsman, perhaps, being in committee at that stage, it may be possible for us to get the information from the Ombudsman's point of view. Having been alerted to the hon. member's question and interest, as well as my own on the subject, we certainly should be ready to try to provide that information at that time.

Education Property Tax Exemption for Senior Citizens

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the hon. Minister of Education? I wonder if the minister could inform the House whether, in light of the government's decision to remove the education property tax burden from senior citizens, they have any plans to restrict the prerogative of senior citizens to vote on school money by-laws or plebiscites?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I don't follow the hon. gentleman's question, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the Minister of Municipal Affairs might wish to comment, but the whole question of the government's future plans in this area is under consideration at this time.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I've heard the hon. minister speak about the question of plebiscites, but there is also just the general question of money by-laws. This is completely divorced from the question of plebiscites, and now that the senior citizens will not be paying education property tax, will they still be entitled to vote on school money by-laws?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member has raised an interesting point. It should be remembered, I think, that such citizens will still be paying that portion which represents the supplementary requisition, and so to that extent there would be an interest by them and a responsibility which they might feel in connection with the affairs of the school district. But I think the point is deserving of further attention and we will certainly give it that.

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 9

Daylight Saving Time

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. the Premier? Has the government received any representations from any farm areas requesting exemption from daylight saving time?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I haven't, but I'll refer the matter to the Attorney General. Perhaps he might be able to shed a little light on the question.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I can't and I haven't.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the government entertain any representations to exempt certain farm areas, if petitioned to do so by the said farm areas?

MR. SPEAKER:

I must rule that question to be hypothetical in contrary to the provisions of 171 of Beauchesne.

The hon. Member for Spirit River - Fairview, followed by the hon. Member for Mountain View.

Gasoline Marketing

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Premier. Does the government intend to implement the recommendations of the MacKenzie Report on gasoline marketing tabled in this House in 1969?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that broad question, of course, deals with the many aspects of the matter that have been raised, and I think the previous administrations to their credit, had some considerable progress with the regard to the MacKenzie Report.

I personally spoke at a meeting of the Automobile Retailers Association of Alberta, I believe some year and a half ago, at which time I was given to understand that they felt they had made considerable progress with regard to the matters raised there. If there are some specific items though that the hon. member wishes us to look into and assess -- I don't have a recollection of the number of recommendations but I do recall that there was a pretty large number.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question to the hon. Premier or to the Minister of Industry. Has the government given any consideration to the recommendation in the report calling for a Service Station Operators' Bill of Rights, as such?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to that is that we haven't, and we haven't received any representation that I am aware of, since we

14- 10

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

formed the government on September 10th. But we will look into the matter in case I am in error, or in case future representations are received.

MR. NOTLEY:

A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the hon. Premier tell us whether any consideration has been given by the government to one of the proposals that wasn't one of the firm recommendations of the report, but it was one of the areas considered, dealing with efforts to inject some genuine price competition into the marketing of gasoline products in this province? The proposal was that the government consider either aiding the cooperative movement or establishing a Crown sponsored company to compete with the five major oil companies in this province.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, as far as the second half of the question is concerned I'm sure I can speak very quickly for my colleagues with a definitive "no". As for the other aspect of that question, though, I would have to look into it, make an assessment, and attempt to report back directly through one of the ministers.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, I believe, was next in line, followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller, and then the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Corcoran.

Government Aircraft

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Have any aircraft been acquired by the department since September 10, 1971?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. LUDWIG:

A further question, Mr. Speaker. Is the government giving any consideration to contracting some of its patrol responsibilities in that department to private enterprise?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, a very considerable amount of the aircraft operations of the Department of Lands and Forests, which are basically the aircraft operations of the Government of Alberta, is done on a private contracting basis with the private sector.

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are the logs and flight plans of all flying done by aircraft of the Department of Lands and Forests filed with the hon. minister?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of detail and if the hon. gentleman from Calgary Mountain View would like to place this on the Order Paper I would be most happy to get a detailed answer for him.

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 11

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I didn't ask him --

MR. SPEAKER:

On the same topic? Would the hon. member perhaps put the question in writing? This is perhaps the third or fourth supplementary on it.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I did request whether the hon. minister knows if these things are being filed with the department, not for the detailed information. If the hon. minister doesn't know he could just say so.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, that is not what he asked.

MR. LUDWIG:

Well, then, I would like to repeat my question. Are the --

MR. SPEAKER:

To prove the misunderstanding concerning the question, could it perhaps be put in writing? Is this a supplementary? The hon. Member for Drumheller is next on the floor. There is a supplementary here, I believe.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Lands and Forests, please. I believe that the hon. minister expressed the view that he misunderstood my question. I would like to clarify the question, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER:

I think we already referred to putting it on the Order Paper and perhaps we should do it that way to avoid misunderstanding.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

HON. MEMBERS:

Out of order! Out of order!

MR. FARRAN:

Out of order?

MR. SPEAKER:

The question is going on the Order Paper. If it's a new question the hon. Member for Drumheller has the floor.

Daylight Saving Time (cont.)

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Attorney General. Does government policy provide for any exemptions for certain farm areas if petitioned to do so by the farm areas, from daylight saving time?

14- 12

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, we do not have any policy on that question at the moment. There is nothing in the legislation that I can recall that deals with it. If there are any such requests that come in to us, then I think we would give them careful attention at that time and formulate a policy.

Oiling and Dustproofing Highways

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Highways regarding the oiling or dustproofing of the highways. Is it proving successful and are you receiving any complaints?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would state his question again. I didn't catch the first part of it.

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, regarding the oiling and dustproofing of certain highways, especially Nos. 36, 41 and 12, I am wondering, is it proving successful, and are you receiving any complaints?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are finding that the dustproofing of the highways that have had no treatment before is working out very satisfactorily. In regard to the second question as to whether we have any complaints or not, they are always available.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Education, or it could be the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

It concerns the serious situation on the Cold Lake Indian Reserve where many of the pupils have not been in school for many months. I was wondering if the hon. Minister of Education has offered his offices or offered any advice to try and break this deadlock, so that these Alberta students can get back to school?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I think the question might most appropriately be given to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio, Mr. Adair.

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the question from the hon. member, late last fall, or actually early last fall, we were requested to go out and look over the situation, at which time we did. We have not had any further requests to enter into that particular problem.

MR. DIXON:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, because of the many months that have passed since that original visit, whether the hon. minister has any ideas or thoughts on following up with this suggestion? I think it's a serious situation, and these children should be in school.

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 13

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, we realize that it's a very serious problem, and we are keeping in touch with the people. We're almost in daily contact with what is going on out there, but until such time as the treaty people come to us requesting further assistance, we'll just keep our eye on that particular problem.

Teachers' Right to Strike

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Education, and ask if he can today inform the House whether the officials of the Department of Education did present draft legislation to the joint meeting of the trustees and teachers, which would have taken away from teachers the right to strike?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd have to say that the hon. gentleman's persistence is of a substantially higher degree than the time I had available to check out the answer, but I will have it within the next 48 hours.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, that's a promise, is it?

Industrial Damage to the Environment

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Environment again today. Is it the intention of future legislation that environment damage as it relates to industry be paid from business profits?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, we have established some very definitive policies in this area. Some of them, I enumerated when I spoke two weeks ago. To summarize very quickly, we have said time and time again that those who pollute shall pay for the corrective measures required to restore the situation, or they shall pay for rectifying their pollution.

Driver's License Medicals for Senior Citizens

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. minister responsible for the Medicare program. At present, I believe, when senior citizens take their driver's test, they have to pay the medical, is this correct? Will there be any change, hon. minister, to the rule in this regard so that the senior citizens will not have to pay for their medicals before they get their driver's licenses?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, this is a project that I have near and dear to my heart because I would like to see a policy change. We haven't brought it in at this particular time, though I personally endorse it and I feel that there is some merit to it. There is a considerable amount of expense, but it's one of the other changes that I would like to see looked at.

14- 14

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

Visiting Psychiatrist Program

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Welfare. Considerable concern has been expressed in the Peace River country by mental health groups there about the possible discontinuance of the visiting psychiatrist program to the Grande Prairie area and the Peace. Can the hon. minister advise the House whether the government has come to any specific decision on this matter?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I would have to say that I'm aware of the situation and had had some representations from the Peace River area. I have been kept informed by the hon. Minister of Public Works who is close to the situation. I have nothing in the way of assurance or a firm answer to give in regard to the matter today, other than to say it is in a state of flux. We hope to see an improvement in the near future.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question. Can the hon. minister advise the House as to when we will have a definitive explanation of the government's position?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I believe the hon. member said as to when we will have a definitive explanation. I could only hazard a guess it would be within the time that the House is still sitting.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government given any consideration to an operating grant for the Peace Counselling Service which has made an application to Preventive Social Services? That application has been rejected. I believe they have made an application to the Department of Foreign Operating Grants. Is this under consideration at this time?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, consideration had been given to the possibility of a grant to the Peace Counselling Service. The present situation is that services of that type are being considered in conjunction with all of the possible alternatives.

Old Banff Coach Road

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Highways. Have you received any representation from the City of Calgary for the change of the name of what is known as the Old Banff Coach Road to the Bow Trail, and what was the response?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have had requests from the City of Calgary to change the Old Banff Coach Road's name to Bow Trail. My response was this: it is the historical name of a trail that was used in the old days by the coach road communication system. I suggested to the City of Calgary that perhaps they should change the Bow Trail to the Banff Coach Road to keep some of our historic history tied to our...

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 15

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. minister aware that there is another Banff Trail in Calgary?

MR. COPITHORNE:

There may be a Banff Trail but there's only one Banff Coach Road.

Seismic Exploration

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. Is the hon. minister giving any consideration to changing the method and the types of seismic operations that are being carried on in southern Alberta? I have in mind, for instance, the use of the drilling and blasting method which upsets many water wells. The other thing is that many companies come over the same area again and again. I think that one company might be able to do it.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, the concern that the hon. member brings to my attention has been brought to our attention before. We're presently investigating that. I think it's a real concern, and I think that in the future legislation is going to be introduced into this House which will deal with those aspects.

Speed Limits in Residential Areas

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Highways. He is aware, I think, of the City of Calgary's desire to change certain speed limits within residential areas and I think they have some thousands of signs already printed. I wondered if he had given any thought to recommendations to the Legislature to allow the city to change the speed limit within residential areas in the city.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I assured the city last fall that we would make it possible so that this change could come about. When the new amendments to The Highway Traffic Act are introduced, that legislation will be included.

Hudson's Bay Route Association

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry. Has the government joined the Hudson's Bay Route Association?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Has the government made a contribution to the Hudson's Bay Route Association?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we have committed to a contribution.

14- 16

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, one more supplementary. Is the government prepared to contribute towards the improvement of this inland port of Churchill?

MR. PEACOCK:

I don't quite understand the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I'll say it again, perhaps a little clearer. Is the government prepared to make a contribution towards the improvement of the inland port at Churchill?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I think we'd have to see the proposal and know what we're faced with before we can answer that question.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Milk Market Sharing

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a short announcement I'd like to make today, in relation to the Alberta plan for milk market sharing. As most hon. members are aware, approximately 7,500 Alberta dairy producers have registered to vote in the plebiscite on milk market sharing. Up to 4:30 pm yesterday, approximately 5,000 had cast their ballots. This leaves about 2,500 producers that have not yet voted. For the ballot to be valid, it must comply with the voting requirements which have been sent to every registered producer. A favourable vote will ensure a stable dairy industry for our Alberta producers, and I would just like to enunciate to the House the four main points that we would ask producers to consider.

1. The Alberta plan will guarantee our producers their fair share of the present and future Canadian dairy needs.
2. The Canadian Dairy Commission subsidy eligibility quotas which were lost from the province will be re-established as a provincial reserve to levels which were in effect on April 1, 1970. This will mean approximately 3 million pounds of subsidy quota will come back to Alberta, representing approximately \$1 million more income to Alberta producers.
3. Subsidy eligibility quotas will then be transferable between producers without the sale of cows.
4. Levies and over-quota hold-back penalties on subsidy quotas will be removed. The levies will be on the more generous market share quotas.

Any producer who has registered and has his ballot should send in his vote immediately. Closing date of the vote is March 27, and all ballots must be in the hands of the returning officer on or before 4:30 pm on Monday next.

I make this announcement, Mr. Speaker, in the hope that the hon. members will encourage the producers in their areas to make sure that they vote.

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 17

QUESTIONS

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move Question 134 standing in my name on the Order Paper.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we move questions, but simply the person answering the question stands up and tables the answer.

134. Mr. Ludwig asked the government the following questions which were answered as indicated by the hon. Dr. Backus.

1. The Department of Public Works advertised for 25,000 square feet of office space in Calgary. What is the intended use of the space?

Answer: To provide space for the South Regional Office of the Social Development Branch of the Department of Health and Social Development.

2. Has the office space in the John J. Bowlen Building in Calgary been fully taken up by government departments?

Answer: Yes, with room for normal expansion of the various government departments.

3. Has the government leased any office space in Edmonton since taking office September 10, 1971? Enumerate.

Answer: Yes, six leases.

4. Is the government presently negotiating for additional office space in Edmonton? Enumerate.

Answer: Yes, in six locations.

5. Has the government served notice of termination of any leases of office space in the Province of Alberta? Enumerate.

Answer: Yes, in three instances.

6. Has the government terminated any leases in Alberta since September 16, 1971? Enumerate.

Answer: Yes, eleven.

135. Mr. Ludwig asked the government the following questions, which were answered as indicated by the hon. Dr. Backus.

1. Is there any intention on the part of the government to change the method of payment for capital works projects provided for in the Budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972 from payment from general revenue to payment by means of borrowing or financing?

Answer: No.

2. Will the following projects for which funds were provided in the Budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1972, be constructed under the management and control of the Department of Public Works and paid through general revenue of the Province as provided for in Capital Appropriation 2682:

(a) Magistrates Court and Remand Centre, Calgary;

14- 18

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

- (b) Magistrates Court and Remand Centre, Edmonton;
- (c) Alberta School Hospital, Calgary (on Baker Memorial Sanatorium Site); and
- (d) Alberta School Hospital, Edmonton.

Answer: (a) The Magistrates' Court and Remand Centre, Calgary (to be known as the Provincial Judges' Court and Remand Centre, Calgary) will be constructed under the management and control of the City of Calgary, and paid for from a bank account established from funds provided in Capital Appropriation 2682 in the fiscal year 1971-72, through the general revenue of the Province, all as provided in Order in Council No. 375/72, and the Agreement attached as an Appendix thereto.

(b), (c) and (d) The Magistrates' Court and Remand Centre Edmonton (to be known as the Provincial Judges' Court and Remand Centre, Edmonton), and the proposed new developments at the Alberta School Hospitals, Edmonton and Calgary, as provided for in Capital Appropriation 2682 for 1971-72, under Job Numbers G188D, (Department of Attorney General), G046A, C and D and G035A, B, C and D (Department of Health and Social Development), are all held in abeyance pending policy decisions by the Departments concerned. No funds have been provided for these projects for 1972-73, but if and when they proceed, it is assumed at this time that the projects will be constructed under the management and control of the Department of Public Works, and paid for through the general revenue of the Province as provided for in Capital Appropriation 2682.

138. Mr. Wilson asked the Government the following questions regarding the publication, "Vacation Alberta", and was answered as indicated by Hon. Mr. Dowling:

1. How many copies of "Vacation Alberta" were printed in English and how many in French?

Answer: 400,000 English; 0 in French.

2. Were tenders called?

Answer: Yes.

3. Question as to the names of the respondents to the tender and their respective bids.

Answer:	Reliable Printing	\$ 137,000
	Commercial Printers	111,469
	Metropolitan Printing	97,760

4. Who was awarded the contract?

Answer: Metropolitan Printing.

5. Please specify the written or verbal instructions given to the company awarded the contract, as to Alberta labour, Alberta products and whether or not they were a union shop.

Answer: There were no written or verbal instructions given to the company awarded the contract as to Alberta labour, Alberta products or whether or not they were a union shop. However, it is the policy of the Alberta Government Travel Bureau to produce all Travel Bureau literature in Alberta utilizing Alberta labour and talents as far as physically possible. The three companies who responded to the request for quotation were all union shops.

A copy of the Purchase Order issued to all printers, as well as the specifications sent out, is attached (e.g. Metropolitan),

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 19

as well as the replies from Metropolitan Printing, Commercial Printers and Reliable Printing.

MR. SPEAKER:

I wonder if hon. members might like to give consideration as to whether answers of these kinds should be read as well as tabled, so that they might appear in Hansard. It needn't be decided now, I will just leave it for your consideration.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, do the answers to these questions not appear in the paper on the following date, whether they are read or not?

MR. SPEAKER:

They will appear in the Votes and Proceedings, but not in Hansard, is my understanding.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I would suggest that whether or not they're read, they should appear in Hansard, and we would look with favour on the answers being read.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would hon. members give some further consideration to the suggestion of the hon. member for Drumheller? I think we'll advert to this again at a later date.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, on the point raised by the hon. member for Drumheller, I can see where, on certain occasions, it might be useful to have the answers read. But on many occasions where the questions are asking for a detailed amount of figures, I want to suggest that the time of the House could be more profitably used if they were inserted in Hansard or as an appendix, rather than having to take the time of the House to read them.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to accept Question 139 as an Order for a Return, and I will table the answer on Friday.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I'd like to raise a question which the hon. Member for Drumheller had on the Orders of the Day for last Thursday, and which I requested to stand over and appear on today's orders; I don't see it.

MR. SPEAKER:

I was going to refer to that Motion for Return No. 129 and to express regret that, inadvertently, this was omitted from the Order Paper today; it should appear on the Order Paper ahead of No. 136. For the convenience of the House, I have a copy of it here. I don't know whether it will be necessary to read it out or not.

14- 20

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that it appear on Thursday's Order Paper, and then we can deal with it?

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it the hon. Member for Drumheller, the mover, agrees. And does the seconder, the hon. Member for Highwood agree that this appear on Thursday's Order Paper?

136. Mr. Benoit proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Taylor.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

All correspondence, contracts, orders and advertisements pertaining to the preparation and construction of the secondary highway No. 940 traversing the federal forestry research station area south of Seebe, Alberta.

[The motion was carried without debate.]

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I have the material requested by the hon. gentleman, and am prepared to table it.

137. Mr. Ludwig proposed the following motion to this Assembly, seconded by Mr. Ho. Lem.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

- (1) Would the hon. Minister of Public Works explain the delay in plans for commencement of construction of the Magistrates Court and Remand Centre, Calgary, and the Alberta School Hospital, Calgary.
- (2) Would the hon. minister table all correspondence between his department and the City of Calgary with relation to the planned construction of the said Magistrates Court and Remand Centre and the Alberta School Hospital.

MR. LUDWIG:

I would like to make a few comments with regard to this motion. I believe that this information is required in the public interest, and a detailed explanation of the questions asked should be given, in view of the fact that this remand centre in Calgary, in particular, had been budgeted for in the last budget. A telegram was then received from the Mayor and Council --

MR. FARRAN:

Is a lengthy preamble like this permitted under the Rules?

MR. SPEAKER:

This is a motion. The hon. member has moved it, and he is speaking in support of the motion.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. A motion was passed by Calgary City Council and circulated to the media and to the government members, deploring this delay in the project, this was over a year ago last winter. In view of the fact that there appeared to be a certain amount of panic

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 21

concerning this project a year ago, I believe it would be in the public interest for the hon. Minister of Public Works to explain in detail what happened.

Why was there such an urgency for creating employment on this issue last year? And a year later they are quiet about this. I think it appears that they owe an explanation to the people of Calgary and to the hon. members here. Perhaps the hon. member who just interrupted me with a point of order, would realize that he was a member of the Council that sent the telegram deploring the undue delay of the Department of Public Works. I believe that since then, it has been established that the delay was constantly created by none other than our Mayor and Council of Calgary, and a year later we are advised by the hon. Minister of Public Works that the whole project has now been seriously delayed. It is my opinion that we ought to know what is going to happen there.

With regard to the Alberta School Hospital in Calgary, Mr. Speaker --

MR. FARRAN:

I rise again on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understand that the hon. Member for Mountain View can speak on the motion as to why it should be produced, but not on the issue involved. Surely he is going too far.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would suggest that it might be difficult to separate those two topics, and if the hon. member disagrees with what is being said, he may participate in the debate and try to refute what is being said.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member would not wish to deny that council passed a motion sending a telegram to everybody except myself on this issue, which indicates clearly why we have to treat some of their communications with a certain amount of reserve and perhaps suspicion.

Now, with regard to the Alberta School Hospital in Calgary, this matter was also budgeted for in the last session. There was a certain amount of urgency in constructing the Alberta School Hospital. The site was approved, the architect was engaged to design this home. There certainly could not be any less need for it now than there was a year ago. I would like the hon. minister, in some detail, to explain why the undue delay in it. project off the ground, when the public is clamouring for it.

The motion also requests that all correspondence concerning this issue received by the minister -- I stated from the city, but from any other interested parties -- be tabled. I wish to point out that when this project was budgeted for, we had provided \$3 1/2 million to \$4 million dollars for this Remand Centre. Now we understand that it is going to be \$5 1/2 million and the hon. Minister of Public Works advises us that he has no further responsibility with regard to this project. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this motion ought to be supported by all hon. members, and a full explanation ought to be given to the hon. members.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member from Calgary North Hill, who I believe was on his feet first, please go ahead.

14- 22

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

MR. FARRAN:

I want to speak to the motion. And in doing so, I plead with the hon. minister to put in every single detail concerning this Magistrate's Court and Remand Centre from the very beginning, which was about two years ago. All the details of how in the beginning there was a controversy between the province and the City of Calgary over the insufficiency of parking; how the minister of that day didn't realize the importance of parking in a downtown core of a city; he didn't realize how parking was congested around City Hall, and really believed in and had agreed to a plan for a Magistrate's Court with people coming and going, witnesses, judges, policemen, guards, and only 50 parking stalls in the beginning. And finally, at the end of the controversy I think they built it up to 75 and said: "look, if experience proves that we need more parking" (and we certainly will), "then we will contribute to a parking structure for the City of Calgary".

Also, go into details of why an architect was hired for this particular job who had no direct acquaintance with the area and not the one who was the architect for the extension to the police building or the library building, with which this building was so closely affiliated. They took away parking from the City of Calgary police in order to build this Remand Centre in the urban renewal area.

Also go on to explain that the delay, the final delay, was not due to this administration. Our poor Minister of Public Works had nothing to do with it whatsoever. It was perhaps partly the fault of the previous administration, partly the fault of the City of Calgary. A final controversy was over 10 feet for a new library building. The architect for the Magistrate's Court wanted the 10 feet and the architect for the library wanted the 10 feet and they couldn't get together. So finally, this administration very wisely, has done the obvious thing. It said; "Look, get on with it, City of Calgary. You can solve your own problems. You build it."

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to this motion because, since September 10th, my department had something to do with some of the delays that occurred in the building of that Remand Centre. The delay occurred in this way. Shortly after coming into office we received representations that the parking for that building was inadequate and also that there was inadequate provision for future expansion of the building.

I met with some of the people concerned with that building on those two points. After reviewing them I felt there was merit to their submissions, that there was a lack of parking facility and there was also a lack of facility for expansion.

We then entered into negotiations with the City of Calgary and arranged to acquire land adjacent to the building and that land will provide two things; first, additional parking and secondly, it will provide in the future adequate space into which we can expand those portions of the Remand Centre dealing with the courtrooms. The delay, which was not of great duration, occurred for two very valid reasons: (1) we needed additional parking (2) we needed facilities for expansion.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you ready for the question? May the hon. member close debate?

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 23

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to note now that the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill says it was the previous administration's fault for the delay. Then the hon. Attorney General says that they were very new causes; new needs and new factors arose which necessitated further delay. On that contradiction, Mr. Speaker, I would like to rest and let them hash it out among themselves.

As far as the requests for additional land and parking, these were not submitted to the Department of Public Works when I was the minister. It should be pointed out that the architects chosen to design this Remand Centre were certainly those approved of and perhaps recommended by the City of Calgary. I wish to reiterate that this delay now requires a full explanation. It will be shown rather adequately that the correspondence rather than supporting the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill negates what he said. I will agree that everything, right from the beginning till now, ought to be tabled so that hon. members can find out for themselves. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, prior to you putting the question, I would like to rise on a point of order in relation to this motion, on a couple of points.

Firstly, I agree with the submission that was made earlier by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill in relation to the debate that can go on --

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Please allow the hon. minister to state the point of order.

DR. HORNER:

The second point of order that I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that I am rather surprised that some hon. members --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

He's debating on a point of order. He is out of order. The hon. minister is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! Would hon. members please allow the hon. minister to complete stating the point of order.

We cannot anticipate the point of order that is going to be stated by the hon. minister and it must be heard.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. The point of order that I am going to make has to do with the structure of the resolution itself: I'm a little bit surprised that it should come from the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View. I think that it is something the House should resolve itself upon, because the question of whether or not you can issue a return to explain something or other in my view, is a debatable situation and should be handled in debate, rather than by asking for a return. This surely should be done on the estimates and in debate and is, in my view, not a proper motion for return in the present form.

14- 24

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, the motion for return was accepted by you, and is therefore in order. It was not questioned prior to the debate, and I suggest that this is the wrong time to suggest that this is now out of order.

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll even allow this much - that inasmuch as the hon. Minister of Public Works was willing to agree to it and inasmuch as we didn't want not to allow the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View to have his say, I would suggest that this is something that the House has to consider for future motions for a return.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister is debating the motion, and he is entirely out of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. We can perhaps take these remarks under consideration of the drafting of future motions for a return.

[The motion was carried on a voice vote.]

140. Mr. J. Miller proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Fluker.

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

- (1) Area of the government ranch at Kinsella?
- (2) Initial cost of the ranch?
- (3) Cost of improvements up to August 30, 1971?
- (4) What portion of this cost came from the horned cattle fund?
- (5) How many cattle were on this ranch as of December 31st, 1971?
- (6) Is this ranch self-supporting and if not, how much is it subsidized by the Provincial Government?

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, in order to provide the hon. members of this Assembly and the citizens of Alberta with still further information on this, I would like to move, seconded by Mr. Buckwell, that the motion be amended by adding the following:

- (7) That copies of expenditures from the Cattle Commission relate to expenditures made at the Kinsella Ranch.
- (8) Does the government plan to continue its operation? If so, where will all the funds come from for its operation?

MR. SPEAKER:

Are the hon. members clear as to the purport of the proposed amendment? Are you ready to vote on the amendment, or do you wish to have it restated?

[The amendment was approved and the amended motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Standardized School Design and Bulk Purchasing

1. Mr. Purdy proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Farran:

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 25

Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta give consideration to establishing procedures that will result in greater standardization of school design and bulk purchase of school building materials to reduce construction and operating costs.

MR. PURDY:

At the present time, in both urban and rural Alberta, schools are built because of need. We have come to the idea that, each time a new school is required or added to, the design must change for the sake of change. This change is costing the Alberta taxpayers unwarranted tax dollars.

I submit that consideration be given to developing school plans that will serve for a number of years ahead. In fact, we would be infringing on local autonomy. But I can reply to this that, with a standard design, it would be a saving to a local taxpayer.

Under the Alberta School Regulation 173-70 for School Building Regulations, the board sets out pertinent rules that must be followed for new school buildings. At present the board may approve the actual cost of permanent type construction up to a maximum of \$15.50 a square foot for elementary schools, and \$16.25 for junior and senior high schools. This figure may be fair when we look at a school outside of Edmonton, but the cost of moving construction materials to the site, would in fact increase the price beyond the figure required by the board. When this happens the contractor, not wanting to lose money, could use inferior materials and inferior workmanship. More communication between architects and educators about the education specifications should be incorporated into school buildings.

I believe that the educator knows best. Wasted efforts in design innovations should not be a burden to the taxpayer and I emphasise that the Department of Education and the local school boards should work closer together and have a say as to the component parts of the school.

If the need requires X number of schools in Alberta, materials such as pre-stressed concrete and steel columns could be ordered, walls designed to fit these columns, doors and windows standardized, hallways utilized to full use. Each time a school is built a different scheme for electrification and heating is used. School buildings, if covering a large area, could be heated by central heating instead of using boilers for each addition. This is also true for air-conditioning.

School community use has started in this province. A good example of this school community use is in Spruce Grove. Slowly the school boards are beginning to realise that school doors should not be locked at 4:00 p.m. and opened the next day at 8:30 a.m. Let's utilize the high cost of these buildings 24 hours a day.

Rural Alberta schools have gone too far in the decentralization direction. Bussing children 40 miles is not correct. The community that I came from, Rich Valley, had a new school built in 1967. I believe it was completed for facilities for Grade 12. Now the school operates to Grade 6. There are six rooms sitting empty and not being utilized. I think it's time that we give consideration to bringing the teachers to the schools.

Last week I had the opportunity to open a new school in Stony Plain. Now this is one of the better designs that I have seen in schools. It was for the junior high school grades and as I toured the school I took a good look at it and there were many, many aspects that we should look for in Alberta. But one obstacle that I ran into was in the boys' washrooms. The washroom facilities, basins and mirrors, are built for children in these grades, not for adults. So

14- 26

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

it would be an idea, if we are going to build more of these schools, to make these washroom facilities adequate for adult social functions in the school.

I can see that my voice is giving out on me, but before closing and asking Mr. Farran to take over, I would hope that the hon. Minister of Education from the previous government, Mr. Clark, would also give his views on this aspect.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, the standardization of school design is a proposal that's often heard at the grass roots level, where citizens are constantly chafing at the ever-rising cost of education. It is only one of the potential areas of cost saving that seem obvious to the man in the street, and one wonders why these suggestions have never been translated into action on a level where the law-makers sit.

I don't think that anyone should take too lightly the significance of events throughout the province concerning school costs. I believe that there is something very positive being indicated, or perhaps you might call it negative, but certainly something is being indicated by people from Bow Valley, Wainwright, Lamont, and throughout the province. It's getting to the point of the last straw breaking the camel's back in regard to escalating education costs.

Perhaps politicians from senior governments are too remote from the scene, but with so many elected representatives formerly of local government now sitting in the Assembly, I hope there is new cause for faith that the message will finally get through. I venture to say that one of the reasons for the defeat of the last government was that pleas for assistance from local government fell on deaf ears. Local councils had the impression that Edmonton was either not listening, or worse, had the sort of attitude of arrogance that led them to believe, that like father, they knew best.

Every local council knows how the confidence trick was worked. In the name of local autonomy, all or part of every program was pushed onto the backs of local government. Financing may have been by grants to supplement the local property tax, but the grants all had strings attached -- except one, which I'll talk about later. They could be cut off, or reduced at will. They didn't expand with rising costs, and the blame always rested with local government. Now while the province went around boasting that it was debt free, the municipal governments had among the highest debts and the highest property tax in Canada.

Few new taxes were imposed at provincial level where the politicians were wallowing in the \$3 billion in oil money that they'd had since 1947. They even want a new tax such as the sharp increase in provincial income tax, which was recently introduced. Even when that came in they got away with it because the public attention was distracted by the much sharper increases in property taxes at local level. So as usual the local councils were the whipping boys.

I, and hundreds of other municipal officials, haven't forgotten the reception we had from the last government when they arbitrarily froze the provincial share of oil royalties at \$38 million. The municipal assistance grants were the only unconditional grants without strings given to the municipalities, which provide most of the services for most of the people. They had been arranged by law at one-third of the royalties. The revenue from the sale of oil leases declined drastically, so without consultation or warning, the government froze the allotment to the municipalities. The money they had expected in their budgets was not forthcoming, and there was no notice.

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 27

Hundreds of us flocked into Edmonton and we were faced by Mr. Fred Colborne, and Mr. Aalborg, and the hon. member from Olds-Didsbury (I don't know if he's listening) in the Chateau Lacombe. The matter was so serious that the City of Edmonton had laid on city buses to bring the delegates down here to the Legislature to plead with the Premier. Well, they received a blank "no" from the three ministers, without apology, without explanation, and it was repeated by the Premier of the day, now Leader of the Opposition. That day played a big part in the eventual disaster at the polls for the Social Credit Party.

This government has, I believe, a different attitude, and is committed to a new deal for local government next year, you may laugh, but next year is considerably better than 36 years -- we should accomplish in one year what you failed to accomplish in 36.

This government has already demonstrated its goodwill by increasing the municipal assistance grants by 10 per cent, despite the general reduction in provincial revenue. There is hope in the cities that the former take it or leave it attitude of the provincial government is changed.

I'm taking the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of this very reasonable motion for a comparatively minor measure to relieve education costs, to review the situation as I think it exists.

In my city, the combined municipal and school debt is more than \$350 million, which is as big as the new provincial debt on the present estimates which the hon. Leader of the Opposition is so worried about. Certainly, it is almost all guaranteed by the province.

You know the merry-go-round that's been going on for quite a while. Canada Pension Plan, which purports to be a social benefit scheme by the federal government, yields a fixed level of pension, and yet it's financed by 3.6 per cent of payroll;

So, perhaps in large part, it is a payroll tax. The money builds up in Ottawa at 8 or 9 per cent per year, then they lend it back to the provinces when Canada buys provincial debentures at about 8 per cent; then everybody wonders why Canada suffers from inflation. The province rations their loan money out to the municipalities on a per capita basis through the Alberta Municipal Finance Corporation.

On current account in the cities, the situation is just as bad. Some 60% of the local mill rate goes to education. Here we have the peculiar device of the supplementary requisition. The municipalities contribute about \$100 million per year to this central foundation fund, this central kitty, which is represented by 30 equalized mills on property tax. The province adds a little over \$200 million and the money is then doled out under a complicated formula to the various school boards. Every year a little "billet doux" has to be put in with the tax notice saying that in the opinion of the province that is enough to supply an adequate standard of education. However, few school boards find it really adequate and they have to charge their rate payers with another 18 or 20 mills to pay the bills.

In hospitals, auxiliary hospitals, health units, senior citizens homes, the same manoeuvre is practiced. The grants from the province fall short of covering costs, sometimes a little more, sometimes a little less, and the bills for the extras have to be paid by ever growing supplementary requisitions. But this is local autonomy, the wise elders in Edmonton say. This is local autonomy, boys, and it's really democratic. If you want extra luxuries, you must pay for them yourselves. They never really examine these luxuries to see if they're essential or how many of them are essential.

14- 28

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

The cities have to collect the taxes and pay the bills for all these semi-autonomous boards. They are bewitched and bedazzled by their own little corners, these boards are, their own little empires, and they spend money without restraint. There is no appeal allowed for the tax collecting authority against these bills, the supplementary requisitions that come in from the semi-autonomous board. The bills have to be paid. There's no real mechanism even for reviewing their budgets, or for cutting them, or talking with them about a possible restraint or postponement, if the council happens to think them extravagant. At one time there was a possibility of an appeal of an alleged extravagant budget to the arbitration of the local authorities board. But the last administration even removed that weak defense, the only defense the cities had.

In effect, the school boards and the hospital boards have blank cheques. Certainly school boards periodically face the electorate, but the main blame for increased taxes is always shouldered by the taxing authority, and the school boards shelter under the wing of this taxing authority. Yet fiscal responsibility requires some control somewhere. If the province will not allow local councils to control supplementary requisitions, it must assume that responsibility itself. The whipping boys at local level are restive, and if people don't see that, they can't see the evidence all over the province, they're blind. Even a worm will turn.

I've analyzed many local budgets in my day, and in analyzing the one that was presented to us the other night, I think I detect a very practical and courageous approach from the hon. Minister of Education. I think he intends to run a tight ship. I hope so. Let's look into the crystal ball and visualize the situation next year. We carry out our promised exercise to relieve provinces of the burden of human resource programs. It can certainly be done. Although it's not as easy an exercise as some imagine, it will be accomplished.

But that isn't the whole story. We must also find ways and means to stop the vacuum thus created from being rapidly filled up by rising municipal costs and rising supplementary requisitions. If we don't do this, it's been an exercise in futility. This means that we must have comprehensive guidelines for both education and health. A manual with many chapters may have to be introduced by both the Department of Education and the Department of Health, and the Department of Labour must also play a part.

The current brake on education costs, the 6 per cent allowable increase with a flexibility factor -- for want of a better name I'll call it the Clark plan -- was a stop gap, a band-aid. It was brought in in a hurry; it was crude. But it did, I believe, serve a large part of its purpose, anyway, for three years. But it was a brake whose linings were bound to wear out, and I'm afraid it couldn't be replaced under warranty. At the end of the three year period it was bound to break, and it's already showing signs of breaking.

Education and health are labour intensive industries where wages comprise as much as 70 per cent of the costs. A 6 per cent increase isn't enough, when you remember that employees have annual increments which may amount to as much as 4 per cent, so that what appears to be a 6 per cent increase is often 10 or 11 per cent. A replacement has to be found for the Clark plan which is now almost busted.

There are still many people who are philosophically opposed to any control over wages and prices. Even when a Republican president, like Richard Nixon in the United States, has been brave enough to show the way, there are all sorts of people who believe that wage and price controls are contrary to the free enterprise concept. But you can't have ground rules like this. They confuse free enterprise with

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 29

laissez-faire. They, like our friends on the other side of the House, should be back in the last century.

During the election, I was asked what that billboard showing a dinosaur on roller-skates meant. It said "Travel Alberta". "Travel Alberta" was in very small letters, and I suppose it was a tribute to the hon. minister from Drumheller, but my reply was that it was Social Credit rolling into the 20th century.

Anyway, without such controls, without some sort of restraint on wages and prices, at least for a period, Canada is likely to run off the cliff into the sea, or become as extinct as that dinosaur, as it goes galloping off into the night with galloping inflation, to the point where you'd probably need a three ton truck to carry your small change, as they did in Germany in the '20s.

In the jurisdictions to the west and east of us, in British Columbia and in Saskatchewan, the problem is similar, and those provincial governments have already taken some resolute action. As long ago as 1969, B.C. applied a freeze to new school design and new school construction -- at least the elements of design. They began to impose some standards on the buildings themselves. In that province, teachers are civil servants, and there is better control over bargaining. Recently a 6% ceiling has been imposed on salaries for all public servants in B.C. In Saskatchewan, a similar freeze has been imposed on total wage budgets for education. In B.C., they didn't single out teachers and in Saskatchewan, they did. This includes the increment.

Of course, the cost push doesn't only come from the teachers and the registered nurses. It probably starts with the multiplicity of civic unions in the cities, the police, the firemen, the electricians, the outside workers. And it's no good saying that we don't want to get into this sort of thing; let's stay out of this controversy; let's keep out of the heat; let's stay quiet and perhaps it'll go away. It won't go away. A teacher is just as conscious of the wages paid to a policeman as to another teacher, and there must be an end to the 8 per cent to 11 per cent year after year compounding. People just can't pay it on the wages and salaries they earn in the private sector. The wages and returns in the public sector have got far, far and away ahead of those in the private sector. Those controls, so sadly lacking, must come from the provincial level. It's no use shucking off the responsibility in the name of local autonomy. That's an abdication of responsibility.

These are the things I think we need. First of all, we need voluntary guide lines as a minimum for all public servants at all levels. Secondly, we need comprehensive manuals from the Department of Education and the Department of Health to give direction to local trustees. The prevailing principle of those manuals must be a quality of opportunity for all Albertans. If this is considered an invasion of local autonomy, so be it. Local autonomy isn't worth the price if it's taken to mean local laissez-faire. We can't afford it. The manuals should include common standards for the entire province, after variations for the peculiarities of the local district. They should cover not only the curriculum, but the question of supplies and textbooks, teacher pupil ratios, the number of floaters they should have, (like the non-teaching teachers, two of them to every school, now), guidance councillors, specialists. They should cover the amount to be spent on overhead, and how the overhead should be spent, on what type of people, the number and types of buses, direction on purchasing, (wherever possible, have central purchasing), and then coming to the specific subject of the resolution, they should have standardized school design for optimum efficiency.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs knows that I'm always kind to architects who are paid 8% of the end contract price, and I

14- 30

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st. 1972

intend to be kind today, as I have always been. But I don't think they can operate without tighter specifications. And perhaps they should keep their experimentation in architectural works of art for other less cost sensitive areas than education.

Incidentally, I believe the hon. Minister of Industry should take note of the huge amounts being spent in this province for education, and ask himself whether the Province of Alberta couldn't start printing its own school books. This, at least, will give us a return in the nucleus of a sophisticated printing industry in Alberta, and give us something back for all the dollars we are spending.

Like everyone else, I also believe we should get our fair share of the huge federal fiscal revenue, and shouldn't have to buy our share through the device of matching grants, any more than the city should from the province. But I must say that I prayed very hard that the voice of the Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker would be heard the other day, when he moved in the House of Commons that federal aid should be given to secondary education. And don't think that voice is not heard. Remember that he has never lost touch with the grass roots. And remember also, he was the one who introduced federal aid for technical and vocational training.

Now, this problem of bringing education under control isn't peculiar to Alberta. It is a top issue now in the United States. In their present election campaign it may be of even more significance than the war in Viet Nam. So we must tackle it resolutely, too. I wonder if we shouldn't begin with a genuine evaluation of our product.

Examinations are no longer in style. The Board says, "You mustn't put those poor children down at a desk and tell them to write an examination paper. It might ruin their whole lives, even worse than hating their father or their mother." So you have to test them all on a graph, a curve, a normal curve, and then of course, the child is only competing against himself. Because he mustn't be taught to compete.

Surely the old-fashioned school inspector hasn't also disappeared from the scene. Couldn't we send an impartial body from some entirely different area (say, from New Zealand, which is supposed to have a very high standard of education at minimum cost). Alberta to evaluate the level of learning of our students at various grades.

We are always talking about merit pay for teachers as though you have to examine the teacher. The ones to examine are the children, the products of the system, to see what they really have achieved, to see how their level of education at various ages compares with those in other jurisdictions in the western world.

There was a letter in the Calgary Herald the other day from a fellow who had been at the University of Calgary, and had then gone to that land of saints and martyrs where so much blood is flowing right now, the north of Ireland. He was at Queen's University in Belfast, and he wrote back and said that he didn't believe that any Grade XII graduate from a Calgary school could pass matriculation for a Northern Ireland university. Maybe they are not taught here to operate like the IRA, and maybe the curriculum is different, but at least somebody has put that question and said; is it true? And if it is true and we are spending all this money, there is something wrong. Perhaps there has been too much emphasis on innovation and experiment, so we are not getting value for our dollars. I don't know if it is right or not. Perhaps we are not getting the value we think we are getting. I understand that Texas also has a very expensive school system, but there are critics who say the standard of education is low there. It isn't as high as in some areas where

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 31

the budgets are lower. So it is not axiomatic that the more you spend the more value you get.

When they are talking about innovations, why don't they think of some innovations for reducing costs? When is an architect going to come up with a viable plan for a modular school? That is the sort of plan that could be well standardized across the province, where the classrooms could be moved from one site to another. I read in magazines that this concept is practised elsewhere; why can't it be done here? In Calgary, we have older schools in the centre of the city with empty classrooms, and then we build new ones in the suburbs. There are two practical approaches to this. You might bus them, and in the United States they bus them for miles, city and rural, and in the rural areas of Alberta, as you all know, some kids spend an hour to an hour and a half on a bus every day. So why can't the city kids? But anyway, supposing there is a big resentment against busing, then why can't we build modular schools that can be moved according to the movement of the population?

At one time in Calgary the trustees said that it was utterly impossible to build a school for \$16.50 a square foot, which was the allowable limit in the Foundation Plan. And I give the other side credit for the fact -- or perhaps it was just habit -- that they didn't listen and they didn't respond, and finally the school trustees discovered that they didn't have to pay \$20.00 to \$22.00 dollars a foot, that they could build these schools for \$16.50 and there was a big reversal in building costs. Suddenly, the architects began to build to the limit with a little bit of direction -- right, not the engineers, the architects. The engineers are just as bad!

My contention is that there must be some direction. There has got to be direction, and it must come from the province. The province cannot abdicate its responsibilities; it must have guidelines; it must have a manual; it must give the trustees something to operate with. It is no good just taking these fellows off the street who are anxious to do a good job on promoting quality of education regardless of cost. They are elected as trustees, and all they really want to do is educate their own children during their period in the school, but they don't really get an overall broad picture of what the people at large can afford. They probably don't know, except in a very amateurish sort of way, what they should be aiming at in terms of standards and guidelines. So I feel that the province has got to do this. The motion is a very simple one. I shouldn't think that there is anybody in this House who doesn't agree with the wording of this motion:

"Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta give consideration to establishing procedures that will result in greater standardization of school design" -- this is just an improvement on the present situation -- "and bulk purchase of school building supplies to reduce construction and operating costs."

I don't know about the second half, how feasible that's going to be. With modular schools it would be completely feasible, but I believe the motion is in the right direction and that the Executive Council on this side of the House is well in touch with the situation.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to bring forth a point of view on this business of the standardization of school design and bulk purchasing. I think before the sponsors of this resolution start showering upon themselves congratulations for saving the province hundreds of thousands and maybe even millions of dollars, they should maybe take a look at some of the ramifications in the areas in which it probably wouldn't accomplish as much as they had hoped it would. Now the idea sounds just fine and dandy and I

14- 32

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

don't argue with it. I congratulate the government for putting forth resolutions that would (if in fact they do) save the people of Alberta money. I think we all commend them for this and I think this is a great idea.

But the fact is this. It will not accomplish in savings to the people of Alberta nearly so much as many people think. Maybe it would be a good idea if this motion were passed, Mr. Speaker, so that the people of Alberta would find out, maybe once and for all, that it is not as practical a solution to the problem as many people think. There are so many things that come into play. For example, if we are talking about the utilization of school plans over and over again, I think we must remember that we will have the Alberta Association of Architects upon our backs in very quick order and probably rightly so. And I'm not so sure that a minimal saving by the total province should be carved out of the pockets of just a few. I have some reservations about that. Then we look at the practical aspects of uniform buildings themselves. We must consider (and as trustees we have talked about this aspect for a good many years) the pros and cons, and we have come up with the answer that there isn't a big saving in this proposition.

Every time a building is built in another location, you have many things to consider. You have the exposure, whether it's east, west, north or south and this does make a difference to the plans. You must consider the business of land elevation, the drop in the land, the services as they are in that particular location. You must also consider the feasibility and the possibility of additions to the school, which very often are affected by the type of building, and if they were all the same they wouldn't lend themselves to this type of thing. Not only that, but having been a school board member, I have a pretty good idea of how school boards and school administrators react to this type of thing, and also how department of education officials will react, because, you know, they don't agree with one another. So I would suggest that we would have real problems in trying to put this across and make it a practical thing.

Now in the area of bulk purchasing, I would suggest that bulk purchasing or volume buying can be effective. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, again I would say, in the province of Alberta most school districts, school divisions, or county school districts, have sufficient buying power of their own that suppliers have a healthy respect for their buying ability. I suggest that the very best way to get the best buy is to be a good tough buyer. I think that if you start getting into real bulk buying, if you get into the situation where you have a central buying depot, the next thing that would happen is that you would be storing things up that may or may not be used in the near future. No object is a good buy just because it's cheap, unless you know you are going to use it in the very, very near future. So I can see us developing a sort of depot where things would be stored up because someone bought them at a good price. They wouldn't be used for a long time. They would become obsolete and not only that, but you are down to the situation where people would feel compelled to buy through the unit. They wouldn't buy through a central buying agency because of the fact that they would have to do volume buying in order to be effective. Therefore it would not be utilized to a very great extent. I still maintain that the most effective buying is done by the consumer himself as directly as possible and being as tough a buyer as he can be.

Now, that doesn't mean that there isn't some merit in this type of a resolution and so far it hasn't been brought forward. I think that there are things that could be done to constitute a saving to the people of Alberta regarding school buildings. For example, I think more emphasis should be put on the flexibility and versatility of buildings. Many of us have been in large convention centres where an area that will accommodate 50 people can be converted to accommodate 250, 500, or 1,500 people within a few minutes. In other

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 33

words we need more removable and interchangeable partitions and this type of thing, so that a greater use can be made of school buildings. Let's make them versatile and flexible within themselves. I think this would be a very important and a very beneficial type of operation which would really make school buildings more versatile, flexible and useable, and would certainly cut down on this business of everyone having to have something different. The outside structure could be the same but inside -- let's make them very flexible. I think this would be the important thing.

Now there is another area that is a real bugbear, not only in school buildings but in all institutional buildings, and that's this business of uniform fire and safety regulations. I think that everyone in this room, if they have had any type of exposure to either municipal or school board regulations and buildings, will have found themselves caught in the conflict between fire and safety regulations that are different in all cities and the provinces themselves.

I can speak from personal experience. We had a building almost completed, to the point where they were putting tile on the ceiling. The merchandise had been ordered. Suddenly a little empire that had its own fire regulations said: "We have now changed our regulations. The type of tile that was originally suggested does not meet our requirements, and therefore you must put something else in."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is utter nonsense. This is where money is being wasted. You can go to any school board in this province and you will see that through the years they have been faced with having to change their building -- to make big changes amounting to thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars -- to suit minor changes in the fire and safety regulations of various departments. This is an area in which we have to do something, because it just doesn't make any sense.

I can give you an illustration that might seem a little comical, but it's very real. I know of an institutional building where it was necessary to build a boiler room. The fire regulations insisted that the door into the boiler room should swing in. There was a reason for that; in the event of a fire or an explosion, the door would be forced shut and the fire would be contained in that confined area. Now this seemed to make a lot of sense to some people. All of a sudden somebody else came along, the boiler people, and they said, "How come that door is swinging in? This is ridiculous! We can't stand for that. This door has got to swing out because if there is an explosion we want the door to blow open so that people can get out of there and be safe."

So what are you going to do? Build two doors to the boiler room, one for fire safety regulations and one for boiler staff safety regulations? I mean this is the type of ridiculous situation in which we find ourselves. So I would say that if we can get to the root of this type of problem, Mr. Speaker, there may be some hope for saving, and something would make some sense as far as uniform fire and safety regulations are concerned for school buildings.

In summary I would say then, Mr. Speaker, let's do something about versatility. Let's do something about uniform fire and safety regulations.

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to enter into the debate today. First of all I know very little about education and education financing, and for that reason, I took the opportunity to study the subject as best I could, because it is a very complicated matter. In fact, it's so complicated that most of us would prefer not to make the effort. However, because of the recent plebiscite situation at

14- 34

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

Wainwright, I felt that all members should be cognizant of what is happening in education, so that when the foundation program expires at the end of 1973, what we replace it with, and I hope it will be replaced, will be with something which is going to work.

The establishment of the school divisions after 1934 led to an intensive movement towards centralization. There are now, I believe, over 200 school boards, and there are some 400,000 odd students. So this is a pretty big concern, and it, of course, takes a large part of the provincial budget. The creation of divisions coincided with important changes in the curriculum. There was, of course, an advantage in concentrating facilities in an attempt to provide adequate programs in a few centres, rather than mediocre programs in many. In order to centralize, there had to be an expansion of the transportation system.

Centralization has, in fact, gone far at the high school level. And what about centralization in the junior and elementary grades? There are certain pressures that appear to carry school boards toward centralization. There is a need to provide better education by supplying a varied program of instruction.

Money is distributed through the foundation program for operating costs. Funds from the foundation program are used for supplying transportation, and also in the area of building of schools.

I have no quarrel with the idea that we should be providing a better education system to our youngsters, but I wonder whether the need to provide a better education is directly influenced by the other pressures, so this becomes the excuse to justify further centralization. The regulations under the school foundation program provide that payments depend on the number of classroom units administered by each board, and the classroom unit is defined by the number of pupils divided by 26. The formula is adjusted where an exact mathematical division cannot be made, and there is a multiplication factor which is used to increase the number of classroom units in the Grade VII to IX level and the Grade X to XII level, presumably because the costs of education are greater at the higher levels. There is a fixed sum of money provided to each board for each classroom unit, and then there are further sums for support staffs per 1,000 pupils.

The present foundation program is designed to cover a budget period of three years, so the school boards could, in fact, get into the area of long term budgeting. This will run until 1973. The previous administration determined the ratios of teachers to students, and of support staff to students, for a three year period. The major purpose of the school foundation plan was to increase the degree of financial equality among the various school jurisdictions across the province.

The distribution of funds was arrived at by certain judgments on the type of educational program that the province was prepared to support. These judgments were based on provincial averages from the information then available. The judgments were in the ratio of teachers to students and the number of support staff per 1,000 pupils. Therefore the amount of money that each board receives is dependent upon the number of students it has. Once the school board gets the money it is free to spend the money as it sees fit, I presume within reason. But if it does not have the teacher pupil ratio of 26 to 1, it can in fact, employ more or fewer teachers. This is left up to each board.

In rural areas, however, there's been a decline in the number of pupils, and I mentioned the situation at Wainwright. The same situation exists at Stettler in the county system. Unfortunately I think bigness has become a necessity of school boards. They have to

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 35

get bigger, they have to have more students in order to operate. Therefore if the student population declines, in order to economize, they're forced to centralize.

There's a third pressure, of course, on centralization and that is the transportation policy. Money is available from the foundation program to boards for pupils whom they must transport under the terms of the School Act. Dr. Hanson, in his research monograph done for the Alberta Teachers' Association called "The School Foundation Program in the 1960's", states on page 43:

"It appears that provisions in the Foundation Program have stimulated provision for transportation and centralization of schools."

This means that while the cost of transportation and maintenance of pupils has increased (and in fact over the period from 1961 to 1969 it rose from \$9.8 million to \$19.1 million), this rate of increase was less than the rate of increase for total expenditures, and therefore the percentage of total costs attributable to transportation declined. This I believe, encourages further centralization. It will be interesting to see the figures for the period 1970 to 1973 in order to compare them with the previous nine years.

If a board is forced to centralize, the fund will in fact, cover the costs of transportation. But I would refer the members in this Assembly to the report of the minister's committee on school finance, which was distributed to the members of the Assembly in 1969. On page 50 of that report there is the following statement, and I quote:

"Actually, the Foundation Fund supports transportation, if not immediately, at least a year later up to the total amount expended by school boards. The fault with such a system of support rests in the fact that it does not provide any incentive for local jurisdictions to economize in the administration of their transportation systems."

The day apparently is fast approaching when we may well see elementary pupils and pupils in the early grades having to ride school buses for 10, 20, 30 and 60 miles twice a day. I raise the question as to whether this in fact is better education. If it is, then school boards will have to get into the dormitory type of facility, even for these young children. If it isn't, then the present foundation program must be changed. We must examine carefully the effect of the present foundation program on rural areas, because as a consequence of that program (which will result, I submit, in further centralization), we have the closure of schools in the rural areas.

The existence of two levels of school administration at the provincial level and the municipal level, causes a great deal of problems. To compare the revenue potential of the provincial government to that of the municipal government is like comparing two entirely different articles. There is a much more elastic revenue source available to the province. But the area of responsibility of school boards is related to the expenditure requirements, and there is a definite pressure towards providing a better education.

During the 1960's we saw that the gap between local revenues and total expenditures widened year by year, with a consequent increase in supplementary requisitions. On the expenditure side, there was a trend toward increasing centralization of schools, which was encouraged by the regulations of the 'then' program. This trend is developing again in the '70s with the new foundation program, introduced in 1970. Because economies of scale are not necessarily achieved, the large school districts add new, more expanded programs. The quality of education improves, but the gap between revenues and

14- 36

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

expenses widens. As soon as more dollars are provided by the provincial government, there tends to be an effort by the Department of Education and by the taxpayers to control how those funds are spent. The main problem then is to what degree should there be provincial control, and to what degree should there be local control over education costs.

There's something Machiavellian in the present system, in which we give local government the tasks of administering the expenditures of education and of improving education, and retain for the provincial government the real revenue sources, leaving only the right to make supplemental requisitions on property owners as a safety valve, and plebiscites.

What happens, I think, is what we probably have seen happen in Wainwright with the plebiscite. The question is, who promotes the plebiscite? The teacher, the school board, the parents, the taxpayer? Who promotes the 'yes' vote -- the teachers, the school board? Who promotes the 'no' vote -- the taxpayers? All that a plebiscite does is to focus the attention of the voters on an increase in taxes, and it's notable that in spite of that the vote at Wainwright was surprisingly close. I submit that the use of the plebiscite is not a real method of making school boards, shall we say, more responsible, because the public now knows that it is really the provincial government who must supply the majority of the funds.

I therefore speculate that, when the present foundation program comes to an end in 1973, a program which appears to be having similar growing pains as those which developed in the 1960's, the provincial government will take over all matters of education, only in turn to be taken over by the federal government, because a similar problem exists between these two levels of government as well.

The Human Resources Research Council of Alberta concludes in its report about the quality of life in Alberta that, and I quote: "The trend towards increased enrollments at all levels, which has continued over the past several years, has now turned the corner. A period of decline may be in the offing."

I would have to say that due to the effect of the pill, birth rates must be dropping, and dropping faster in the rural areas because of the exodus of people to the city. As our present foundation program is based on ratios, dependent on the number of students under the jurisdiction of each school board, it is likely that the present program will be under severe strain before the end of the foundation program in 1973. Therefore, with regard to the motion before us, I think we must first decide who is to be responsible for deciding whether or not there should be standardization. It is either a local matter, or a provincial matter.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on Resolution No. 1 on the Order Paper today, at the outset let me congratulate the mover on putting forward what I think, at the very least, is a thought-provoking resolution, and certainly, I don't question the mover's sincerity in the resolution at all.

Secondly, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I recall rather well, in wrestling with this problem over the last two or three years, that the government commissioned a report by a private consulting firm, Reed, Crowther and Associates. The people of the province spent \$100,000 on a report looking at not all the matters involved in the resolution here, but certainly at some of the matters. I'd like to allude to that just a bit later.

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 37

I must say that I found the comments by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, the hon. gentleman who used to be in the newspaper business, who perhaps most noteworthy is the chairman of the task force on the future of municipal government in Alberta -- I think that school boards, hospital boards, and likely some people in municipal government will find his comments today rather revealing, and I trust they don't really represent the feeling of the 'now' government. One of the comments that I found perhaps most straightforward and a bit startling was something to the effect that, if the preparation of manuals by the Department of Education for curriculum and for school buildings and for staffing and so on infringe on local autonomy, so what?

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is an attitude that I certainly wouldn't want to associate myself with. I think, frankly, one of the real cores in the question we are debating this afternoon, is a question the hon. Member for Stettler raised, "Who is going to control education?" That's one of the questions that all the hon. members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, are going to have to resolve in their own minds in the course of the next year or two. In the next few months the Worth Report (or the report on the Commission on Educational Planning) will be coming in. It will become the responsibility of this Legislature and every member herein to come to grips with a new means of financing education in this province. And perhaps before we get involved in those kinds of issues, we had better go back to the real seat of the whole question, who is going to control education. Frankly, the comments made this afternoon by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, who is a most delightful person, and very active in the House, on the question of who's going to control education and his allusion to local responsibility and so on, left me a bit cool.

The hon. member referred, Mr. Speaker, to the march on the hotel last year, the Chateau Lacombe (it wasn't the Legislative Building) by the representatives of the municipalities across the province. And I suppose one might facetiously say that I am the only surviving one of the three ministers who went there.

But on a more serious note, let me say that the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill was as active that day as he has been in the Assembly. He and that other great Conservative from Calgary, John Kushner, were two of the people who were most active when it came to the presentation over at the Chateau Lacombe. Now, I want, for the benefit of the hon. members, to read into the record another Tory attitude with regard to this question of local responsibility. And it happens to be in the Daily Herald Tribune. It says: "Tory replies to letter." And the date is April 27, '71. I think hon. members would find that that is some period of time following the march that my friend across the way referred to. And I quote the letter:

"I am delighted to read Mr. Colborne's letter (Reader Comment column, April 20th). I have a high regard for Mr. Colborne as an outstanding member of the government, and I am sure his figures are accurate. In reply to this follow-the-leader comment - are not the Conservatives fortunate having such an outstanding leader to follow?

His second and fourth paragraphs conflict. If the government is withholding money from the municipalities because it believes it knows how to spend it more wisely, whether it be on people's services or higher administrative costs, this surely credits the municipalities with less maturity and suggests that municipalities do not know how to take responsibility for their fiscal policies.

14- 38

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

If I cut down my mature son's allowance and tell him I will buy his clothes for him, am I showing him a greater or lesser regard for his maturity?

That more than 40% of the provincial budget is used for assistance to municipalities, I do not deny. That it is given with a tight hand on the purse strings so that locally elected boards have little say on how it is spent is also true.

The simile of the sugar daddy may be true, for most sugar daddies expect a full return for their gifts, but at least they are giving away their own money, not that of Alberta's taxpayers.

Dr. W. O. Backus,
Grande Prairie"

Now it seems to me this indicates somewhat of a different view. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the member in the front bench rather represents the government's point of view and the member from Calgary represents his own point of view, when it comes to this matter of local responsibility and local autonomy.

Mr. Speaker, I should move on from this question of local autonomy, which I emphasize once again as the real core issue in this resolution here today; but it is also the real core issue in the whole financing of the grade 1 to 12 system in this province. I think that the hon. members are well aware that the costs of education aren't just simply those of the buildings: in fact the average cost of a school building will be eaten up in the operating costs in 3, 4, or 5 years. For members to feel that procedures such as are proposed here are really going to enable us to come to grips with the problems of increasing education costs, really that's wishful thinking. It isn't going to have a substantial bearing on the matter of rising education costs.

It perhaps should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that the Edmonton Public School Board over the course of the last few years, and perhaps the Calgary Public School Board, although I'm not sure about them, have utilized similar plans for two or three schools. They've used the same plans over again within, I believe, one year. In some areas, that experiment has been successful. But I ask the members to think of your own constituencies, and think in terms of designing a plan and designing procedures and having standardized school designs and bulk purchasing which will meet all the varying needs there are across the province.

You can go into the Rainbow Lake country in the far northern part of the province, where within the last year, they've needed to build one or two rooms, one of those being an activity area. You can go down to the very southern portion of the province, to a new elementary school at Cardston with something like 400 students. You can go west of Lacombe where they had a fire and burnt the school down not long ago. (Well, they didn't have a fire; a fire occurred, excuse me. The result was the same, that the school wasn't there.) You can look at some of the large schools that have been built in Calgary, several large schools that have been built in Edmonton, and schools in the rural areas of the province. For us to say that we can think in terms of a few plans that are going to meet the needs of all these changing situations across the province -- maybe it would be nice to wish it would happen, but there is no way that this is going to be the answer to all of the problems there are in the field of school building.

I have no hesitation about supporting the resolution and there may well be some advances coming out of the proposal here. But I'd urge the hon. members not to think in terms of this proposal solving all the problems as far as school buildings are concerned. I'd really urge hon. members to think very seriously about this question

March 21st 1972

ALEERTA HANSARD

14- 39

of who is going to control the education system. Because I seem to be able to read into this resolution that if we're going to be involved in the standardization of school designs and the bulk purchase of school materials, then the decision is already made that, in fact, the Department of Education is going to be controlling it.

If this is the direction the members of the Legislature want to go, I'm certainly one who wants to opt out of that decision. I don't think that's the right direction to go, and I hope we have a heck of a lot of opportunities in this Assembly to argue that one before any final decision is made. I trust that we will.

But I do think the resolution here today is implicitly saying that the government or the Department of Education is going to be involved in the standardization of school designs and bulk purchasing.

Whether that's what the mover of the resolution really had in mind or not, I don't know, and I really would appreciate him commenting on that when he gets an opportunity to close the debate I think the second issue is the question of local autonomy, and who is really going to control education.

The hon. Member for Lethbridge raised an excellent point on this matter of fire regulations. If, as a result of this resolution, this problem can be solved, it will be time jolly well spent. Changing fire regulations are most annoying to school boards across the province. There is a sizeable cost involved in following the requirement of the Fire Commissioner's office and making such changes.

So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say these things. (1) Certainly I am agreeable to the motion as long as it doesn't mean the Department of Education will assume control for education in all aspects; I would oppose that. (2) I would urge all members to think in terms of the question, where do we go in this question of local autonomy and local responsibility? And I'd urge members not to think that this is going to solve all the problems of educational finance in this province. As sincere and genuine as this resolution is, there is no way. (3) I hope the chairman of the Conservative task force rethinks some of his thoughts on local autonomy.

Thank you very much.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, this topic has become more intriguing as the afternoon has worn on, so much so that my original intentions have changed considerably, and I now welcome the opportunity to speak to it, however briefly.

The last speaker has stressed, at length, the matter of local autonomy as being the basic issue here. I would submit that this House might be better advised to consider the issue in terms of the opportunity for discretionary decision making. In other words, I'm suggesting that we ought to consider that basically this House is responsible for education in the province of Alberta, as we are responsible for a number of other issues and public concerns. We are the ones who must make the initial decision as to what programs receive priority consideration, and how much of the public funds are going to be allocated to those specific areas.

Having made those decisions, we then have to decide, within education for instance how we are going to administer the school system, and here is where considerable debate enters the picture. I suggest to you that we go too far when we start bandying around terms like 'local autonomy'. I'm not so sure that there is such a thing as provincial autonomy, for instance. I think that we find ourselves

14- 40

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

always operating within a whole series of constraints, and really what we should be looking at is what kinds of decisions should be made, at what operational level.

I have some very strong personal opinions on this particular matter. They are basically that the further toward the scene of the operation decisions can be made, the better those decisions should be, because the more knowledgeable should be the people who are making those decisions should be.

Perhaps I can illustrate one concern that I have by reference to the system for financing education. We have had today an explanation by the hon. Member for Stettler about how the present system works. Well, the financing program which we had in this province, which preceded the present system, was of a different type. That particular program provided a direct incentive, a contingent or a tied grant for various items in the school operation. For instance, if one hired a teacher with one year of training there was a payment of a certain amount; if one hired a teacher with three years training there was a larger payment, and so a whole series of incentive grants were made available.

The result was, in many instances I fear, that in terms of making decisions as to what the proper priorities should have been on the local level, some local officials made decisions in terms of what money they could extract from the province. Now this to me completely distorted, thwarted, and even coerced local education officials. And I would submit that while we might have had local autonomy, we certainly subverted the opportunity for discretionary decisions at that level. And I think that we are treading in that area again here.

The question, I think, that does deserve considerable attention is how much pretesting needs to be done of building design. We have had, in some instances, a fair variety of school buildings introduced in this province. Some of these concepts, perhaps, should have been tried out, but there ought to have been, in my opinion, a better system of reporting the good points, the bad points, the successes and the failures which occurred here. Having been involved in the school system for some time, I am aware that some of this went on between the school boards in Calgary and Edmonton, but I fear not enough of it. And I would submit that this is an area that ought properly to be a concern for the provincial government. Could we not at least get a better working relationship among these boards so they could sort out the valuable aspects of some of their designs and some of the attributes of their designs which should be avoided in future?

We've had some discussion of bulk purchasing, etc. I would commend in passing to this House that one of the points we ought to look at from a provincial point of view, is the nature of some of the decisions that are made at the provincial level by the Department of Education, at least in times past, which have been very influential in terms of decisions that local boards have had to make. And I refer not to financial grant structures, but rather to program changes which can have effects way down the line, in terms of the use of buildings even. For instance, if a certain type of science program is altered radically you may find you are in for a lot of changes within your buildings, not to mention textbooks, etc. Again I raise the question: how fast should these changes be made, and are they well thought out before they're introduced?

There probably is room for more consideration of modular construction possibilities and the use of modules.

There are a couple of points that I would like very much to stress which the hon. Member for Lethbridge West mentioned. One is flexibility. Since it has been mentioned I will just reiterate that in my opinion this needs to have a lot more attention. That same

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 41

point was mentioned by the hon. Member for Stony Plain in his review of the school which he opened a week or two ago.

The point on fire and safety regulations deserves a great deal of attention. This is something which, for years, we have not been able to get through to the previous government as requiring immediate attention. This is both confusing and frustrating and absolutely and utterly needless.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Now, now!

MR. YOUNG:

That's right, now!

AN HON. MEMBER:

We'll be waiting!

MR. YOUNG:

Well, we'll do something about it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

We'll get some action on a study.

MR. YOUNG:

We don't need another study. All we need to do is get some fire commissioners together and a few safety experts and decide where the priorities are. And we'll be able to get some decision made.

Mr. Speaker, I underline these points because I think of all the area of very obvious unnecessary cost, the fire and safety regulations are the greatest tugbear at the moment.

I would like to add another facet to this particular debate. Some mention has been made that we won't solve the problems of financing education, and with that I would agree. I haven't worked recently with the data, but I believe approximately 14 per cent of the educational expenditures, and that may be high, are used for paying off school buildings and this sort of expenditure -- expenditures related to the physical plant as such. I don't think that is a case for not looking at the issue. Any money that we can save anywhere is a valuable step forward, but I do suggest that we are looking at a fairly small portion of our educational costs. We should keep that in mind.

Also, in terms of this particular element of educational cost, we ought to keep in mind that a major portion of these costs now, are occurring in a relatively few localities. Not every school division, not every county builds a school every year. By and large, the bulk of the building is occurring in the urban areas. There are some new towns which have school programs, and there are occasional small additions here and there in rural areas. But the bulk is occurring in the city districts, and I think it would be relatively easy to take a good hard look at trying to standardize school design, at least to the extent of finding out the good points, the bad points, the successes and failures of some of our existing school plans.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to support this resolution.

14- 42

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I've enjoyed listening to the comments of the members very much, because up until a couple of years ago I used to earn my living a great part of the time by designing schools. This was always a problem of interest, I know, to the school trustees who were our clients and wrestled with it, in fact, architects, builders, and officials of the Department of Education used to give it some attention too.

I was particularly interested in the comments the hon. Member for Lethbridge West offered in this afternoon's debate. He showed his experience as a school trustee when he put the finger on some specific problems that relate to the problem of design standardization. I wonder if many of the members know that there are, at least in the two major metropolitan areas, some pretty stringent cost controls now in effect by the boards. I think those elected boards are just as concerned about building costs as we are. For example, I know the public school board in the City of Calgary requires four estimates to be given of the cost of the proposed school at different stages of design, as it becomes possible to get more done, and make more accurate estimates, these are requested from the consultant architect. The net result, and this is written into the architect's agreement with his client, is that if the cost of the building does in fact come in above the architect's last estimate, he has to design it over again at his own cost. So I can't agree, and I never have completely agreed with the member from Calgary North, that it's to an architect's advantage to make a school building cost as much as possible, because he's working on a fee basis. Usually the opposite holds true, Mr. Speaker, if he does, in fact, exceed the budget as has been approved by the client.

I think I agree with the last speaker's remarks as to the percentage of the education budget, that is devoted to the capital cost and the operating costs of buildings; they are really relatively small when we're looking at the total costs of the education package. The operating costs, may be in the proportion that the hon. member from Olds indicated -- I don't know, I don't have those figures. Certainly the capital costs of the schools which are being built in Alberta today are fairly reasonable. Even if it was possible to cut those costs in half, and that would be a gigantic undertaking, probably impossible, the net effect on the overall education budget would be extremely negligible.

Because if the schools are to last any sort of lifetime at all, and be built in such a way that they will stand up to hard use by active young people in the rigours of our climate, there are certain standards that are not economically sensible to go below, Mr. Speaker. I believe some of the school boards in the province now are trying to make substantial savings insofar as operating costs are concerned. We're all familiar with the newer school designs that have very few, if any, windows in them. This has cut down on breakage and also on heat loss. I don't know what the effect yet is on children of getting their education in a windowless classroom I know personally, I wouldn't want to work all day in a windowless space. More extensive use is made of multi-purpose synthetic fibre carpets, rather than the traditional linoleum and asphalt tile floors. This is found to be far more economical, and I know this is now purchased in bulk quantities by some of the school boards in the province. In other words, they'll buy enough carpet to do eight or ten schools at a time and thereby be able to take advantage of substantial savings. This same kind of process, I know, is used with respect to certain kinds of moveable partitions and equipment, lighting fixtures, etc.

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West did point out, in a realistic way, some of the practical problems that are concerned with taking a standardized plan and being able to put it down on any site, anywhere. I think the members can recognize some of the very real problems. I wouldn't want them to be misled by thinking that once a

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 43

good standardized plan is developed this is the answer for all parts of the province. The questions of topography and of slope have been mentioned, as well as exposure. The type of soil conditions certainly affect the design of the foundations. Whether or not the school is going to be built in an urban or a rural setting makes a big difference, as also does the population and the size of the surrounding children group that will be attending the school. The size of the school definitely relates to the cost, not in a direct way with respect to the number of classrooms, but there is a certain core part of the school - the boiler room, all the plumbing facilities, the library, the teachers' offices, the gymnasium, the kitchen which are there, whether or not they support one classroom or ten. Of course the proportionate costs of those facilities goes down as you add classrooms.

I can remember about two and a half years ago when I still had a practice in Calgary, Mr. Speaker, doing a school for a new subdivision in an area called Willow Park. The school board liked it very much; it was about a 14 classroom elementary school. Their projections showed that they needed another school, but with two less classrooms in the Lake Bonavista subdivision, just eight or ten blocks away. Despite the fact that two classrooms were taken off the standard plan, and that the project was tendered within a few months of the first one, the cost of the second one came in higher. In other words, a smaller school cost more in an aggregate amount. I suppose there are reasons for this, depending on conditions of the labour market at the time, the extent of competition among contractors, and the climatic conditions. I'm merely mentioning these examples to show that standardization in itself is not the answer. There are some advantages to be gained from it, but certainly it is not the answer.

It has been, I think, very interesting the way the Province of Ontario with its relatively large population, as compared to Alberta, has approached the program. They have looked at a systems building approach or technique, and it's my understanding that some of the programs they have been able to carry out using systems approach to the building of school facilities have been very successful, and are starting to cut costs. The Ontario Housing Corporation, as a matter of fact, has been most interested in this approach, and recently commissioned a report -- I have a copy of that here -- dealing with the advantages and the principles of systems buildings. And systems building, really, is just wherein a client, such as a provincial government, will go into bulk purchasing, using a standard building code, and try to take advantage of standard building systems techniques.

With respect to that, the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury showed some concern over what he thought the role of government should be, and that if we ever went into this, autonomy would disappear. I don't think that would happen, Mr. Speaker, because the report prepared for the Ontario Housing Corporation very specifically deals with the advantages that do accrue to the public if the role of government is defined in these three areas. First of all, it can ensure continuing demand. Secondly, it can take advantage of standardization, that is, wall panels, window units, lighting fixtures, etc., and it is in a position to carry on research and development that a smaller individual client would not be able to do.

Insofar as a standard building code is concerned, I think that is very important, because some examples were mentioned with respect to whether a boiler room door should swing in and out. I was going to announce it later, but I suppose now is as good a time as any, that the advisory committee of civil servants and municipal officials that has been working on a standardized building code for the province of Alberta, submitted last week to myself and the hon. Minister of Labour the first draft of the report dealing with a standardized building code for the province based on the National

14- 44

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

Building Code. It looks as if it's a possibility that this will come about with the cooperation of municipal and educational organizations that would be involved in using the code. So I'm optimistic at this time that at least that step can be taken in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, I just want to put one other question in front of the members for their consideration. We have always argued this concept of standardized building, on the assumption that it is necessary for a school board to own real property. I don't think that's a necessity at all. I see no reason why they have to own land or buildings, or what the advantages are. These days, I think it would make a great deal of sense, on an experimental basis at least in some parts of the province, to ask for proposals for lease-back space, either on a straight lease basis or a lease purchase arrangement. I'm quite impressed by the number of private enterprisers we have in this province who are able to put up leased space for a variety of uses. There's nothing really sacred about school space, wherein a really experienced and intelligent operator couldn't provide it to local school boards. It doesn't even necessarily have to go on a separate school site, Mr. Speaker, and that separate is with a small 's'. It could, perhaps, depending on the characteristics of the neighbourhood, be included in a highrise apartment building. This approach has been used in France for many, many years, since just after World War II, and there are all sorts of exciting approaches one could take if you're willing to look at the concept of leased space, and multi-use space. There's nothing very magic in our system today. As you go through a typical residential neighbourhood you see a Separate School Board building here, a Public School Board building here, a Community Association building here, a fire hall here, a Branch Library here, and you know, you can go on and on down the list of community type buildings.

There has been, I think, a sincere attempt, but with not very much tangible progress to date, in the approach of using community type school buildings. And more and more adults are going back to using the buildings in the evening as the concept of education is expanded, and that makes a great deal of sense.

Mr. Speaker, with our modern technology, with our methods of financing, with the ways of changing the arrangement of space, a school today is nothing more than a warehouse for learning. These modern school structures are really essentially large warehouses, with open spaces, the large spans in the centre, the carpeted floor, the moveable partitions and the simplified mechanical systems. There's really not much difference between their physical structure and that of a large warehouse. So, when we put our minds to the uses that might go on within those buildings, to the ways they might be financed, to where they might be located, and to who might do it, I think it is a tremendously exciting concept. I have no hesitation at all in supporting the role of the provincial government in looking at that kind of approach and reporting back to the Legislature. So I certainly support this motion.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a word or two to the comments that have already been offered on this particular resolution from both sides of the House. And certainly, I think it would be difficult to disagree with practically any of the comments that have been made this afternoon in the debate. One way or another, I think all the propositions that have been put forth have some merit in them. I also find, however, that if one wants to stand up and be critical of this particular resolution, you are automatically on record as opposing the principle involved. And of course, I don't think anyone who sits in this Legislature, or even a party to a local authority, is in favour of trying to find more ways to spend more money in education these days, on school costs and operating costs. But there is a lot of difference of opinion as to how it

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 45

should be achieved. While I certainly support the basic intent of the resolution, trying to find more ways to economize in the field of education, I must confess I have a considerable degree of reservation as to what will be achieved with an undertaking such as this.

My colleague, the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, commented that the government, a very few years back, spent \$100,000 on a consultant's report on the advantages, pros and cons, savings, and so forth, of standardized school design. As he mentioned, the report basically concluded that it just wasn't really very practical. So I hope, regardless of the disposition of this resolution, that before the government rushes out to tender some further consulting studies on it, they will dig back into the files and dust off some of the studies that are already on file on this subject. I have the very strong feeling myself, that the setting up of a centralized purchasing department within the Department of Education to pool construction and operating costs, would add substantially to the bureaucracy within the provincial civil service. What wasn't being spent on maybe slightly higher material purchase prices would be spent on the overhead administrative costs relating to a central purchasing organization. I have to suggest when talking about a system that is as decentralized as the educational system is, that the administrative costs of such an approach would be substantial.

It has also, Mr. Speaker, been my very brief experience that the expenditures in this type of an investment automatically rise in keeping with the funds available. Or if you want to put it the other way around, it's also been my experience, when hiring architects and engineers to do work on a particular project, that you'll get back essentially what you ask for. And if you lay out very broad terms of reference without any rigid stipulations as to limitations on expenditures, you can expect to get back a fairly grand monument.

But it has also been my experience, Mr. Speaker, that if the constraints are properly defined to the people who are doing the design work, to the professional people involved, that they can bring in a plan that will live within the funds available. I recall a personal experience in this regard, and somewhat in keeping with the comments of the hon. Mr. Farran about the experience in Calgary.

In about 1963, just prior to my first election to this Legislature, I was on the school board in the community in which I live. We were building a school under the Foundation Plan. If I recall correctly, the total was about \$13 per sq. ft. at that time. In one of my neighbouring communities, no more than 15 miles away, they were just completing a comparable size plan, and there was an awful to-do over the cost of designing it. The school boards got themselves into quite a tizzy; they couldn't possibly build within the limits of the Foundation Plan. It got to be quite a local political exercise about how cheap the provincial government was in their program, and so on and so forth. It finally ended up, Mr. Speaker, in the school board disappearing and a county system being established. They had two schools under construction; they ran out of money on their appropriation and there were plebiscites coming in against the expenditure of additional funds to finish the school. It led, in effect, to the formation of a county form of government and got rid of the school board.

Mr. Speaker, in actual fact it is difficult to justify that type of an argument, but you can't provide a reasonable structure at a reasonable expense. On the other hand, if you want a Taj Mahal, you can certainly get it. I concur with the statements made by previous speakers, that there is no direct relationship between the expenditure of public funds and the calibre of education. In fact, I have the strong opinion myself, when it comes to the professional people involved in education, that the availability of funds has attracted many mediocre people into the teaching profession, because it looks like something with a soft touch for the rest of their

14- 46

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

lives, you won't get fired and you will have a real easy job. I suspect Mr. Speaker, that the availability of funds has very definitely, in my opinion at least, lowered the standard of education because I think it has tended to attract into the educational field people who aren't particularly highly motivated so far as their contribution to educating children is concerned.

This is, I am sure, a subject on which there will be some differing views and opinions by the members of this House, but none the less, Mr. Speaker, I come back to the basic proposition that the expenditures in all these areas will rise in keeping with the funds available. I think it might be of interest to point out very briefly the experience the Department of Health had regarding standard hospital plans which were used and may still be used, I don't know, to construct some of the smaller hospitals in the province. These were drawn up in consultation with private architectural firms and the Department of Public Works and were used for the construction of hospitals throughout the province in that particular range and that particular size. The only good thing I can say about the standard plan, Mr. Speaker, was that it did provide the government with some guidelines on which to base grants to the local authorities, because we could always say, "Well we will just finish this particular job; we know what it cost, and it was the standard plan; you should be able to build a comparable one for a similar amount of money, and so you can have this amount of money for the build-up of your hospital."

But I must also point out, Mr. Speaker, that the results were never satisfactory in terms of the users, because the medical people in the community weren't satisfied, didn't like the plan, and so forth. There were always challenges from the architectural people involved. The design concepts weren't up to date, and so forth, and I don't know whether the government is still using this standard plan approach when it comes to small hospitals. I think not, because there are very few small hospitals being built in Alberta at this point in time. But certainly the concept of a standard plan would provide a yardstick by which restraints could be placed on the local authority when it came to spending.

But I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, the foundation plan approach of so much per square foot does achieve the same thing in education at this point in time, and if any local authority makes up its mind to build within the money allotted, it can do it.

The basic question, Mr. Speaker, therefore boils down to whether the funds being allocated provincially are adequate to provide a plan which is functional and which is basically safe. And there have to be the main criteria. I quite frankly must confess, completely aside from the basic questions of responsibility, local autonomy, and so forth, in many ways I have more confidence or faith in the common sense of the interested citizens who serve on the school boards throughout the province, and their ability to arrive at intelligent decisions that fit their particular needs, than I do in a group of centralized bureaucrats who are buried down in specifications, codes, safety standards and so on.

To add to the comments of some earlier speakers about some of their ridiculous contradictions in standards, they are very definitely there, Mr. Speaker, and you are faced with continually changing codes. Just about every school that was built, even ten years ago, was built in accordance with the codes that existed at that time. Someone comes along and changes the code and then you are obliged to come along and tear things out and do it over again. Sometimes it even boils down to which side of the fire door the tin sheeting should be on.

But, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that before the government gets too enamoured with how much money they are going to save, they firstly dust off some of the files and find out what has been done in the

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 47

past in this regard and secondly consider all the pitfalls that I think would exist in setting up some form of centralized bureaucracy to supervise the purchasing of materials for construction and operation of schools.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I have far more confidence in a program which makes a reasonable amount of money available, which would provide the wherewithall for the local authority to do a reasonable job, and then leave it up to the good common sense of the citizens involved.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller has moved the adjournment of the debate. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

In view of the time, I will consider the adjournment of the House now until eight o'clock tonight.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:24 pm.]

* * * * *
* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 8:00 p.m.]

BUDGET DEBATE

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I would like to record in respect to the budget delivered last week by my colleague, the hon. Provincial Treasurer, my confidence in that document and my full support for it as presented. Along with that, I would affirm my confidence that it will be well received by the people of Alberta over the coming fiscal year, and will be recognized for the responsible document that it is and a valuable instrument of service to the people of Alberta. I would have to say that I'm particularly pleased with the emphasis in the budget, as of course would be anticipated following the Speech from the Throne, in regard to senior citizens, the handicapped, and mental health.

I would like to join in the congratulations that have been offered to the hon. Provincial Treasurer in bringing down his first budget and in presenting such a fine one. I would also like to remark upon the quality of some of the speeches that have followed the formal introduction of the budget, in particular, that of the Minister of Mines and Minerals, who should be commended for the detail and the clarity of his presentation. Now that remark isn't entirely without some little trace of self interest in it, Mr. Speaker, because I have the feeling that what he brings in through his department, goes out through mine and I just want to keep on the best possible terms with him.

14- 48

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

Mr. Speaker, the imposing figure attached in the estimates to the Department of Health and Social Development is in the neighbourhood of \$393 million. Because of that I think the House would certainly like to have, and would be interested in, an outline of some of the programs that are being maintained from existing programs of the past; some programs that are being expanded, and as well of course, a reasonable statement of the new priorities which are being highlighted by the budget, consequent upon the highlighting of them in the Speech from the Throne, and in particular the financial framework in which these new priorities are to be regarded. In presenting this information I will try to dwell, not so much on criticism of the policies of the recent government, as on the directions for today and for the future.

One of the things, Mr. Speaker, that I have tried to achieve during the preparation of estimates and generally in familiarization with the many tentacles of my department since last fall, has been the question of improved financial control within the department. I am afraid the record shows that over 40% of the amount that had to be requisitioned as a supplement to the budget passed by the last Legislature, is attributable to inefficient estimating by the last government in my department, and that figure stands in excess of \$34 million. To try to overcome this failing in the future, we have from the start, over the last several months begun to increase our expectations of the program directors in the department, with regard to their financial responsibility and accountability; this area was notably without emphasis prior to our taking office, and one would suspect perhaps over rather a long period of time.

Now the means by which I hope to be successful in this connection are these: Firstly, the program directors have been involved in the determination of estimates and priorities, as well as in the reorganization of the appropriations in the department into program groups. We have commenced -- and I think that is the right word -- the practice of priority budgeting, and have attempted to apply our cuts in the estimates on a program by program basis, where the weak points could be identified, selected and cut, rather than by making cuts across the board which, of course, levels the same axe on a good program as it does on a bad one. I do feel that with just that much leadership in the department, the officials, at estimate time responded better than I believe was the situation in the past. As the Provincial Treasurer has said, we will use the budget as an instrument of the management of government programs and the management of the directors of government programs and not, as in the past, when the budgetary procedure appeared to be rather too much of allowing further pudgy growth around a doubtful core of program.

In another very important area, we are trying to achieve increased cost sharing with the federal government. I wonder how many members of the House realize just the significance and the importance of this subject. In particular, I wonder how many of the new members understand just how important this subject is. As I became acquainted with this area of concern in my department, it was a real eye opener. I don't suppose we have achieved all that is to be done there yet, but we are working very hard in the direction of increasing cost sharing with the federal government. With the limited funds available for new developments, these funds are very important indeed. While the fiscal relationship on health costs is being discussed, it is important to utilize the present agreement to the maximum possible extent to ensure that Albertans get their fair share. This refers to the dialogue that is taking place and the change we sense as a future possibility in our relations with the federal government. But while we are still anticipating, it is necessary to get as much sharing as possible under existing arrangements. I am not satisfied that the previous government undertook this responsibility with dedication. It has been found that at least one program not previously shared is shareable under The Canada Assistance Plan, and this relates to the geriatric centres

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 49

at Camrose, Claresholm and Raymond that are shareable to the extent that patients are unable to pay for the cost of their care. I am optimistic that other programs are shareable, and would say that every effort is being made to insist that Albertans receive their full share of these programs. I can certainly say that if successful, we are talking about a saving of several millions of dollars each year for Alberta taxpayers. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that through a meeting of the First Ministers, of the Finance Ministers, or of the Health Ministers further progress can soon be made in regard to a new cost sharing formula relating to the health and social development fields. One of the limiting factors in developing new directions in the health care and changing the existing system is that the federal-provincial formula is itself one of the contributing factors in increased provincial costs. The present formula inhibits the development of alternatives by encouraging excess hospitalization and discouraging community care which is not cost-shareable.

To go on to another point, that of health manpower, yesterday we heard the hon. Leader of the Opposition say that the Department of Health and Social Development was looking to 220 new positions. My count is 213, an increase of 3.4%, but I think the House should have regard to where these new positions are to be used. Without going into all of the detail, 160 of these new positions are going to be used in three areas. The first one, where 33 new positions will be used, is the area of the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission.

At the time that we came to office last fall, that organization was in a crisis condition. It was claimed by the commissioners to be under-budgeted and understaffed, and the statement was made that they had been budgeted on the basis of the old Alcoholism Division, with no capability built into their budget of last year -- the year that just expired. No capability was built in for the handling of the additional problems of drug abuse. Therefore, the 33 new positions that will be going to that commission are to enable them to handle their duties properly in both of their areas of interest, and as well, their budget has been substantially increased. We look forward to a more solid effort in this area than has been possible for the commission in the past.

The other two areas, where the health manpower increases were substantial, both relate to programs for the handicapped. These involve 127 new positions, providing services that were non-existent under the recent government. They are involved in new positions in Edmonton, and the House is very familiar with the run-down I gave a few days ago in regard to the facilities at what was the old Misericordia Hospital in Edmonton, where some 96 positions are involved. The balance of the 127 are involved in Red Deer.

Mr. Speaker, this brings me to a brief summary of programs for the handicapped that will be funded from the special government allocation referred to in the budget for this purpose. First, a new director of services for the handicapped and necessary supporting staff will soon be appointed to ensure the development and implementation of new services for handicapped persons in Alberta and their coordination with existing services. During the next year, primary consideration will be given to mentally retarded children because of their established need for additional service which have not been developed to date. Steps will be taken to arrange for a review of the approximately 600 retarded children reported to be awaiting admission to the Red Deer School Hospital to determine if the extent of their needs has changed, and to explore other alternatives as to their placement.

I think that this sort of initiative, Mr. Speaker, is important. It implies, as I believe to be the case, that no continuing review of the status of the children on this waiting list was being done over the past several years. One will be done now and the exploration of

14- 50

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

other alternatives for their placement appears to have real possibility. One might wonder that it is possible not to have sufficient information on those both on the waiting list and in the institution to permit consideration of whether or not an alternative for each patient might be found outside of the institution. Since the numbers of physically and mentally handicapped persons in the province, where they are located, and what services are best suited to their individual needs, is not known, it is proposed to conduct a survey of the province to obtain the necessary information with which to plan the rational development of services for these handicapped people.

Next, on the basis of present knowledge, and the results of the survey to be undertaken, it is expected that new programs and changes in existing programs will be required as follows. First, an assessment of the unit in Red Deer to prepare residents of the Alberta School Hospital and Deerholm for discharge into community facilities, including a follow-up program. Secondly, an improvement in the staff to residents ratio at the Alberta School Hospital and Deerholm in Red Deer to expand their social and vocational rehabilitation programs. Thirdly, a foster care program for persons discharged from these two institutions in Red Deer, as well as for persons who may benefit from foster care placement as an alternative to placement in an institution. Next, the expansion of the existing community residence program to provide for a group living situation for handicapped persons as an alternative to institutional placement on foster care. And fifthly, the possible establishment of day care centres for handicapped persons in Edmonton and Calgary. If it is possible to establish such centres within the new program, they would have as their main objectives the more adequate preparation of the children for admission to special school facilities, and to assist the parents of the children in providing for their care at home.

Further, in connection with the handicapped, I would like to outline new initiatives in the field of sheltered workshops, which are so important in providing useful activities for mature handicapped people to the extent of their abilities. Currently, there are seven sheltered workshops in Alberta, plus three others in the planning stage serving the handicapped, both physical and mental. In the past, no policy was established by the Alberta government to assist and provide direction to this important service. Sheltered workshops are considered by the government an essential service program within a community as part of the total delivery of health and social development services. Our objective is to enable handicapped persons to function to the best of their ability within their community. A six-point program which will be the first organized in Alberta in this field, has been drawn up. In connection with developing a formula for providing capital and operating funds to agencies that would operate sheltered workshops, the House should be aware that sheltered workshops, when they are normally developed, are the result of a private association or society getting together with this commendable motive in mind, undertaking certain programs that would be of assistance to the handicapped, and then seeking from the government as much assistance as they may require to make their operation viable. Now the assistance that can be looked forward to from the government in the future will be as follows.

First, a capital cost grant for new workshops or the expansion of existing workshops to accommodate additional clients will be calculated according to the number of persons to be accommodated.

Secondly, as to the above grant, the total would be \$900 per client for land, buildings, equipment and furnishings. This represents about 50 per cent of the minimum cost of establishing a sheltered workshop. The remaining 50 per cent would be the responsibility of the sponsoring body and would stand as an indication of community support.

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 51

Thirdly, where an association or agency is renting space for a sheltered workshop, a yearly grant of 50 per cent of the annual rental cost may be made in lieu of a capital grant.

Fourthly, the amount of the operating cost grant will be established on the basis of \$3.00 per day, times the number of spaces available in the workshop, based on 240 attendance days per year. Where spaces are available for only a portion of the year the grant would be calculated as \$3.00 per day times the number of days available times the number of spaces.

The fifth item in the program is that the operating grant will be made for a 12 month period covering the period of the government fiscal year - April 1st - March 31st.

Lastly, the cost of material, client wages, and equipment or renovations would be offset by revenue from the sale of products manufactured by the clients in the work shop, and expenditures from these items and revenues from this source would not be considered in calculating the operating grant. In order that a firm financial footing can be planned by the department for the coming fiscal year, we will be asking agencies and organizations to have budgets and submissions prepared and submitted by September of each year for the following fiscal year.

For the purposes of the coming fiscal year and the present budget, the current funds that will be allocated to support these critically important services have been based on estimated known requirements according to the expression of interest in sheltered workshops received by the government from different communities. Additional financial support could be made available on a selective basis if the demand were greater and if sufficient funds were available.

In summary, I am proposing that operating grants totalling approximately \$90,000 for existing workshops, will be allocated. In addition, approximately \$200,000 in operating funds will be provided for newly established workshops and approximately \$100,000 for capital costs.

It will be seen that when the matching funds from the private sector are taken together with the funds available from the provincial grant initiative, a substantial fund will be created for the development of sheltered workshops.

Mr. Speaker, moving on to mental health - much has been said and will be said in regard to the Blair Report. The priority recommendations are well known, but I would like to summarize some of them. First, one of the priorities listed was the development of a new organizational and administrative structure for health services in the province. One that I referred to at the time of the Throne Speech Debate was the introduction of an active program of recruitment and training of mental health professionals at realistic pay scales. Next, the coordination of community facilities related to mental health. Next, the intergration of health units and clinics and possibly welfare units on a regional basis. This is a substantial challenge and would not be free from difficulty. One that I have just touched on in regard to handicapped people to some extent is the improvement of standards, facilities and services in connection with the treatment and care whether the handicapped person be emotionally disturbed or otherwise handicapped. The \$1.2 million special fund provided for in the budget will be used for seed money to begin and redevelop the sagging and unimaginative mental health program.

My review of the developments since the Blair Report of April 1969, showed little program development had taken place. Not much significant leadership had been undertaken and no usable planning had

14- 52

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

been commenced. The reorganization of Alberta's mental health services can be commenced simultaneously in several areas and I will deal with some of them.

First, under delivery of service, our planning is placing emphasis on the development of community based comprehensive services. Such cost effective proposals as day, night, and weekend services, follow-up clinics, drop-in centres, domiciliary care and emergency services are receiving attention. Special emphasis will be placed on the urgent need to expand greatly the foster home care program. Foster parents will be appropriately remunerated and will receive training in the necessary support services. Two basic principles must be accepted in order to ensure an improved service. Decentralization is the first of these. Each area of the province has its own special problems in its own different stage of development. No overall plan will apply easily to all regions, yet services must be developed without duplication. Special attention will be paid to the development of services in Alberta cities, and the plans can soon be forecast for travelling clinics to provide a more equitable distribution of mental health services in rural Alberta.

The second basic principal is that of community participation. With the cooperation of the Alberta Mental Health Association, it is hoped that local communities will be organized so that each has a mental health organization which will support and assist travelling clinics. Existing service delivery systems such as the Public Health Service and the Alberta Guidance Clinics will be used in early detection follow up and in information gathering.

Next, in respect to manpower, existing programs aimed at training nursing staff social workers, psychologists, and other mental health workers are not adequate for the development of new community health programs. Brief training and orientation programs will be instituted as soon as possible to provide necessary information to registered psychiatric nurses, public health nurses, general nurses, social workers, psychologists, and physicians. The government plans the appointment of a Director of Education who would be concerned with the education and re-education of mental health workers.

In respect to the existing institutions, the Alberta Hospital at Edmonton will develop its long term and remand forensic functions, and will continue to look after long term psychiatric patients and maintain an acute function to relieve city hospitals. Consideration will be given to transferring geriatric areas to the Hospital Services Commission. An intensive behaviour modification unit will be developed.

In respect to Ponoka, I made some remarks about that in the Throne Speech debate, and an effort will be made to develop a further rehabilitative program at the Alberta Hospital, Ponoka.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have dealt in moderate detail with two or three very important areas and in closing in just a few minutes, I want to make passing reference to the question of hospitalization. I mentioned earlier that my department was well represented (to the extent of over \$34 million) in the supplemental estimates that had to be passed as a result of estimates that were carelessly, or at least inaccurately, made last year. An attempt is being made now in the hospital area to rationalize this sort of explosive budgeting, which we indeed had some difficulty and some concern in trying to bring under control in regard to the Hospital Services Commission during the last several months. Just to draw the figures to the attention of the House in brief summary; in 1970-1971, the actual cost of the services that are now provided by the Hospital Services Commission, including nursing homes, amounted to \$188 million. The recent government budgeted for an increase to \$195 million in 1971-1972, the

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 53

current fiscal year, and therefore proposed a modest increase of about \$7 million or about 4 per cent. In fact, compared to the figure of \$188 million for what will be the base year of 1971, \$24 million; this was not an increase of approximately 4% as budgeted for, but an increase of some 13 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose that this relates to the difficulty that one has in estimating programs which admittedly some people across the country have said are out of control. I think a much better job could have been done than what is painted by the figures I have just been obliged to recite.

I am aware that the rate of increase in these costs per year has averaged 14% in each of the last five years in Alberta. For the next fiscal year, in respect to the present budget of 1972-73, we are budgeting for a conservative 11 per cent increase and if successful, Mr. Speaker, this will represent -- and I think this is very important, and conclude in making this remark -- if we are successful in sticking to the 11 per cent increase that we are budgeting for, it will represent the first downward pressure on the inflationary trend in hospital costs within recent memory.

Thank you.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the budget debate, allow me at the outset, Sir, to congratulate you on being elected as Speaker of this Assembly. Certainly to date, Sir, your handling of the affairs of this Assembly have been of the finest order.

Secondly, I'd like to congratulate the hon. Provincial Treasurer. I would have to say to the hon. gentleman that I'm not quite prepared to go as far as some of his colleagues are in making all those very flattering statements, but I think that the Treasurer has made a reasonable start. I would like to reserve my final decision until such time as we're through the budget debate and through the estimates, and perhaps by that time we'll have a better indication of whether the Provincial Treasurer is going to have more hair or less hair. And that may be one of the approaches we might use in assessing the Provincial Treasurer. But on a serious note, Sir, I think that the least one can say is that you've made a start.

I'd be remiss if I didn't say that I find considerable satisfaction in the government's move in removing the 30 mills as far as the education tax is concerned from senior citizens. I am disappointed that to date there is no indication of some sort of a limit on this, and I am rather hopeful that the government will rethink its position in that area.

As far as the \$50 for those people who are renting accommodations, I have some real concern that this \$50, which comes to something like \$1 a week, and a considerable amount more, if one wants to be cynical about this, may quite possibly be picked up by some slum landlords or tenant owners in the course of the year that lies ahead.

I would say to the hon. Minister of Education that I'm particularly pleased to see the million dollars in the field of handicapped programs. I would further say, and I think perhaps this could go to the hon. minister responsible for the Health Care Commission, that an area that she might very seriously look at, in the course of her review of the operation of the Alberta Health Care and the government's stated priorities in the field of senior citizens, are those people who are over 65 years of age, who for good medical reasons have to be in a private ward in a nursing home because of their condition. I know of some people who have gone through this; it costs them as an individual something like \$8 a day.

14- 54

ALEERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

And it doesn't take them very long to eat up that \$50. I would suggest to the hon. minister responsible and to all members of the Assembly, that perhaps this is one of the most glaring inequities that we have in the Alberta Health Program as it stands at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, there are perhaps two matters that relate to my constituency that I would like to dwell upon for just a moment or two. First is the question of power transmission towers. I'm sure some of the hon. members are familiar with these. These are the large, usually steel towers that are placed on farm land. These towers generally sit alone, or two beside each other, two or three sets to the quarter section. It is true that farmers are paid a rather sizeable amount, at least in some people's view, for the initial acquisition of the land for these towers. But some of us in central Alberta now have the distinction of not having just one transmission line going through our property, but in fact two transmission lines. The right of way in itself takes up in excess of five acres. Secondly, might I say that it doesn't take very long for the farmer involved, when he's going around these transmission towers, to forget about the money he received or his father received, or the person from whom he acquired the land, received. It doesn't take very long for that money to be eaten up with problems involved in farming around these towers.

Now I know it's likely a reasonable question for members opposite to say, well, why didn't you do something about this in the past few years? The Minister of Highways, in perhaps a more serious moment, would likely concede that in the course of the last year there was some work done on this. My purpose in raising this in the Legislature is to say that there has been some work done on this, but not as much as I personally would like there to have been, and I trust in the course of some of the new thrusts and some of the new directions that this won't get lost in a number of other things.

The second matter that I'd like to touch upon for just a moment or two, dealing with my own constituency, (and it didn't affect only my constituency, but several others in that area as well) was a teacher's strike which developed in the Bow Valley region. I don't plan to become involved, Mr. Speaker, in the pros and cons of who was right and who was wrong, but I raise this issue, to indicate what a difference a year makes, not just where members sit in the Assembly, but also in the way that individuals and members respond to responsibility.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, in the last session of this Assembly, approximately one year ago, when there was a strike in Calgary. If my memory serves me correctly, during the second or the third day of that strike, the gentleman who was the Leader of the Opposition and who is the 'now' Premier of the province, during a question period asked the Premier, and I believe also the Minister of Labour, how long it would be before we could expect the Minister of Labour to become personally involved in doing something to settle that strike in Calgary. It isn't important that the Minister of Labour indicated that in due course he would become involved if the matter wasn't settled shortly. It is important though, Mr. Speaker, to point out to the members of the Assembly, that the government at that time said to the trustees and to the teachers in Calgary, if this situation isn't cleared up within a reasonable period of time - I think the reasonable period of time was six or seven days - the minister and the government would become very directly involved. Now I go back to the question asked by the 'now' Premier when he urged the Minister of Labour to become directly involved in this strike in Calgary.

It was for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I asked for Return 116. The questions on that Return were concerning the Bow Valley School Authority Association and the teachers involved in that area of the strike. I asked for the dates during which the Board of

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 55

Industrial Relations was involved in trying to resolve this strike, a strike, I should add, that had the unfortunate distinction of being one of the longest this province has seen. There were 12 meetings held between officials of the Board of Industrial Relations and the people involved teachers and trustees. But the significant factor, Mr. Speaker, is that the Deputy Minister of Labour was not involved in any meetings at all, and the answer I got when I asked in how many meetings the Minister of Labour was involved, and I quote from Return 116: "No meetings with the Minister of Labour".

I cite this, Mr. Speaker, to indicate what a difference a year makes, and what a difference responsibility thrusts upon individuals. As I say, later on in this Assembly, in the course of estimates, I plan to raise this matter once again. Certainly, people in that area of the province were disappointed, to say the least, that neither the Minister of Labour nor the Deputy Minister of Labour found that they could contribute to solving this situation in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move on to a matter of, I think, some public concern in the province. This is the matter of the hon. gentlemen, or at least some of the hon. gentlemen in the front bench across the way. I think that it has become obvious now, Mr. Speaker, to most members of the Assembly that on occasions it will become the responsibility of all members to remind the members opposite, that they are now involved in proposing solutions, and proposing 'where do we go from here.' I sometimes enjoy the question period more than others, especially when it appears that some of the hon. members forget that in the course of the last year there's been a change of positions. And so, Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to offer my services from time to time to remind certain of the hon. members opposite that their responsibility is to propose not to oppose.

And while I'm handing out advice, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I might hand out just a bit of advice to the hon. Premier in saying that, Mr. Premier, on occasions I see your government as being very similar to a large corporation composed of a president, and four or five vice-presidents, and several branch heads. I say to you, Mr. Premier, with greatest sincerity, this may be a reasonable, logical approach to a large commercial operation, but I don't think it's the approach that's going to set Alberta on fire during the 1970's.

I would now, Mr. Speaker, like to make some comments with regard to the budget, and to that area related directly to the municipalities in the province. We had an opportunity this afternoon to rehash and to relive and to rekindle some of the flames that were developed last year, but I do think that it's appropriate to go back and rehash this question of the assistance to municipalities. Mr. Farran, the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, has already indicated in this Legislature how upset the municipalities were. I would give him, and as I indicated this afternoon, that good Conservative, John Kushner, considerable credit for much of what went on that particular day. At the same time I would remind the hon. members of the Assembly, especially the new members of the Assembly, that you might find rather interesting reading the debate that went on in the Legislature last year.

While I don't propose to read the debate back to the hon. members, I think you'd find interesting the comments made by Mr. Russell, the 'now' Minister of Municipal Affairs, when he talked in terms of the real necessity for holding a public hearing; I think you'd find interesting the comments made by the 'now' Minister of Agriculture and Deputy Premier when he said that the government's decision not to increase the royalty payment to municipalities in accordance with the one-third principle was a catastrophe for rural Alberta, Mr. Speaker. I say, if it was a catastrophe last year, what is it this year? And then I am reminded of the 'now' Premier's

14- 56

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

comments, when he cited from a publication entitled, I believe, "Where Do We Stand?" I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that members on the other side of the House are perhaps more familiar with the publication than those of us on this side. Reference was made to principle 2 in "Where Do We Stand?", or perhaps I should more properly say, where do they stand? Perhaps the salient portion of principle no. 2, or plank 2 or slither 2, talks about municipal government in the province. The principal element of the second plank, shall we say, is that municipalities should have adequate financial resources made available to them so that, they can live with the responsibilities that their Legislature proposes to them.

Now, I say, Mr. Speaker, that for a group who carried on the way they did last year on the question of the ceiling on the unconditional grant, and then, too, in the Budget Speech, Mr. Speaker, made a plea to the municipalities at this time to help the 'now' government in its fights with the federal government, so that in fact we will have more resources in Alberta as a result of convincing the federal government to change its position, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it's a strange approach. Last year the 'now' government gave the impression that they would live with the one-third portion of the royalties. This year, Mr. Speaker, if my calculations are correct, the royalties are \$174 million. I think a number of the municipalities expected to get one-third of those royalties, Mr. Speaker, which would have been something like \$58 million, quite some distance from the \$42 million which is in the budget. And my goodness, think of the line the Provincial Treasurer could have put in the budget. Here he talks in terms of a 10 per cent increase in those payments. You could have made quite a line, had you chosen to live with the directions or live with the thrusts that municipalities certainly got the impression you supported last year when the matter of the ceiling on oil royalties was being discussed.

Mr. Speaker, it was with considerable interest, in looking at the oil royalties and then hearing the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals speak, that once again we heard comments about the hearings which will be coming up. And I'd be less than fair if I didn't say that I congratulate the government in holding these public hearings.

But, I do think, Mr. Speaker, that there would be some merit in the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals giving serious consideration to having the Energy Conservation Board, or whatever officials he would deem appropriate, come before the committee at the very outset of the hearings to give us their views on what they feel is the life of the hydrocarbon industry in this province and also in Canada. It may be that we should go further afield than just getting the Energy Conservation Board to do this. But it does seem, Mr. Speaker, that before hon. members of the Assembly can make a valid judgment on what these royalties should be, the life of the petroleum industry and the various points of view there should be among the first things the members of this Assembly should have presented before them, before we become involved in some more of the nitty-gritty.

I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that I will await with considerable interest the government's Position Paper on the royalty question, because I think one of the important points in that paper will be the indication as to whether the government plans to set the royalties at this time for another ten years, and also whether the government plans any other changes in the field of revenue from the petroleum industry.

Mr. Speaker, moving on, might I say that before the Provincial Treasurer had got very far into the Budget, and soon after I became a little bit familiar with the change of the format, I took the estimate of expenditures and turned to Appropriation 1226. The reason I turned to Appropriation 1226, Mr. Speaker, is that it would seem to me that this is the area where we would have a considerable

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 57

emphasis, or find considerable support for the government's emphasis on the Bill of Rights. Because Appropriation 1226 in its description says, and I quote: "Provides for payment through the Law Society of Alberta of fees and expenses of solicitors appointed under the Legal Aid plan, and appointed by the Court to defend accused persons."

I go back and I think in terms of the Bill of Rights, which was introduced early in this session, and the priority that the government has indicated that it would have; and I should say that I am in favour of the Bill of Rights, Mr. Speaker, but I have to say there's no guarantee in that bill of any minimal level of existence. There is no guarantee of any rights enumerated in that bill, Mr. Speaker; there is no guarantee that individuals in this province can be guaranteed of the rights set out in the bill unless a person can afford to make use of them himself or herself.

It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I looked at Appropriation 1226 because that's where I hoped to find a pretty significant increase because this, I felt, would be the area or the mechanism the government would use to really make that Bill of Rights a real, live part of the 1970's in Alberta.

I am disappointed that we won't have an opportunity to have all the presentations made to the Legislature. I am a little cautious, Mr. Speaker, to become involved in the next comment that I would like to make about The Bill of Rights. There is a term used in The Bill of Rights, 'due process of law.' I am certainly no student of law, but I would suggest that to those who are, that you might well look at some of the problems that this terminology itself has caused south of the border. I am told, and I have done a little reading on it, that the precedents here in Canada are limited in this particular area. I would expect, Mr. Speaker, that if the government is as sincere with regards to The Bill of Rights as it says it is, the Premier may well seriously consider suggesting to one of the conferences of the First Ministers that The Bill of Rights, as is proposed here, should become a part of a constitutional consideration, and become involved in the question of entrenchment of certain of these rights as far as Canada's future constitution is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I go on now from the government's emphasis on the Bill of Rights, and my regret that there isn't a sizeable increase in the legal aid program in this province. I continue, Mr. Speaker, with a rather fresh memory of the 1968 session of the Legislature, when the 'now' Premier quoted rather extensively from the report of the Economic Council of Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, I can't say it nearly as well as he did. He was able to put his hand in his front pocket and say, "You know, Mr. Speaker, things aren't quite so good in good old Alberta." So perhaps as a result of that we became readers of the Economic Council of Canada.

At a period of time when the government is giving priority to The Bill of Rights, I think it is appropriate that we look at the Economic Council of Canada and its 8th Annual Report. The Economic Council of Canada has given the whole report the theme of design for decision-making and application to human resources policies. In the course of the Economic Council of Canada's report, in the third chapter, it talks in terms of a review of new decision-making approaches. It just so happens that on page 26 of this, and I quote:

"In Canada, there has been as yet no major or large-scale collection, evaluation, and publication of social statistics. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics has several committees involved in preparation work in a number of areas. In Alberta, the Human Resources Research Council is working on a report on social trends in that province, using a number of commissioned research papers on health, education, and other subjects."

14- 58

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

So, Mr. Speaker, seeing the Economic Council of Canada's concern in this area and the fact that it is citing the Human Resources Research Council, I think for the benefit of members we should go back and say that the Research Council was established in '68; the objectives of the Council were to become involved in research in the fields of education, social and economic problems in related areas, certainly centring around human resource development and human resource emphasis. The council has attacked social problems in six major areas, Mr. Speaker, the areas of urbanization, education, social economic opportunity, human behavior, studies of the future, and social audit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate that we look at at least the last of these six areas. It was, in fact, the social audit which the Economic Council of Canada was commenting about in looking at the Alberta Human Resources Research Council. Members are well aware that earlier this year the government announced they would be phasing out the Human Resources Research Council in Alberta. I think the two major reasons given in the press report that I saw, Mr. Speaker, was that the Human Resources Research Council was duplicating the work of the Commission on Educational Planning, and secondly, that \$750,000 was being spent on the Human Resources Research Council. Doggone it, Mr. Speaker, if we are really interested in a Bill of Rights, if we are really interested in the problems of people, it would seem to me that an expenditure of even \$750,000 in attempting to assess how we are doing in coming to grips with the problems of these kinds of people wouldn't be an unreasonable thing to expect.

But you see, Mr. Speaker, I don't have to defend the Human Resources Research Council, because over a period of time it has had some pretty good defenders. I refer to 1966, when the Alberta Federation of Home and School Associations petitioned the Alberta government, asking for the establishment of an institution of educational research, and at approximately the same time, Harold Gunderson, who is now president of the Alberta School Trustees' Association, writing for an afternoon newspaper in that great city in the south, quoted a gentleman as saying: "The government's decision to abandon a research centre (in that year - 1966) is a potential tragedy." The man who made that statement, Mr. Speaker, is the 'now' Premier of this province.

And then on May 10, 1967, in the Calgary Herald, there was a headline something like, "Raps the Government of the Day for its Tardiness in Establishing an Independent Institute of Educational Research." That person was none other than the present Minister of Telephones and Utilities in the Conservative government.

Then in a position paper on education, recommendations for a future Conservative government policy -- and the future is here, Mr. Speaker -- "That educational research studies be conducted through the Human Resources Research Council with more emphasis on the co-ordination of projects and the dissemination of results to those who may use the results." And the individual who made that presentation to a Conservative convention -- policies for future Conservative government -- was the very delightful and charming member of the Legislature for Calgary McKnight.

As so, Mr. Speaker, with such gentlemen defending the Research Council and supporting the concept, I find myself in a position of saying that I don't feel I should really have to defend it. Yet we come back to the emphasis which the government had placed on Human Rights, Mr. Speaker. We come back to the slogan which was used last year -- "People Before Party." And then we pick up this booklet which, if members haven't seen it, I would encourage them to have a look at; it is entitled "Alberta '71 Towards a Social Audit." It's the publication of the Alberta Human Resources Research Council, and it's this social audit, Mr. Speaker, that the Economic Council of

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 59

Canada indicated we were pioneering here in Alberta in a manner that had not been done in any other area in Canada.

I would like to quote to the hon. members a portion of the foreword in this "Alberta '71 Towards a Social Audit":

"The year 1971 has proved to be a timely selection for this preliminary, baseline report on the quality of life in Alberta. For the report attempts to take stock of the human condition, to add up the social balance sheets as it were, and thereby, to establish a bench mark against which to measure future progress or retrogression."

What time would be more appropriate for the establishment of such a bench mark than the year of the changing of the government? It just seems, Mr. Speaker, that this is a logical time that the new government would want bench marks established, against which it could show its progress. And done by an organization at arms length from the government. Statements have been made by some people in the government that the research is going to be done within the various government departments, perhaps even by caucus committees and task forces.

But seriously, Mr. Speaker, if the research is going to be carried on within governmental departments, we are going to get the kind of research that the Minister of Labour is going to get when he asks for research on the priority training program. We've heard the Minister of Labour say: "It's a heck of a good program, and it's working well." Now what Civil Servant in his department is going to give him a report saying anything else?

Mr. Speaker, if this is going to be the quality of social research we are going to have in Alberta, then, by gosh, we are in for some pretty serious times ahead.

I have indicated to you, Mr. Speaker, that I don't feel that it is my responsibility to defend the Research Council, but I do see, Mr. Speaker, it being my responsibility and hopefully the responsibility of all other members of the Assembly to look after the plight of the rural poor and the urban poor and the sick and the handicapped, and those folks with housing problems, and people with economic problems and health concerns - these people, Mr. Speaker, to whom the Social Audit was pointing and saying, "These are areas where we are weak in Alberta."

And by gosh, Mr. Speaker, the new government would have had four years to show up these areas and go across the province as I know one or two of them on occasion like to do, and say, "This is the progress we've made over the past number of years." But nobody is going to believe them, going across the province in four years time and saying, "This is the progress we've made because people in our department have researched and say, 'This is the way it is.'"

Mr. Speaker, I get the rather distinct feeling with regard to the Human Resources Research Council and also as far as human resource programs in this province are concerned, that the 'now' government has decided upon an approach of really slowing down, gradually tearing these programs apart. And then in a year or two, or perhaps three years down the row, we will want to re-invent the wheel, and we will have lost the momentum that has been gathered. Certainly the Research Council, certainly the human resources programs have had problems. But whenever you're going to pioneer in new areas you're going to have problems, and when in two or three years, as I predict, the new government or the 'now' government re-invent the wheel and we become involved with human resources programs or some other term like this. There will be a great fan-fare across the province and we'll become really involved in educational research and we'll become really involved in research in health, we may even

14- 60

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

have a White Paper or several of them. And we'll go back through this all again and we'll have lost four or six years. The people who are the real losers are the folks who can't speak for themselves in this province, the folks who aren't as well organized and perhaps as vocal as the members of this Assembly.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I see the government's action in the area of the Bill of Rights being some of that style my hon. colleague to my right referred to earlier. I would not have said that, Mr. Speaker, had we found in the estimates that the appropriation for the legal aid program had been doubled. I would have stood in my place and said, "Yes, I think the government means what it says." But there is no indication of that at this time.

As far as the Human Resources Research Council is concerned and the hacking, generally, of the human resources programs, I think we might term their action in this area as an example of meat-axe Conservatism. I was rather intrigued by the comments of the hon. Minister of Health tonight, when he talked in terms of the government using the budget as a means of establishing government priorities. That may well be so, Mr. Speaker, but I see the way this government, the 'now' government, have handled the Human Resources Research Council program, and I see their dollar commitment to making the Bill of Rights something really alive in this province. I see those as being shallow and not sincere, and I am disappointed, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature Assembly, as this is my first opportunity to address this House, Mr. Speaker, may I echo the words of congratulation that have been showered upon you by all members of this Assembly on the basis of your exalted position in this House. I must say that your appointment to the position that you have at the present time disappointed me somewhat because we're going to miss you on this side of the House. We're going to miss your rapid fire debate, your cool judgment, and I know you would have considerably added to the debate had you had the opportunity to sit here with the rest of us. However, our loss is the gain of this House I am sure, and we look forward to future experiences of your quick and subtle wit, as we have seen already so many times in your few days in this Assembly.

Also as a new member, I would like to thank the members of the Calgary Buffalo constituency who honoured me by allowing me to represent them here today. Although I must confess as a new that for my first two months as an MLA I thought the only problems and priorities that existed in this province related to alcohol, wine and spirits, for if one were to judge by the correspondence, petitions, and phone calls that I was receiving during these first two months, one would think that all the people were thinking about in this province were things of an alcoholic nature.

Friends have said to me, it was an admirable appointment, Ghitter, for you to be the chairman of this investigating committee due to your long time propensity to alcohol. But I deny that readily, and I must confess that the challenge is indeed interesting.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, at the outset in looking at the budget, that I wish to congratulate both the hon. Premier, and the hon. Provincial Treasurer, for what I regard to be a very clear document, one that I as a non-accountant can clearly follow, and one which I think is indeed an improvement over the documents that we have seen in the past. And in this regard, I wish to congratulate them, for it has certainly been a great assistance to me in my endeavour to determine what the budget is providing for in the ensuing year.

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 61

May I also suggest, at the outset, to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, that we understand the pressure upon government today can best be seen in the examination of a budget. Some have suggested that a budget is a method of weeping before you spend, instead of afterwards, and possibly the opposition would suggest that the budget is a mathematical conformation of their suspicions. Realistically, all members, I am sure, are well aware of the provisions, and the requirements, and the pressures upon the public purse in areas of health care, education, pollution control, maintaining satisfactory levels of employment, achieving reasonable law enforcement, and stimulating our agricultural base.

Realistically all members are indeed aware of the fact that the traditional sources of revenue in the province of Alberta are indeed diminishing in some areas. And realistically we are all aware of the economic problems of the Province of Alberta, that deal in terms of inflation, spiralling costs, unemployment, and the cost of government. And over and above all of these budgetary policy difficulties that we seem to experience in the Province of Alberta, are added the fluctuating and unilateral actions of the federal government, who fail to understand, in my opinion, the needs and aspirations of the citizens of the Province of Alberta in our financial programs. For as our hon. Premier stated at the First Ministers' Conference in November of last year, in reference to the federal-provincial cost sharing agreements, and I quote:

"In Alberta you have now (the you being the federal government) placed us in the position that under the present agreements 40 per cent of our direct provincial budget is tied into federal-provincial shared cost programs. This imposes a totally unacceptable degree of rigidity on our fiscal planning. It inhibits to a considerable extent our establishing new priorities in accordance with the mandate we recently received, and it restricts our ability to determine between competing demands for other provincial services."

Our Premier went on to add later in his address his concern over the unfair and inequitable new federal tax measures with respect to our tax revenues arising from the use of non-recurring wasting provincially owned assets, and the provisions which create disincentives to maintaining the family farm in Alberta and to developing Alberta's resource industries with Canadian funds.

Mr. Provincial Treasurer, the easy answer to all of these problems and the pressures which are upon your treasury, I would imagine, would be through the creation of new taxes, be they hidden or otherwise. The temptation for governments in this day and age to increase taxes is indeed a great one. So I compliment the hon. Provincial Treasurer in availing this temptation and in setting his priorities on a straight course which does not require the advent of additional taxes at the present time and which should not, in my view, be levied upon Albertans.

The answer to our financial dilemma must come from clearly defined management and planning by government, as is recommended by the Economic Council of Canada, in their 6th annual review looking at prospects to 1975. The answer must come with federal and provincial governments, continuing expert joint studies of national goals and priorities that would set out costs and manpower requirements for attaining specified objectives.

I am pleased to note, Mr. Treasurer, that in your view, the improving economic conditions in the latter part of 1971 will continue, and your expression of reasonable optimism regarding 1972. However, may I caution you that the pressures on our everexpanding social services which were so admirably expressed by the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development this evening, will require you to be firm in steering the provincial ship into the hazardous

14- 62

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

waters of the demands that will be placed upon you, due to the worrisome attitude which seems to prevail in our society today, that the ultimate responsibility lies with the government and not with the individual himself.

I am indeed concerned over the extensive growth of government, resulting in lack of human incentives, withdrawal of individual enterprise, and new levels of mediocrity which seem to be creeping in. The challenge of government today should not be what government can do directly to benefit people by the giving and issuance of cheques, but the challenge must be what we as a government can do indirectly to assist our citizens in helping themselves to become able, independent, enterprising citizens.

This challenge is faced by all of us, Mr. Treasurer, more particularly by the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development whose ever increasing budget dismays me. It does not dismay me from the point of view of the assistance that is required for public and mental health services. It does not dismay me for programs for the handicapped, but it dismays me when I look upon our welfare programs that are designed more to destroy than to create, more to enslave than to free, and more to deteriorate public initiative than to encourage it. An awesome task, Mr. Minister, but a task we must all face, is that of moving our Albertans from these welfare roles and get them back onto the payrolls. And if we can but slow down this awesome trend towards socialization in our next four years, we will have indeed created an accomplishment of which all Albertans can be proud.

Mr. Premier, I am proud to be a member of a government that is implementing budgetary programs to assist Albertans who are in need, not as a result of their own doing, but as a result of misfortune, of mental and physical incapacities and age. During the past election those of us on the government side said that a Progressive Conservative government, if elected, would do a number of things. How well I know this pamphlet referred to as "Alberta in the '70's" which talked in terms of the problems of our senior citizens. And how often I discussed this document with senior citizens during the past election campaign. And how proud I am that many of the directions for the '70's that are contained in this document were followed by this government immediately upon coming into office.

We said in this document that we would remove the education portion of municipal property taxes payable by senior citizens, and we have done this. We assured senior citizens that we would do our utmost to recognize their plight as individuals who had pressures upon them as renters, and we have endeavoured, albeit in a small way, to accomplish this program. We have said that we would be conscious of the problems of senior citizens, and anyone who was with the hon. members and myself at lunch today with the senior citizens from Calgary, from the Golden Age Club, would recognize how well they are responding to our approaches, which are somewhat meagre, I agree, and our concern for their position.

May I suggest, hon. Premier, that never in my view has a government responded so quickly to honour its election commitments, and although we have indeed many more commitments to meet, I am confident that with this courageous start we will carry forward and that we will complete them.

I am very disappointed however, over what I regard to be the shallow, ill-prepared comments of the members of the Opposition with respect to this budget. Quite candidly, I am uneasy and indeed disappointed over the apparent lack of desire on the part of the members of the Opposition generally to fulfill their vital role in this Assembly. As a new member of this House, I was of the view that the considerable government experience sitting on the other side of this House would offer constructive, well documented, well prepared,

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 63

highly considered viewpoints, which would assist this government in meeting the needs of all Albertans. Instead, all that we have seen is a Leader of the loyal Opposition who spends more time out of the House than within it. All that we have seen in the last 14 days, in my humble opinion, has been a spiritless, poorly coordinated, ill prepared Opposition that apparently merely asks questions for the sake of asking questions, and debates from time to time from the top of their heads with little preparation and little recognition of the vital need that the Opposition must fulfill in any Legislative process.

Is the white hanky for me?

I can only look back to an example last evening, as we sat here on the first night of the debate on that vital document, the budget. When the turn of the members of the loyal opposition came to rise, they did not even have a speaker available, until the hon. member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest remembered to read from Bruce Hutchinson for five minutes to overcome their situation. This is not to me well prepared opposition and may I say sincerely, in a totally non-partisan manner, that the members of the loyal opposition would be doing extreme disservice to all Albertans if they fail to recognize the importance of the position of an opposition in the democratic process.

It is time that our question period, instead of becoming a dull, boring, shallow debate, progressed to a depth-penetrating examination of the various ministers' portfolios. When I think that the members of our front bench here tonight during the last 14 days have not yet been brought to task or even disturbed or even quivered or even raised a sweat on their forehead, I can't believe it. Possibly, we should loan the loyal opposition 26 members for a day or so to illustrate to them the manner in which the responsibility of the opposition should be carried out, and to ensure that government policies are properly scrutinized and properly debated, and to ensure that the ministers in each and every department who sit in the front row today will have to stand forward and explain their department and their positions. I sincerely hope that the members of the other side take a more serious attitude to their vital roles in the proceedings in this Assembly. For if you fail, in your complacency, the danger of government complacency becomes more real, and this must not happen.

With respect to the position of the hon. Leader of the Loyal Opposition in matters relating to the debate on the budget, I am not particularly surprised by the lack of understanding by the leader of the Social Credit party as to the nature of the budget, for Social Credit economic policies were never particularly noted by economists for their enlightenment, be it the A plus B theorem of Douglas or present day Social Credit economic theories.

I listened with great care to the comments of the hon. Leader of the Loyal Opposition during the debate and it would seem to me from his comments in this House, and outside of this House, that his basic opposition to our budget is contained in his suggestions that we have plunged the province into debt and we have mortgaged the future generation of all Albertans. I am pleased to see that the other non-economic members of the loyal opposition agree with that absurd position. Never, the hon. Leader of the Loyal Opposition states, have his expectations been higher, and never have they dropped to such a new low. This, indeed, is quite a statement considering the expectations that the hon. Leader of the Loyal Opposition must have had prior to August 30, 1971, and the new low that must have overtaken him following that date. Possibly, if I may suggest to the hon. Leader of the Loyal Opposition some very, very basic economic principles, his disappointment will not be quite as acute as that stated in the House last evening.

14- 64

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

It would be trite to suggest that modern economics is no longer based on the matter of the balance of government accounts as a rule of thumb, but that modern economics accepts the premise that the budget is an integral part of the province's business, influenced by and having an influence upon the state of employment, income and prices. It is, therefore, the obligation of government to pursue price and wage policies aimed at maintaining a stable high employment economy with as little inflation as possible. I need only quote from a fundamental book on economics utilized in every university across this land which states:

"There is no need to balance the budget or try to balance it in every year in a growing economy. Prudent policy does not even require that the budget be balanced over a decade or even over a complete business cycle as long as continuous deficits do not result in the public debt growing faster than gross national product grows. Good economic health can then and will prevail".

For the economy, balance means full employment and healthy growth with no wasteful gap between our potential and our actual real output and also no inflationary gap. What the hon. Leader of the Loyal Opposition fails to understand is that growing debt is no peril in the dynamically growing economy. The challenge that governments must face is that of the maintenance of growth in an economy. The size therefore of our capital deficit of \$199 million is far from dangerous in relationship to the overall income account of this province. Are we then in fact, as suggested by the hon. Leader of the Loyal Opposition, mortgaging the future of later generations of Albertans? This suggestion to me is even more absurd and I again quote from a basic book on economics used again across this land.

"The main way that one generation can put a burden on a later generation is by using up currently the nation's stock of capital goods, or by failing to add the usual investment increment to the stock of capital."

In other words, the burden of later generations is not the repayment of the deficit, but it is the cost to maintain the province's ownership of capital goods if they are not kept up at all times. In fact the cost of the service of the deficit of \$199 million is but mere peanuts in relationship to the gross provincial product, and as long as the taxable capacity of the province's productivity grows overtime, no serious threat is imposed by a provincial debt that expands at equal to, or less than, the rate of increase of the provincial productivity. Indeed, it could well be argued that had the Social Credit government over the years adopted an enlightened program of fiscal management including sound deficit financing, when interest rates were at a much lower level than they are now, we would not be placed in the position today of obtaining funds at a much higher interest rate.

As the hon. Leader of the Loyal Opposition, has not in fact attacked the specific programs in the allocation of funds by this government, I would then ask him to tell us what he would do, although I note once again that he is not in his seat this evening which is not indeed unusual. Would he in fact raise taxes to obtain additional funds for the necessities of Albertans? If so, let him tell us that. The leader of the 'Unity Socialist Party' has told us that he would raise taxes, that he would raise oil revenue costs. Is this then the position of the hon. Leader of the Opposition? Or would the hon. Leader of the Opposition cut back on the capital account expenditures of the government? If so, would he indeed tell us? Would the hon. Leader of the Opposition tell us if he intends to cut back more than we have done in our statement of capital account expenditures, in the field of agriculture, in the fields of highway and transportation, lands and forests and municipal affairs. For if it is his view that he wishes to cut back more than the \$4,606,490

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 65

than we have, then let us hear from him as to where he wishes to do this, so that he too can stand up and be counted.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the shallowness of debate that I referred to earlier in my comments about the opposition. It is not enough for an opposition to speak in terms of their great disappointments, of new loads, etc., and to offer nothing constructive to the position of the government.

We heard yesterday about the gross deception of our government, about how we have deceived ourselves and that we have only created new priorities today. If that be the case, then I highly deny it. Let the hon. Leader of the Opposition tell us what he would do, what programs he would cut back. I have also listened with great interest to the hon. and avowed socialist member of the loyal opposition and his comments relating to the debate on the Speech from the Throne and the budget and I intend to deal with that in just a moment.

Getting back for one moment to the deception that was suggested by the hon. Leader of the Opposition on the part of this party. If anyone has practised deception in this House, it was the hon. Leader of the Opposition last night when he accused the government of increasing bureaucracy rather than reducing or controlling it. In these statements, he accused the government of creating some 835 new positions. Here lies the deception. For what the hon. Leader of the Opposition did not tell us was, first, that approximately one half of these positions were filled by the prior government prior to September 10, 1971. What the hon. Leader of the Opposition did not tell us was that the comparison that he drew of increased positions was based on the estimates for 1972-73 against the estimates of 1971-72. What he did not tell us was that the change includes not only new positions provided in the 1972-73 estimates, but any positions created in the 1971-72 estimates, for which funds were not provided by the prior government in their estimates. And therein lies the \$70 million that was overspent by the past government that was not budgeted. And therein hidden in the \$70 million is a considerable amount for the new positions to which we refer.

We have also heard this evening from the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development who advised us of the necessity for another 127 positions in his department alone to fill some of the basic programs that are required in this province. But if the hon. Leader of the Opposition were here tonight I would be pleased to tell him that as opposed to the deception by this department and by this government, which was suggested, the truth of the matter really is that the percentage change in salaried manpower of the government from 1971-72 to the 1972-73 situation is but 3.7 per cent, an increase substantially lower than any exhibited by the past government in many years.

If I may deal for a moment with some of the comments exhibited in this House by the hon. member for Spirit River-Fairview, I would suggest to you, sir, that when you express your views, your party's attitudes and considerations are becoming more appealing to the citizens of this province. I suggest that you indulge in fantasy, for the electorate of this province clearly expressed their opinions relating to your philosophies on August 30, 1971 when the Socialist vote in this province fell from approximately 17 per cent to 11 per cent.

MR. TAYLOR:

They all voted for you.

MR. GHITTER:

And so they should.

14- 66

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

When you suggest that the governments of the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba are adopting wonderful, contemporary programs designed to stimulate their rural economies and encourage the family farms, I again suggest to you that you indulge in fantasy, for it is in both these provinces, already two of the highest taxed provinces in Canada, whose present sessions are introducing gift taxes and succession duties that will inevitably force businesses out of these provinces, that will wreak havoc to the family farms, and that will cause situations whereby the owners of family farms will have to sell their farms in order to pay the high taxation which is imposed by your form of government in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

I might add as well that the very same taxes that you will be raising by these programs are utilized to subsidize the costly socialist program that we are now seeing in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba. And I might further add that the subsidization includes the cost of the installation of government owned power, and I might add that the reason why the cost of power is so much less, as you suggest, is due to these very subsidies that come out of your higher forms of taxation.

When you suggest that the answer to our lagging oil revenues, sir, is to substantially increase the oil royalty payments and set up a gas bank, you are again indulging in fantasy, and displaying your lack of understanding of the oil and gas industry, the same lack of understanding, I might suggest, that is displayed by your Mr. Lewis in Ottawa when he demands severe controls upon the Canadian economy, negating any form of international investment in Canada.

In conclusion, let me express my hope that your party on the other side, sir, be always united and never be more than one. For our Socialist member who so eloquently quoted Abraham Lincoln in his address to the Speech from the Throne, let it also be remembered that it was Abraham Lincoln that stated:

"You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich, nor can you build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and his independence."

More specifically, with reference to the address of the hon. member of the socialist unity party, I congratulate you for two things, Sir. You commended the government for its desire to aid handicapped children, and for our thrust into agricultural marketing. This took you approximately a minute and a half. I am surprised that that is all you could find to say in a positive sense about our budget, considering your self-professed concern for the underprivileged, the disadvantaged, and the poor.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview suggested last night, and I quote; "The budget was a middle class budget, containing middle class concerns". He added that the government is doing precious little for the forgotten man in our midst, and he referred to his "trickle-down theory". I am surprised the budget struck him in this manner, sir. It sounded to me like his speech was written before he read the budget. But let me bring to your attention some of the following matters, which I suggest to you are not but a mere trickle. In the field of Health and Social Development, as we were advised tonight by the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development, the government is increasing its expenditures for research and planning by 48.7 per cent, for youth receiving centres by 21.6 per cent, for infant medical assessment centres by 7.2 per cent, for public assistance by 9.5 per cent, for preventive social services by 22.8 per cent, for emotionally disturbed children by 16.30 per cent, and allocates entirely new expenditures for mental health for \$1,237,800, and I could go on and on. This, sir, is not a mere "trickle down", it's a flood.

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 67

How can the hon. Member for Spirit-River Fairview expect to enjoy any credibility in this House, when he overlooks completely the areas of this budget which are indeed, I submit, compassionate and understanding of the needs of all Albertans? How is it that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview can really believe that by the mere changing of title deeds you will change the status of the problems of the economy of Alberta today? How can he really believe that industry will tolerate the extravagances of government, when he has before him the sad example of Great Britain, and what are going to become even sadder examples, unfortunately, in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba? How can you regard Alberta as a tax haven for the rich, when Albertans pay substantially more taxes than most countries in the world?

And yet you criticize our approach to senior citizens, while the senior citizens applaud us. You criticize our approach to the family farm, while the rural editorial writers commend our forthright approach to these difficulties. However, I do congratulate the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, for at least he has had some suggestions. Although I do not agree with his suggestions and solutions, he was at least constructive from his point of view. His suggestions of a selective sales tax, more taxation, and striking at the oil industry were suggestions indeed. I must add that I deplore each and every one of them, but I give him credit for making his viewpoints known.

The hon. member also regrets the decision to slash the Human Resources Research Council. We also heard about this area from the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury. May I suggest that you take another look at the budget to see where we are placing our expenditures and our areas of research? Look at the Human Rights Commission, which will show a 70.3 per cent increase in expenditure from the point of view of dealing in programs exactly of this nature. I must say, from having read the works last presented by the Human Resources Research Council, to me they were disappointing. They were naive, and they were of little use other than the fact that they came in a very nice folder.

In conclusion, the hon. member suggests in a very melodramatic tone that the farmers will be storming the Legislature, and he repeats the typical Lewisonian speech heard so many times in the House of Commons -- that rhetoric will not hide the frustrations of Albertans. I suggest that Albertans will accept what this government is doing; I suggest that they are willing to listen; and I suggest that Albertans are proud that we have undertaken the steering of this province in such a responsible manner, and I certainly extend to you, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, my sincere congratulations.

I wish at this time, briefly, as there are matters that I hope to deal with in much more detail at later debates in this House, to talk in terms of the constituency of Calgary Buffalo. For those of you who are not aware of its boundaries, this is an area in the heart of one of our urban centres, an area which has its complement of residential dwellings as well as high rise apartments, an area noted for its concrete, an area not unlike the constituency of Edmonton Centre which the hon. Provincial Treasurer represents. For it is in the core of our urban centres that one can see many of the human ills, the social problems that are so evident in our society today.

You know, for a while, I thought that this was really a rural Legislature, as I listened to speech after speech talking in terms of the problems of the family farm, the problems of highways, the need for the hon. Mr. Copithorne to spend some more money, all of the rural problems which are indeed great. But let me assure the members that many of the difficulties that we find in the cores of our urban centres are indeed just as serious. Let me suggest to you that the lives that are being led by apartment dwellers as they go from concrete to concrete is not appealing, and let me suggest to you that

14- 68

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

much of the alienation and frustration that we see in our society is evidenced by our rising crime rates; the radicalism, the irresponsibility, and the permissiveness in our society can be seen right in the centre cores of our cities. And unfortunately, I am sad to report, they can be seen right in the heart of the City of Calgary.

So it is, indeed, a challenge to all of us to understand the problems of those who live in our apartments, who understand the isolationism and the loneliness that can be felt by those who live with thousands of people around them, to understand the basic feeling that these people have that the world has passed them by and that their lives are of little significance. The de-humanization process continues on and on, not only in the centres of our cities, but also in our universities, where our students become nothing but computer numbers and have no feeling for a style of life that possibly other older members in this House had the opportunity to experience. These are the problems we must all face in this rapid changing, technological world. And it is policies in this area that we are challenged with, and must deal with.

One area of concern to me is the area of public housing, not for what it is doing, but for what it is not doing. Right in the core of the City of Calgary, we have some fine residential districts, but can an owner of a home within these districts obtain any financing for improvements which would indeed stem the decay in the core of our cities? The only financing that can be found is for the development of public housing in the perimeters of our cities. What should be done, and I submit this for the consideration of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, is that money should be allocated so that districts of this nature, in the cores of our cities, could improve themselves, so that the cores of our cities would not decay, so that suitable accommodation for our senior citizens would be available where the action is, where they can move around easily, where they don't have to be thrown to the outskirts of our cities, awaiting buses wherever they go. For the cores of our cities must not die; if that happens, we will have the problems that are experienced in so many urban centres in the United States. So this is one area that I certainly hope we will look into at a later time.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, to me one of the brightest spots in the budget was something that may have been of the utmost insignificance to many hon. members, for I see the solution to many of our social ills in the city, in the areas of recreation, youth and culture. For it is in these areas that people will move beyond themselves. It is in these areas that they will find useful things to do. It is in these areas that our youth will become involved in athletics, and it is in this area that I see the challenges of our cities must be answered. So when I looked at the budget and I saw what, to some, might be an insignificant amount of \$50,000 which was awarded for the support of Alberta artists through the purchase of works of art, I was indeed proud. I know the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation must have had quite a chore to get that through. But I'm sure that any of us who heard the warm, sincere address of that hon. minister last Friday can understand his feelings toward his department, and the needs that his department must fulfill. And I certainly feel proud that we have a minister of that kind.

Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks, I wish to congratulate you, I wish to thank you, and I look forward to the future enlightened debate of this House in future years.

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, as this is my first opportunity to address this Assembly, may I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your selection as the Speaker of this Legislative Assembly. Your

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 69

knowledge and your judgment will offer us, I am sure, the guidance necessary to see this 17th Session of the Legislature through to a most successful conclusion. I would, Mr. Speaker, offer my congratulations to the Deputy Speaker as well, and to the hon. Provincial Treasurer for an excellent budget and an excellent budget presentation on last Friday night. I feel we of the government's side of this House are most fortunate in having a man of such high calibre to take the office of Provincial Treasurer. His job, Mr. Speaker, is not an easy one, and at times, I am sure, will be one of the more frustrating jobs in government. But, if I may inform the members of the other side of the House, I've had the opportunity to see his strength and his convictions, and they are extremely strong.

I must at this time, Mr. Speaker, publicly thank the people of the Peace River constituency for the honour they have bestowed upon me by electing me as their representative for this term. I'm grateful for the opportunity to serve them as a member of the team, the team of the members of the Progressive Conservative Government of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, relative to the budget, may I spend a moment or two to outline this year's plans for northern development? It is my plan to build a foundation for the future. We must, Mr. Speaker, establish this foundation as quickly as possible. We must do this by assessment, by reassessment where necessary, by review, and by consultation with the people of northern Alberta. This must be developed with proper direction from people with an understanding and a sympathy for the many unique problems of a developing area such as northern Alberta.

It is most important that we keep the overall objectives and the new directions of northern development as our goals, and that we do not become completely project oriented. Plans for setting up a northern development fund must be included in our long range plans. This fund, Mr. Speaker, must be incremental. No more can we be a part of a program that is based on getting as many dollars as possible out of the northern development fund in order to pay the other departments of government -- a system that in fact has been considered by a number of the people of northern Alberta as the best break the south ever got.

An example, Mr. Speaker, was when previously the budget in Lands and Forests for a parks' program was reduced to nil. But the Northern Development Council carried on a vigorous parks program that year, and expenditures on provincial parks in southern Alberta actually increased. Similar trends developed in municipal affairs, in highways, and in other departments of government. Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to play this type of a game. Once we do have funds available, Mr. Speaker, they must be incremental to the current expenditures of all the other departments of government in the northern part of our province.

I am most grateful to the hon. Provincial Treasurer and to our hon. Premier for recognizing the fact that the reestablishment of the priorities of northern Alberta and northern development was necessary, and that this is shown in the budget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I might add, that we, of northern Alberta, are on the threshold of a bright and prosperous future. For example, in the Fort McMurray area, Great Canadian Oil Sands are currently in operation, and they are expanding. Syncrude are preparing for construction of their \$500 million extraction plant just a few miles up the river. Mr. Speaker, we must plan now, in order that the people of the north can take full advantage of these projects and the jobs they offer as they develop. On the west side of Alberta, in the Peace River country, the large iron ore deposits extending from west of Dixonville almost to the B.C. border, are as yet untapped. Anderson Oils have had great success in drilling for natural gas in

14- 70

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

the Fairview area. Procter and Gamble are aiming at the 1973 opening of their giant pulp mill. The 500 ton rapeseed crushing plant is slated for somewhere in the Peace River country. The Fort Vermilion Bridge, currently under construction, at a cost of some \$3.5 to \$4 million, will open up vast timber reserves in north-central Alberta.

And, Mr. Speaker, the oil discoveries in the Arctic dictate the possibility of a pipeline down the Mackenzie Valley into northwestern Alberta, a pipeline that would be routed just west of High Level and east of Peace River. Mr. Speaker, in view of the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals' statement of yesterday that he was planning a pipeline conference, I would like at this time to extend to him publicly an invitation to hold that conference in the town of Peace River, a location, Mr. Speaker, that would be in the proposed area for that Arctic pipeline in the Province of Alberta. I am sure it would be a natural location for the pipeline conference and that the hospitality offered by the people of the mighty Peace would long be remembered by those attending.

Mr. Speaker, I have some real concerns over the special ARDA 3B agreement signed in the first part of September, a program that leaves a great deal to be desired by the people it was intended to assist. This program is currently under review, and I have already had meetings with the Metis Association and the Indian Association of Alberta to obtain alternatives that they would like to see included in any future discussions that our good Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs will have with the federal government. It is our hope to assist the native people with implementation of responsible programs, Mr. Speaker, and to present a bill during this session to set aside a day as Native Peoples' Day in order to give recognition to and to preserve the cultural contributions and the importance of the native people in the history of Alberta.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again relating to the budget, I would like to stress the enormous size of the constituency that I represent. It is the second largest in Alberta, stretching from eight miles south of Peace River to the Northwest Territories boundary in the north, from the British Columbia-Alberta boundary in the west to the 5th meridian at its widest point. We have a great number of communities of all sizes, from Indian cabins, the last community on the Mackenzie Highway in Alberta, to the town of Peace River, the largest centre in the north Peace, with a population of some 5,300 people. We also have the oldest community in Alberta, Mr. Speaker, the community of Fort Vermilion. One of the newer ones is also located in my constituency and that is the new town of Rainbow Lake.

Tourism is a factor, Mr. Speaker, in our area. For the fishermen we have the Margaret Lake Fishing Lodge. It's located on Margaret Lake, a lake in the beautiful Cariboo Mountains north and east of High Level. On the west side of the Mackenzie Highway are a number of lakes; Zama, Hay and Bistcho lakes related lately to the oil patch. We have Twin Lakes as we come down the highway at Mile 90 on the Mackenzie Highway, a lake, Mr. Speaker, that has been stocked with rainbow trout, and appeals to all the tourists that pass. Lac Cardinal Provincial Park is located right next to my constituency. The once mighty Peace River flows through the town of Peace River and the view from the gravesite of Twelve Foot Davis in late September looking west to the confluence of the Peace and Smoky Rivers is a sight unmatched anywhere in North America.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remind you that our people in the Peace River country are a friendly people. They're friendly, but oftentimes frustrated, frustrated because of the previous lack of consideration shown for the many presentations made, but with one thing in mind, Mr. Speaker, to make the Peace River country a much better place to live.

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 71

A number of areas need attention - transportation is one I can think of, roads, a lack of secondary roads, and up until now a lack of a realistic paving program on the Mackenzie Highway. Imagine paving up to 16 miles per year with the exception of course of last year, election year, when they paved 24 miles. I have stated that 24 to 25 miles a year should be a realistic figure and I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to thank the hon. Minister of Highways for just that many miles for this coming year. I can see the necessity for more discussions between the Minister of Highways, the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, and the federal government as to cost sharing of the balance of the Mackenzie Highway from High Level north, the main reason of course being that it's the only highway artery into the Northwest Territories at this time. I think when these discussions take place, that we should also be discussing the completion of Highway 58, the road from High Level through Fort Vermilion to Fort Smith in the Northwest Territories, a road that was started some time ago on a cost-shared basis with the federal government.

Our transportation costs in the Peace River country are very high. Our farmers need a much better rate for shipping their products, for example, to the west coast. The Peace River country is one the largest producers of rapeseed, and, of course, we have a rapeseed plant that will be located in either High Prairie or McLennan in the Lesser Slave Lake special area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have received many, many requests from the residents of my constituency to have the entire Peace River country included in the incentive area, and thus allow the secondary industries to locate in that part of the province. They have also asked me to seek an extension in the special area, to allow the rapeseed plant to be built closer to the geographical centre of the rapeseed acreage in the Peace River country, and that would be somewhere near Grimshaw.

In the other areas of frustration, Mr. Speaker, I must mention the lack of mental health facilities in the north, and for that matter, in the entire north Peace area, and the need is there for these facilities. We are pleased to see a beginning with the implementations of the recommendations of the Blair report in this year's budget. I might also mention that we're pleased to see the announcement for the beginning of construction for the health centre hospital for High Level. The hospital was announced three times prior to this past election. Three years ago, two years ago, and twice during the last election.

Mr. Speaker, the north Peace area has seen some poor crop years in the late 60's and the early 70's. These crop years, as far as the farmer is concerned, were caused by frosts, early frosts, lack of rain, and almost every conceivable adverse event possible. It hit the farmers, forcing many of them into heavy debt, in order to just survive. And I'm sure that the best news to the farmers of the Peace River country, and for that matter, for all residents of Alberta, was the news by the Provincial Treasurer last Friday that there will be no new taxes, and no increases in existing taxes for this coming year.

Mr. Speaker, the new directions of the Department of Agriculture, I might suggest, have come just in the nick of time. The farmers of the Peace River area, I am hopeful, will be able to use some \$5 million of the \$50 million agricultural development fund. I'll make every effort to see to that.

I might mention other areas of concern to our people in the Peace River country: the current construction costs for rural power, the lack of natural gas to the farm homes, and of course, in the area of extended area service boundaries, we would like to have a look at

14- 72

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

more realistic boundaries in the Peace River country, owing to the distances involved between the communities of the Peace.

Financing in our country is another problem, Mr. Speaker. Financing in the Peace River country seems to be one of the hardest things to be able to get. Try and get a loan to start a business, and unless you are almost 100 per cent secure, you have a great problem in securing some financing. And speaking of financing, Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of a joke. A farmer came in to talk to the bank manager about picking up a loan. He said that he'd like to get the lowest interest rate possible and he was most concerned about the rising interest rates. The bank manager said it was most interesting that he should mention that, because a chap was in a little earlier today and stated that he was concerned about which was going to win the race between interest rates and the mini-skirt to see which would go the higher. The farmer, a very sharp individual indeed, said he knew who the winner was. It was the interest rates, because as far as the mini-skirts were concerned, the end was in sight.

Mr. Speaker, we have a great many areas where help is needed in the Peace River country. Tourism is one. It could be one of the biggest industries of the north, but we will need assistance: first, in the completing of the McKenzie Highway; secondly, to allow for upgrading and providing additional eating and sleeping facilities; thirdly, to inspect and stock lakes that are suitable for fishing. And, of course, in general, to assist the friendly people of the Peace in showing you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this Assembly that in spite of all the shortcomings present in our part of the country, and because of the people up there, there is no better place to live in Alberta than the land of Twelve Foot Davis, the land of the mighty Peace.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to congratulate you, too, on your election as the Speaker of the House, and also in another way. I understand that you've probably carried the Conservative banner for your party for several elections, and it's probably a lot more than most of them across the way have.

I am proud of anybody, whether Liberal, even NDP, Social Credit, or Conservative, as long as they fly their colours proudly, strongly; I see no reason to follow on anybody's shirt-tails to be elected. At this time I'd like to pay tribute to the hon. Member for Grouard until the last election, Roy Ellis; for 12 years he was the member for the Grouard constituency and has worked very hard. Being new in the area, just seven years as a resident, I didn't really realize the amount of work a member of the Legislature does until I went out to meet the people. In the course of the 30 days before the election, I met many people, and the former MLA, Mr. Ellis, knew them all individually, talked with them, understood them, got them their little piece of road. Then I realized that there would be many hours that I would have to burn in order to fulfill maybe just half of what Roy did. At this time I would like to pay tribute to him for another reason, on being one of the first to pioneer the Ombudsman, and he worked hard in establishing that.

Before I get into the Budget Speech I'd like to take maybe a half hour to explain some of the myths as to why the Lesser Slave Lake area got designated in the first place. I think most hon. members realize, and I know the hon. Minister of Agriculture said, it's hard work. I would like to take the time to go back to the year 1967, when we first started to get the local area designated. Our town council in Slave Lake attempted it. The area just east of us and south of us was designated. The industries were locating on the perimeter of this, and the labour force was in our area. After a year of hard work and little results, the Chamber of Commerce took the project over, and at that time, I realized that the areas of designation by the federal government were rigid. There was no

March 21st 1972

ALEERTA HANSARD

14- 73

moving around. So, in turn, we did about three months of study in all aspects of regional economics, over ten years. And in that, we decided that we had to establish a need. In establishing that need, we had to pick an area to represent people that was basically, economically typical. In this, we learned that the average wage in our area was 30 per cent below the Alberta average, 28 per cent below the Canadian average in earnings, 14 per cent below the unemployment average of Alberta, 60 per cent of the people were under the age of 25, 50 per cent were of native ancestry.

So in order to do this, we used a resource. In a lot of cases it was criticized, but we used this Company of Young Canadians as a resource. And with a group of committees we established meetings in all areas, Peerless Lake, Graham Lake, Chipewyan Lake, Wabasca, Kinuso, Faust, High Prairie, Grouard, Gift Lake, East Prairie. In a matter of a year and a half, we compiled an inventory of the area. And in this inventory we were offered a census division, that was the next stage. So in doing that, we travelled to the census division in the ARDA program in the Edson area. Four of us took two weeks off and toured it from the grass roots up. We decided we didn't like the program. It was the wrong approach, it wasn't going to the people, so we decided that we needed a better deal. At that time, we presented the Social Credit government with a brief, and at that time they opened their eyes wide, understood us, brought us in, developed a special area program, one year before the administration of the federal government DREE looked at us.

Now let's go back to the history of how we negotiated the program with DREE. I had calls to write several letters. One letter went several times to the hon. G. Baldwin. We did not receive a reply. It was a forgone conclusion that they couldn't do anything. We contacted Senator Harper Prowse. We contacted the hon. Mr. Diefenbaker. We contacted Arthur Laing. We spent roughly 16 months setting up the mechanics of getting Ottawa to look at us. Well, just after the election of the federal government, we had a stroke of luck. The Liberals, under the new leadership of Mr. Trudeau, sent a man out: I will never forget that meeting, because when we tabled all the correspondence we had sent to Ottawa over the two years, he said, when I go back there, I'll bring back results." And he did. A year later we were designated.

At the time we presented our brief, the DREE people said, "What have you got out there? Who wants to move there?" Economics said that we should move the people away. But in the first year of the program there were over 1,000 jobs created, and I daresay before the end of the second year there will be 2000. I think that you will find that, in breaking it down, Alberta Vocational Training has increased the budget. A fish plant in Faust is under the program. There are many meaningful programs; an opportunity corps I see was increased and I think this should be expanded to other areas of the North. I think that in our area we will be coming to a point where the opportunity course should maybe take a look at itself and back away, and move it into another area because I am afraid they may get a little complacent. We are fortunate enough not to have anybody on welfare other than those who are unable to work. They are either working in capital projects that were sponsored by the communities and the opportunity corps provided the labour.

Now it disturbs me to read press releases by the Premier, "Loughheed unhappy with duplication". I question the duplication, because I think the biggest problem of most programs is people like the front bench opposite, doctors, lawyers, architects, dentists - the whole works - come out there and really don't listen to the people in the area. They come in and they think our program is the only program in Canada that is a successful program because of the fact the local participation was there, the people were there. They were out in the area doing their job, rather than in some areas in Ottawa.

14- 74

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

Now let's go back to the special area, which seems to be a little confusing. I can't quite follow the hon. Member for Spirit River Fairview; the designation of any area doesn't really mean anything. You can designate any town with a \$50 million development fund which the hon. Minister of Agriculture promised some two years ago to the northern Alberta people. I hope it's not lip service but the hon. Minister of Northern Affairs says that when I see Bill 35, which will be introduced by him, it will contain that \$50 million and will also set up the council and get some work done. So really designating an area doesn't mean anything. I came from one. We couldn't attract anything because we couldn't afford the services to get the qualified dentists, doctors, lawyers, the professional people into our town. So then we asked for an infra-structure. And in this infra-structure we got participation in our two schools, we got participation in our sewer system, our by-pass road. We got participation in all the infra-structures of a town that are required so that the tax payer can meet the commitments to industry that may come in.

I am very disappointed with the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, as I have some very close connections with Ottawa. I don't think he's really sat down with them and discussed any part of the ARDA agreement. I don't think he even was there for the full hour last Friday - I think he came late. After travelling all that way I feel that he should have at least been on time. After all, with the concerns of the 'now' government and the people of the north, as the hon. Minister of Northern Affairs stated, I see a million and a half dollar cut in Metis programs.

I see also Appropriation 1482 in the capital accounts native projects in Faust, under the reforestation program. Now that program took the community two years to design. They had an agreement for five years. It's a bank type of program; it's reforestation; it's an environmental program. I don't know how the Minister of Environment can possibly resist a cut of a program like that and give the people the alternative to go back on welfare. I think you have got to look at it just like a savings bond - it matures with age. I really can't see the logic of buying a king airplane to compensate and scrap a program like that one in Faust.

It bothers me too, the approach of the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. We like the program, but we don't like the area. How does he know? Have any of you been out there? I know a few members that have been out there, but I want you to go out there and talk to the people. I invite you all, especially the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo. Any time you want an eye opener on the ghettos, come on out. We have them all through the north.

I am very disappointed at the \$116,000 appropriated to the hon. Minister of Northern Affairs. I know he's a big man, and I know he has been a radio announcer and a very popular fellow, but I think the front bench and the hon. Premier of Agriculture -- Minister of Agriculture should bear in mind --

AN HON. MEMBER:

You were right the first time!

MR. BARTON:

I often wondered who really was the true Premier, and it must have slipped; I apologise. I think the Minister of Agriculture should bear that in mind if he dare, go back to the north without that \$50 million he promised.

I'm quite concerned over the rape plant. I think it's quite logical it should go into High Prairie or McLennan. I think it's

March 21st 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

14- 75

time that the hon. Minister of Agriculture made a decision as to where he wanted to locate it.

I would like to plead to the hon. Minister of Northern Affairs, that he expand the Lesser Slave Lake project to northern Alberta, north of the 55th, totally. Designate it. Go for a rail system from the deep port of Kitimat right across the north. Build a line that is non-competitive. Let's get the products, our grain, down to the port, off the non-competitive lines.

Co-op won't get government aid. 'Pass a field test' - I thought we were past this stage. Quote from the hon. Minister of Agriculture: "Another Wabasca co-operative is planning to get into beef grazing." Dr. Horner says the beef co-op and others will get field inspections of their ideas before financial aid is given. May I point out that Indian Affairs have been doing this for years, and they have been trying to get away and develop their own economy? We all make mistakes - I know I've made a lot that have cost me a lot of dollars.

I happened to be able to go to Grade X, XI or XII. I know that the hon. minister has made a few mistakes and he is an educated man. I say that most of these in the co-op probably haven't got an education of more than Grade III. I don't think that in today's day and age we can restrict anybody. I think the lessons that they have learned have well earned the \$200,000.

At this time I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the hon. Gordon Miniely for the substantial increase given to northern development and native affairs. This increase of some \$80,000 will be very welcome to the native people. Especially when we turn the pages of the budget and find that Appropriation 1463 has been cut by \$1 1/4 million for grants, mainly in support of native affairs. So this also reflects the government's concern for native people.

Social Credit supports the phasing out of cost sharing programs. But caution -- while working to that aim, you do not cut off your nose to spite your face. I am extremely concerned at the apparent inactivity of the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, and he has not, apparently been very successful in producing any new areas of federal agreements to date. His stand is, 'we're not going to lay down our cards, but we'll leave the charge down there'. I feel that until we know what they are prepared to offer -- we are only a million eight hundred, and I don't think you've got a big enough charge to handle it.

Thank you.

MR. RUSSELL:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister begs leave to adjourn the debate. Do you all agree?

Agreed.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I move the House to now stand adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

14- 76

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 21st 1972

The hon. Premier moves that the House stand adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The House rose at 10:23 pm.]