

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Friday, April 7th, 1972

(The House met at 2:30 pm.)

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being The Environment Conservation Amendment Act. Mr. Speaker, this act does several things. First of all it transfers responsibility for the Environmental Conservation Authority from the Executive Council to the Minister of the Environment. Secondly, the Environmental Conservation Authority is increased from three members to four members. This is done because of the heavy workload that is being established for the Authority. Thirdly, certain changes are being made to the act to permit the closer working relationship between the Authority and the Department of the Environment.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 42 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce two bills; the first being a bill to amend The Legislative Assembly Act. The purpose of the bill is to make it quite clear that only this Legislature, and not the Executive Council, has the right to authorize the use of public funds for the support of committees of this Assembly. The second bill, Mr. Speaker, is a bill to amend The Health and Social Development Act. The purpose of the bill would be to give the Department of Health and Social Development the right to place a limit on welfare payments to those individuals who are receiving welfare, who are able to work, who are offered work, and refuse to work.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 205 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc begs leave to introduce Bill No. 206, being an Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act No. 2. Agreed?

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 206 was introduced and read a first time.]

24-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

MR. FLUKER:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 49, The Meat Inspection Act. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to bring inspection service to all processing plants in Alberta. This will mean, Mr. Speaker, that this will widen the marketing opportunities for our small processors throughout Alberta and improve the quality of products that they are going to be able to market. We consider it to be a part and parcel of our marketing thrust in relation to both the domestic and export market.

We hope it will be tied in closely with the federal government . . . and major packing plants we feel it is absolutely essential to both the marketing and agriculture . . .

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. Is the hon. member summarizing the bill?

MR. FLUKER:

Yes, sir. And expansion of the industry in our rural areas.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 49 was introduced and read a first time.]

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, that Bill No. 49, The Meat Inspection Act, be placed under Government Orders on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER:

It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, seconded by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, that Bill No. 49, being The Meat Inspection Act, be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Public Lands Amendment Act 1972. The purpose of The Public Lands Amendment Act 1972, Mr. Speaker, is to remove two sections from The Public Lands Act as it now stands, and alter another section, the purpose precisely being, to repeal Bill No. 66 from last year's Public Lands Act Amendments and leave The Public Lands Act precisely as it was prior to the introduction and passage last year of Bill No. 66.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 46 was introduced and read a first time.]

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-3

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to this Assembly, 18 members of the Golden Sunset Beef Club of Clyde, Alberta. In charge is Mr. Joe Fuchs. They are in the members' gallery. I wish to commend them for their interest and for visiting here this afternoon, to observe democracy in action. Will the Golden Sunset rise and shine and be recognized.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, also observing today's proceedings in the Legislature is the 88th Guide Company from the constituency I represent, Edmonton Belmont. The group is accompanied by Captain Mrs. Pcdmore and Lieutenant Mrs. Ward. I am very happy to welcome them here today. They are in the members gallery. Would they please rise and be recognized by the Legislature.

MR. FLUKER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, 25 members of the St. Paul Conservative Association. May I commend this group for taking time out of their busy schedule to view the work of this Assembly today. They are seated in the public gallery. I would ask them at this time to rise and be recognized.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

Banff-Jasper Autonomy Report

MR. LOUGHFED:

Mr. Speaker, I have an important document to table for the consideration of the members of the Legislature. This document is the Banff Jasper Autonomy Report prepared by the staff of the Department of Municipal affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the document arises out of two items that were developed in the 16th Alberta Legislature involving a motion by the present Minister of Agriculture, Dr. Horner, and subsequent to that, to a motion by the hon. member, Mr. Benoit. It dealt with the question of autonomy of the Banff and Jasper townsites. Mr. Speaker, the report I commend to the members, in particular the conclusions on page 10, which I believe, having regard to the present public discussions in this province and the future of the national parks, are important. The conclusion of the report is that they have arrived at the conclusion that the communities of Banff and Jasper are financially and otherwise capable of operating as autonomous towns, and that they can do so without any adverse effect on the parks, bearing in mind special measures can be utilized to provide guarantees that the towns' developments are compatible with the federal government plans for the parks. Provided also in the report is the recommendation that any such action would involve, naturally, negotiations between the federal government and the Alberta government, as well as the petition being circulated by the residents of the two towns and the necessary support.

There is a reference on page 3 of the report, which I commend further to the attention of the members for their consideration, to the following effect, that the suggestion that the transfer of the towns if incorporated from the parks for the creation of a corridor, that either of these steps could be a choice of the government of Canada and Alberta.

24-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make it abundantly clear that this is a document that has not as yet been reviewed by the Executive Council and is not yet government policy, but because of the general interest in the important subject and the contemporary interest, we felt that it should be tabled as quickly as possible in the Legislature so that all members, including the Executive Council, would have an opportunity to give adequate consideration to it.

Superintendent of Insurance Annual Report

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, some days ago I filed the annual report of the Superintendent of Insurance for the business year of 1970, and I would now like to file 75 copies of a correction in respect to certain errors that were made in that report.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I meant to mention with regard to that report, efforts are being made to have 75 copies so that all members will have them. It would be our hope that the members would have them no later than Monday and Tuesday of next week.

Lands and Forests Annual Report

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to submit herewith the annual report of The Department of Lands and Forests of the Province of Alberta. This is the annual report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1971.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the return as ordered by the Assembly being a reply to Question 146 of March 21.

ORAL QUESTION

Standards of Justice

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Attorney General. In light of your earlier statements this week in the Legislature assuring us that you would not tolerate two standards of justice, can we assume that pledge also applies between Albertans and citizens in other parts of Canada?

MR. LEITCH:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I find that a little difficult to answer because there may be different systems of justice throughout the rest of Canada, and some of them may or may not be as good as those we have here. But I assume the hon. member is referring to a recent report that referred to a news story appearing in the *Albertan* today. Am I correct in that? Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say that the report, which is one prepared by Professor Matthews, only reached my desk yesterday, and I haven't yet had the opportunity of studying it in any detail. It is in essence, Mr. Speaker, a statistical study and then the author draws conclusions from that study. And while I haven't, as I say, had time to study it in detail, that kind of a report does, I think, require a good deal of study; because it is based on statistics and conclusions drawn from statistics, before one can assess the validity of the conclusions.

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-5

I should say that in going through the report, I found in the early pages, one rather remarkable statement to the effect that Alberta, for the year 1969, faced a net deficit of more than \$25 million for the legal justice system. Mr. Speaker, that statement startled me, because it is, in my view, completely erroneous. The statement is taken from the revenue estimates of 1970-71, and those figures include the many items of cost which have nothing to do with the legal justice system in the province, nor do they contain the items of revenue that come from that system.

So that startled me, because as I say, this kind of report needs a great deal of study before you can assess the validity of the conclusions, and the first item I came across indicates that there is a very grave error in it. Now that of course, doesn't in any way cast reflections on the conclusions that appear in the other portions of the report, but it does indicate to me that very great need to carefully examine it before one can make any comment on the validity of those conclusions.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In your opinion, has Dr. Victor Matthews, the University of Alberta sociologist presented any facts which indicate Alberta's standards of justice are the most punitive and repressive in North America?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is not entitled to ask any question of opinion, but if he wishes to ask the question in relation to government policy, it may be acceptable.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I can put in a different supplementary question. What action, if any, does your government plan, to counteract the alleged situation where hundreds of Albertans are sent to jail in Alberta yearly, who would be acquitted, suspended, or probated in other provinces?

MR. LEITCH:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the report does raise some matters that are of very great concern to me, because if the conclusions that are reached in the report are valid, they indicate that there is a different type of judicial system or legal justice system, as it is called in the report, in Alberta than in other places in Canada. It's something my department will regard as very serious, it's something that we will examine very closely, and if we felt changes should be made, endeavour to bring about those changes. But as I've said in answer to the hon. member's earlier question, we've had it something like 24 hours, and that simply isn't enough time to be any more definite than I have been.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would copies of the report be made available to all members of the Legislature?

MR. LEITCH:

I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that can be arranged.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, and the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

24-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

MR. NOTLEY:

Can the hon. Attorney General advise the House whether or not his department was in possession of any of the data gathered by Dr. Matthews as long ago as January of last year?

MR. LEITCH:

Well, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that my department would be in possession of some of the data in this report in January of last year and for some time before. But whether they were in possession of the data on which the professor bases his conclusion, I can't at this time answer.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, again to the hon. Attorney General. Is it true that the jail population in Alberta increased by 71% between 1960 and 1970, as Dr. Matthews suggests and that this increase was the largest increase in Canada?

MR. LEITCH:

Those are matters, Mr. Speaker, that I would have to check.

MR. NOTLEY:

One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the light of the report by Dr. Matthews, has the government established any timetable as yet for the full implementation of the McGrath Report on penal reform, more specifically the recommendation for a central registry?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I find the hon. member's question a little astonishing. I thought I just told him I had the report something like 24 hours. Now, how he can suggest that in that 24 hour period you should establish the kind of thing that he is talking about is beyond me.

Calgary School Board Budget

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the hon. Minister of Education. Are you aware, Mr. Minister, the statements in the press that the City Council of Calgary has been refused a copy of the Calgary Public School Board budget, and what is the exact position in this regard. Can the Council demand a budget and have they power to review a school budget?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of news reports to that effect. I think there is perhaps some question as to whether the Calgary board has refused to provide a copy of the budget to the Calgary City Council. They have, to my knowledge, agreed to provide the Calgary City Council with copies of their budget estimates, when the requisition is sent in from the Board to the City. However, I think the Calgary Board has said that they will not be in a position to agree to a review or any purported changes by the Calgary City Council of their School Board Budget, on the basis that as an elected school board they are responsible to the electors, and that it is for the electors to decide whether or not they are responsibly handling the affairs of the public school system there.

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-7

MR. FAFRAN:

Can a school board tax for, or budget for a surplus?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Amendments to The Labour Act

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower. Just in case the hon. members opposite think I am going to make a little speech I must give a little background. In view of the fact that many of the people in my constituency are employed in industries that operate 24 hours a day and seven days a week, hon. minister, I would like to know if there are going to be any amendments to the Labour Act to enable

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to indicate to you and the House that this kind of legislation will be anticipated in amendment to The Labour Act that will come before the Assembly this spring. This will be done on the basis of application to and approval by the Board of Industrial Relations. This will be on a one year basis, so that we don't anticipate what might be the final recommendation and the final action of the Legislature with respect to public hearings on the matter of The Labour Act.

Senior Citizen's Accommodation

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Little Bow, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway, and then the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Is it the intention of the provincial government to increase the present ceilings for senior citizens' accommodation, to increase the ceilings from the present levels of \$80 for shared accommodation, and \$90 for single accommodation?

MR. CRAWFORD:

The amount payable in respect to such accommodation as approved by the government -- if that is the question the answer would be no.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Has the hon. minister had any representations on this particular matter?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, there has been -- as was reported in today's press -- some difficulty over the foundation in Edmonton, and my information is that there is similar difficulty over the foundation -- the large project they have in Calgary. However, there have been no representations assuredly from the foundation to my knowledge, or from the people who normally occupy such accommodation for this sort of thing. The municipalities, of course, who are involved with the foundations, are interested in the manner in which the obligations can be met. But to say that anybody is actually in the picture asking for us to charge higher rates -- the answer is once again no.

24-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

Evelyn Unger School

DR. PAPROSKI:

I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Education. Does his department intend to provide much needed urgent financial support for what is considered one of the best, if not the best school for children with learning disabilities in Edmonton, the Evelyn Unger School?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of meeting with a number of people including Mrs. Unger from the school recently, and she left some information with us regarding their situation. We are now assessing it and will certainly be taking appropriate action as soon as possible.

DR. PAPROSKI:

I have another question, Mr. Speaker. If that school had intended, and I understand it does intend to expand its facilities from 100 to 300, would the department give consideration for support in that direction, Mr. Minister?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that any questions of capital expansion by private organizations involved in the area of child care and education should be looked at against the broad background picture of where we are going in future years on a general basis, with either government or private or quasi-private organizations. So I will be involved in discussions with the Minister of Health and Social Development to work out some policies in that regard.

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-9

No Amendments to Cities Act

MR. HO LEM:

I have a question for the hon. the Premier. Mr. Premier, has your government given consideration to the amending of The Cities Act to provide for a measure of parliamentary procedure immunity to members on the municipal councils. As you may be aware, in the Calgary political arena, the mayor is now being sued by various people, and we find in another instance that we have an alderman being sued by the mayor, and yet in still another case, we have action against an alderman being contemplated by a school trustee. Now with this sort of thing going on, what does your government intend to do to alleviate this problem in order that the people may pay attention to the governmental responsibility rather than worry about these things?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that is a very difficult question to answer. Representing a constituency from Calgary, I have some knowledge about what the hon. member refers to, but I think there are others in the House that know a great deal more than I. But I do think it is perhaps an appropriate question to refer to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and see whether he might want to elaborate on the amount that has been developed.

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member may be aware, there are considerable acts within the jurisdiction of the Department of Municipal Affairs, and those acts have been broken down into two packages for introduction at the spring and fall session. I can assure the hon. member that there is no legislation of that kind contemplated for this spring session.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell and the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Farm Machinery Dealerships

MR. RUSTE:

I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Have any dealerships for farm machinery been closed out in Alberta since January 1st of this year?

DR. HORNER:

I haven't got that information off-hand but I will get it for the hon. member.

Provincial Courts and Remand Centres

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Public Works. I understand that the planning for the new Municipal Court Building and Remand Centre in Edmonton is far behind that of the planning for the one in Calgary, and my question is, what are the reasons for this fact that Calgary is ahead?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, this is primarily a matter of logistics. The plans for the Calgary Remand Centre and Provincial Court were far in

24-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

advance of the plans for the Edmonton facility, and for this reason the planning has gone ahead farther in Calgary than it has in Edmonton. We had reached the point in planning in Calgary where we were able to implement those plans. The planning in Edmonton has only reached a point where it still requires considerable planning before it can go ahead with the actual preparation of tenders, so I think Edmonton is going to be about one year behind Calgary in this fact.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the hon. minister. Has the land been acquired for the Edmonton Remand Centre to date?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the delay in the construction of the Edmonton Remand Centre actually the planning or design by the architects or are there some other reasons for the delay?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, there were some slight delays effected by discussions of the suitability of the land. The land chosen for the Remand Centre in Edmonton is to be in the area of the new Court House. Some question was raised as to whether this was a suitable site. There was considerable feeling that it should not be as close to the Court House. However, these problems have been sorted out and the present reason for the delay is one of planning.

New Chairs for Legislative Assembly

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Public Works. Why was it necessary to purchase 84 new chairs for this Assembly at a cost of more than \$14,000?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, it was felt that with the general upgrading of this Assembly, however you look at it, it was going to be necessary to buy 10 more chairs because, after all, there are 10 more members to the Assembly. Some difficulty was encountered in trying to match the age and quality of the previous chairs. It was, therefore, considered more suitable to purchase a set of 75 new chairs rather than have a hodge-podge of different chairs provided throughout the Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would it not have been less extravagant to have purchased 10 chairs similar to the ones that were here before, which were of a black ...

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is ripe with innuendo.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister tell us who tried out these chairs before they were purchased at \$170 each?

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-11

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I can only tell the questioner that I didn't personally try them out -- I personally find them quite comfortable, I don't know whether the questioner has a different shape than the rest of us.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am in excellent shape, where I stand and where I sit. I would like to ask the hon. minister one further question. Does he consider we got value for these chairs at \$170 each and were the chairs tendered?

MR. SPEAKER:

I would submit that this type of question would perhaps more properly fit under the discussion of the estimates.

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Sporting Complex

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Public Works, and ask him when he plans to call tenders on a major sporting complex in the constituency of Edmonton Whitemud, as was promised during the provincial election campaign by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not at present have in the budget estimates for this particular sporting facility, however, I will certainly check into that for the hon. member.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, one supplementary question. Does the hon. minister know if there are any preliminary plans in the department for such a project?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, no, I don't know whether there are any preliminary plans, but I would be very happy to look and see.

MR. CLARK:

One last supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When the hon. minister is checking out the preliminary plans, would he check to see if there are any plans at all on that particular project?

Board of Police Commissioners

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Attorney General. I am wondering if he is aware of the letter that is being sent out by Mr. Bryan Westerman who is secretary and commission council for the Board of Police Commission in Edmonton. Mr. Westerman is telling those people who have requested hearings regarding complaints before the Board of Police Commissioners, that the Commission really hasn't got the authority to hold an inquiry in a form of a hearing. He suggests in his letter that they are going to get in touch with the Attorney General's Department in order that the matter may be clarified for the complainants. I was wondering if he has anything to report on this matter?

24-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

Police Act

MR. LEITCH:

I would like to thank the hon. member for giving me some advance notice of this question, because it does raise a very important matter. I should begin by saying that whether the Edmonton Police Commission has the authority to hold such an inquiry is a matter of legal interpretation of The Police Act. The problem arose because, as I understand it, the Edmonton Commission received an opinion indicating that they did not have such authority. The matter then was passed to me and again, Mr. Speaker, I can do no more than express an opinion, for whatever value that may be on the meaning of the legislation. I would like to report to the hon. member and to the House that I have now considered the matter and am of the opinion that the Edmonton Police Commission has the authority to conduct the inquiry to which they referred. A letter from me to them will be going out very soon to that effect.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East, followed by the hon. Member for Cloverbar.

Union Lockout - Catelli Plant and Uni-Royal

MR. ANDERSON:

I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Labour with regard to a question that I asked yesterday. Is your department aware of the lockout at Catelli plant in Lethbridge, and if so, is your department taking any action to assist in the settlement of this dispute?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, we have looked into this. Catelli has locked out its employees - 58 in all. Our labour relations people have been in contact with the Company and with the employees. At this point the management is reassessing its position. We are in touch with them and are offering every assistance, particularly through mediation. We will know shortly what the company position will be.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet that the Uniroyal operation in Edmonton has also taken a strike vote. This vote has not been made public yet.

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Cloverbar.

Immigration Law re: Foreign Students

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Education. This comes from an article that appeared in one of the Calgary papers, and I think it is very important that the hon. members of this Assembly know if there has been action taken. This goes on to say that a scheme which uses high schools to circumvent normal immigration requirements appears to be operating in Alberta. It goes on to say that there are students, especially from Hong Kong, that are enrolling in high schools in Alberta and taking student visas out and are staying. They are using this - if you

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-13

pardon the expression - as a racket. I was wondering if the hon. minister can give the House any enlightenment on this.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this came to my attention yesterday when I received a copy of a news release by Mr. Gunderson of the Alberta School Trustees Association. There seems to be really two problems here; (a) is there in fact a problem or is it simply an alleged difficult situation; and (b) what groups are involved. Certainly, any student or pupil residing outside a school division in the Province of Alberta can in no way force a school board to enroll that student. So the school boards in the province, as I believe the Calgary Public School Board has been doing, can simply say, in respect of the letter received from another country that they are not in a position to enroll that student. Should the student, of course, reside, or his parents reside, in the school division, then the school is obliged to make space for him, and the parents are obliged to send him to school. I don't see it as a problem of major importance at the moment on the information I have, insofar of the 430,00 some students in this province, approximately 221 - that is my recollection - are Chinese.

Recycling Paper

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. This question stems from a request by a group in my constituency. Are there any salvage depots in Alberta where a person can dispose of paper for recycling? If so, where are they located?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, a private industry has established, or is in fact, collecting newspaper in certain locations in the Edmonton area. It has bins which it shifts from one location to another in which the public is invited to place their newspapers. I do not know if such a depot exists in the hon. member's constituency, but I will look into it and report later if, in fact, there is one.

MR. SORENSON:

If I might ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Do you have any plans to utilize our youth during the summer months in gathering paper for recycling?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, this government has many plans to employ youth during the summer on ecological matters and environmental matters, but to my knowledge at this time, we do not have a program associated with using youth for gathering paper.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Small Farm Development Program

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister without portfolio in charge of Rural Development. Has any agreement been reached with the federal government on the proposed Small Farm Development Program?

24-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that. If the hon. Minister of Agriculture wishes to report, I'll turn the question over to him.

DR. HORNER:

There has been no agreement as yet signed with the federal government in regard to the small farm program and the reaction generally of the provincial Ministers of Agriculture to the federal proposal was that we would like much more input from the provincial minister's position into that program, particularly as it relates to the activities and policies of the Farm Credit Corporation in the Small Farm Program.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister agree with the central registry as proposed in that and secondly, what amount of money might Alberta possibly get out of the amount allocated this year?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated previously in the House, the question of the central registry and the activity of the Farm Credit Corporation in relation to the land transfers is one of the things that concerned all of the provincial ministers in relation to provincial agricultural policy.

Secondly, in regard to the question of the total amount of money, the federal government has allocated \$150 million, over a seven or eight year period. When you divide that into that seven year period, you come up with about \$15 or \$20 million a year. And when you divide that into about 10 provinces, and having regard to the maximum figure that's in the Small Farm Plan of the federal government, that's \$20,000. And we can easily see that the amount of money that's going to be available to Alberta is very minimal in the entire program.

MR. RUSTE:

One further supplementary question. I believe the amount this year, as I understand it, is \$17 million. But the question is, when do you propose to meet with the federal authorities on this again?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have been meeting with the federal authorities for the last five or six months on this and people in my department are negotiating with other provincial departments of agriculture and with the federal department at the present time to see if we can resolve the impasse of the question of the input of the provincial governments into the Farm Credit Corporation.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood and the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder.

McGrath Report

MR. NOTLEY:

I'd like to direct a supplementary question in the matter I raised earlier to the hon. Attorney General. I think he may have misunderstood my last question to him. By way of explanation, my question was, does the government have any timetable for introducing the recommendations of the McGrath Report, which as he knows was

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-15

prepared some three years ago? More specifically, the one recommendation which relates to this current question of the central registry?

MR. LEITCH;

Mr. Speaker, the answer is that my department does not now have a timetable for either of those matters. As I have said on a number of earlier occasions, our plan is to review the entire operation of the correctional institute system in Alberta, beginning as soon as present sitting recesses, and I would expect we would have the kind of plan the hon. member has in mind later on in the year.

Loans for Delayed Unemployment Insurance Cheques

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. I would like to have his confirmation as to whether in fact, directions or instructions have gone out to the Provincial Treasury Branches with respect to making loans on the strength of delayed Unemployment Insurance cheques. If this is correct, what instructions or directions went out to the Branches, or whether instructions did go out to all the Branches confirming that these loans should be made available to people who are on Unemployment Insurance and who have had extensive delays in receiving their paycheques.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question, as I indicated in the House very shortly after the public concern was made aware to the government, I immediately instructed the Treasury Branches at that time, to accept applications from any persons who were experiencing delay in receiving their Unemployment Insurance cheques. These applications, of course, should be predicated upon the basis that the loan would be adequately secured by assignment of the Unemployment Insurance cheque from the federal government when it did come through. Those are the instructions I have given.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, what direction would you then give to such recipients to take when the Treasury Branches are advising them that there is no such arrangement and they are not taking applications. This is presently happening, as a matter of fact, as late as today.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I was not made aware of this earlier, that there was any such case. Certainly, they have received specific instructions from me. If, in fact, the case you are referring to is the case, I will be in touch immediately with the Treasury Branches, regarding my instructions.

U.N. Conference on Environment

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. I wonder if the Department of the Environment will be participating in the United Nations conference on environment, which, I understand, is to be held in Sweden in June.

24-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, if I might take a moment to advise the House with respect to several details on this conference, 130 nations will be participating in this conference, which will be held between June 5th and June 15th. Canada will be represented by six accredited delegates, and I am pleased to advise the House that the Minister of the Environment was invited by the hon. Mr. Davis, to be one of the six accredited delegates.

HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. YURKO:

Two of the six delegates will represent provinces, and the other four delegates will represent the federal government. I am further pleased to advise the House that the Minister of the Environment of the province of Alberta has accepted the invitation.

HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the hon. minister. According to news reports, when he was first elected to the high office of Minister of the Environment, he said the first thing he was going to do was send a personal wire to President Nixon regarding the Amchitka atomic blast in Alaska. Now that he has reached the United Nations, I am wondering if he did get a personal reply from President Nixon.

MR. YURKO:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did get a reply from the Canadian Ambassador to the United States.

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-17

Task Force on Urbanization

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Following the questions posed by the hon. Member for Hand Hills yesterday, will the scores of committees in the local towns and villages that have been set up by the urban committees, be used in your new setup after the urban force is disbanded?

MR. RUSSELL:

Certainly, the government would hope to involve the private sector in voluntary citizen groups to the greatest extent possible. When we talk about committees, Mr. Speaker, the committees that are winding up their work at the end of June are the paid committees, those people under contract and on salary by the government. They are winding up their work as of the end of this June. But, there is no indication or hint that we want any voluntary citizen groups to wind up their work. In fact, the hon. member may be aware, I think, of a very successful experiment that was carried on in the Drumheller radio station recently which involved a number of the paid task force members as well as several of our Executive Council members. We hope to encourage that kind of thing, we've had indications from Grande Prairie that they would like to try the same kind of thing, and you know, I really hope the message is getting across that this work is being carried on for another two fiscal years, but merely under a different system -- under an appointed permanent co-ordinator, rather than the paid committees.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview and then the hon. Member for Stony Plain.

Mineral Engineering -- U. of A.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals, and ask him if he is giving consideration to encouraging the development of a department of Mineral Engineering at the University of Alberta.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, that hasn't been brought to my attention but in view of the fact that the hon. member has brought it to our attention, we'll certainly look into it.

International Utilities Corp.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. It concerns International Utilities which as you know, sir, is the holding company for three of the largest utilities in the Province of Alberta. By way of explanation, in 1971 the company had to replace three of their Canadian directors with Americans in order to comply with U.S. regulatory demands. My question to you is -- are you aware of this decision, and if you are -- have you made representation to Ottawa about this infringement of Canadian sovereignty?

24-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware specifically but in a general way. I would like to point out to the hon. member that when International Utilities did form a new holding company, and combine all their operations, because of the federal tax legislation that was implemented last year, they at that time dropped their Canadian citizenship, or their Canadian corporate rights, and they are now an American based corporation for tax purposes, and as I indicated, the basic reason for dropping their Canadian corporate citizenship was because of the federal income tax legislation that was passed in the federal House last year.

MR. NCTLEY:

Supplementary question then. I take it that there will be no representation to the federal government about this occurrence, that is the dropping of three Canadians from the board of directors of International Utilities.

MR. WERRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that we really don't have any jurisdiction or right to suggest to the federal government that in fact International Utilities out of the United States appoint any Canadians to the board of directors. If the hon. member wishes I would certainly follow it up and speak to the corporate officials in Edmonton here to see if they would be willing to consider such a suggestion, but as I indicated, the Company has dropped their Canadian corporate citizenship and are now a wholly owned American utility firm.

MR. NOTLEY:

One final supplementary question on this general matter. This time to the Minister Without Portfolio in charge of rural development. You mentioned in the...

MR. SPEAKER:

I must find that not to be a supplementary. The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury followed by the hon. Member for Stony Plain, and then the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Pollution Index

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of the Environment. The ozone reading or the air pollution index reading is now being monitored by the City of Edmonton. What is the highest reading now recorded in the City, and what is the danger point?

MR. YURKO:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Environment recently announced that it had established a pollution index for the City of Edmonton and it will subsequently follow the same procedure in Calgary. This pollution index is a measurement and then a formula calculation of the total oxidants in the air as well as the total oxides of nitrogen, total carbon monoxide, as well as something we call the coefficient of haze or smoke. We are publishing results regularly now on the condition in Edmonton. Basically a reading from 0 - 25 indicates clean air; 26 to 50 light air pollution; and 51 to 75 is moderate air pollution; 76 to 100 is heavy air pollution.

Generally I think the Edmonton readings have been running between 20 and 30, but we expect that during the summer these might rise substantially. I might say by way of comparison, that I think I can remember that Los Angeles readings have been

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-19

above 50 on a number of occasions and I would suggest that if we get up to 50 to 75 that we are experiencing a substantial degree of air pollution and that in fact, if we get over 75, then we are experiencing heavy pollution and there is cause for concern.

Telegram Regarding Amchitka Blast

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I might suggest that I believe my answer was wrong to the hon. Member from Calgary Millican. I indicated that I received a letter to my telegram from Mr. Nixon to the Canadian ambassador to the United States. I meant from the United States ambassador to Canada.

Lake Wabamun Weed Harvesting Project

I would also like to suggest while I am on my feet that I used a word in the question period yesterday, indicated that the government equipment in connection with weed harvesting on Lake Wabamun was going to be loaned to Calgary Power and this is not really correct, Mr. Speaker. We really have a co-operative program of weed harvesting on Lake Wabamun this year; a co-operative program between the provincial government, which will supply some of the equipment, between Calgary Power, who had undertaken to play a major role in this area and will be expending over \$100,000 a year, and between some of the local communities in the area. Kapasawin Village for example, had donated funds toward this project. I would just like to say that this is the first time that this program will really get under way, irrespective of the token efforts that were being made by the previous government and would also like....

SOME HCN. MEMBERS:

Oh, Oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister is engaging in debate.

MR. YURKO:

I just have one more thing to state. It appears to me Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Member for Drumheller is making a real effort, feeble as it may be, to sabotage this program.

(Laughter)

Air Pollution Index, cont.

MR PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question in regards to the air pollution reading. Who was bearing the cost in the respective cities, of Edmonton and Calgary...are these cities, and industry bearing any cost of this monitoring?

MR. YURKO:

No, Mr. Speaker. This is basically a Department of the Environment program.

Anti-Pollution Programs and Employment

MR TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the hon. Minister of Environment? Do you, on behalf of the government, plan to pursue anti-pollution programs even if it means loss of employment to workmen in this province?

24-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the hon. member that from my standpoint our department is creating jobs, many jobs, in fact. When industry has been made responsible for their pollution and are required to put in additional equipment and additional facilities, and are required to make many measurements; then in fact, these requirements for management of Alberta's resources create jobs. And I particularly want to cite the energy industry, where our energy is in fact, exported to the United States. When we, in fact, generate jobs by asking the various companies associated in our energy resources to monitor the atmosphere, to install new equipment, to provide engineering for new facilities, we are creating jobs in this province, and the payment is done by the country to which we export that energy. I would just like to suggest for the hon. member that my department is not only in the area of managing the environment of this province, but it is also directly concerned and directly contributing towards the generation of jobs for this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR SPEAKER:

Is this a supplementary? The time has run out for the question period.

MR. TAYLOR:

It was a nice speech, but the hon. minister didn't answer my question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame, shame.

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask a further supplemental very briefly?

MR. SPEAKER:

Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

It will only require a yes or no answer.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

Thank you, I thank you, the hon. gentlemen seated opposite for their condescension. I would like to ask the Minister of the Environment, is he suggesting that industry prior to September 10th in this province was not responsible for cleaning up and controlling their own air pollution?

MR. SPEAKER:

Next order please.

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-21

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Committee of Supply

MR. HYNDMAN:

I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the estimates.

[Speaker left the Chair]

* * * * *

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of Supply will come to order.

Department of Agriculture (cont.)

Appropriation No. 1102 General Administration

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I thought this might be a useful time for me to review the basic format of the estimates, since certainly we have many new members and the estimates have changed in their presentation to a significant degree. I would just like to briefly go over the format with hon. members today.

I wonder if hon. members would have their estimate books in front of them and if they would first of all refer to the preface in advance of the estimates book. Normally, Mr. Chairman, I would not want to take the time of the members to review this preface, however, I fear that some hon. members have not read the preface to the estimates and as a result of that are not fully conversive with the format of the estimates. So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read the preface from the estimates.

"The estimates present to the Legislative Assembly the expenditure proposals of the Government for the fiscal year 1972-73. Estimates are detailed by department, with each department as a separate vote. The Legislative Assembly will be asked to appropriate sums from the General Revenue Fund to each vote under the Appropriation Act, 1972. Also to be appropriated under this Act are Special Warrants, as Supplementary Estimates for 1971-72 and Further Supplementary Estimates for 1970-71. Although Statutory Appropriations are shown in the Estimates, they have already been approved by the Legislative Assembly and do not require to be voted upon.

"Several changes have been made in the presentation of the Estimates for 1972-73, for the purposed of clarity and usefulness to members of the Legislative Assembly and to the public. One significant change is the inclusion of brief descriptions of activities under departments and under individual appropriations, with explanations of increases or decreases where these are substantial. These descriptions and explanations are intended for information only and have no legislative significance.

"To allow for meaningful comparisons between 1972-73 and 1971-72 a forecast of 1971-72 expenditure has been included for each appropriation. This forecast is based on ten months actual plus two months projected expenditure. Also included is the

24-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

percentage increase in the 1972-73 estimate, compared to the 1971-72 expenditure forecast. Salaried positions are based on estimates of man-year equivalents (or in other words equivalent full-time positions: part-time have been translated into equivalent full-time positions) provide a measure of the labour input in government services.

"Wherever possible the 1971-72 Estimates and 1970-71 Actual Expenditures have been adjusted to conform to the Departmental and appropriation structures which will exist in 1972-73."

Now I wonder if hon. members, to carry on further, would turn to the Agriculture Appropriation No. 1101 and if we could just go across the top of the page, I can indicate it to you, so that there is no misunderstanding.

Appropriation No. 1101, our government's first budget, the estimates for 1972-1973, is \$43,205. The next column is the percentage or the degree of increase over the level of expenditures in the previous fiscal year 1971-1972 forecast. In the case of Appropriation No. 1101 that is 8.8%. Now the next column is the 1971-1972 forecast actual level of expenditure in that appropriation in total. The next column are the original estimates presented to the Legislature last spring for that particular appropriation in total. Now the 1970-1971 actual has been provided for every department with the exception of the Department of Agriculture. The only reason it is not in agriculture is because of the extensive re-organization, not just of appropriations, but also internally within the appropriations, and I would, of course, say that in any event that information is simply additional information which is not required by statute to be provided. In every other department's case it was provided but in the case of agriculture the extensive re-organization that was undertaken made it impossible for them to dig out the 1970-1971 actual, and it will be up to the hon. minister whether or not he wants to provide it.

Now carrying to the right-hand side of the page is the object of expenditure which is a classification breakdown -- again our government's first budget 1972-1973 estimates compared to the estimates presented to the Legislature last spring. Also noted you will see the salaried positions, which I indicated earlier are the equivalent full-time positions. In the case of No. 1101 it's four positions in our first budget, and in the case of the positions in the estimates presented last spring to the Legislature, three equivalent positions, but we were unable to breakdown the actual positions which existed at March 31, 1971, immediately prior to our first budget.

The description, of course, is right at the bottom under each heading of appropriation and includes the full description. I would like to repeat that in past years all that the estimates have included are basically column one, 1972-1973 estimates, and column three, 1971-1972 estimates. Supplementary information was provided to the members, as I understand the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury indicated, at the request of the opposition of the time. I have a copy of previous supplementary information provided and, basically, this is all incorporated in the actual estimates book at the present time, with the exception of the Department of Agriculture for the reasons I have indicated, and in that case it will be at the hon. minister's discretion as to what he does. It's all there if you want to follow it through.

Basically, soon after we took office, there were several vote transfers between departments, corresponding to functional changes arising from the re-organization. So in order to reconcile in total our government's first budget with the estimates of expenditure presented last spring, you will see it reconciles in total, including

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-23

vote transfers, transfers into the department and out of the department, reconciling the two figures in total.

Mr. Chairman, I think this should clarify it for the members and possibly assist throughout the entire examination of the estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Thank you Mr. Minister. Yes?

MR. HENDERSON:

I would just like to comment briefly on what the hon. Provincial Treasurer has just said. While we agree that some of the data that is in here is academic, nonetheless, since the government has seen fit to include it, the least they could have done was to make it complete and accurate.

MR. HENDERSON:

It may not be of accounting significance but certainly some of the things they are showing are certainly of political significance. The hon. minister himself, has stated in his comments in the debate, or on the budget, that these percentage increase change in forecast figures reflected changes in government priorities. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that percentage figures, as they stand here now with all the juggling that has been done, don't necessarily reflect government priorities. Because some of these appropriations that show fantastic increases really are nothing but bookkeeping changes. The amount of money allocated to it hasn't changed. So to come along now, just when we are supposed to start studying these estimates and hand this book out here -- I have just been looking at it -- for the Department of Agriculture and all the changes, and expect hon. members on either side of the House to sit down and intelligently digest this supposedly layman's presentation of the estimates; in such matters to intelligently question the hon. minister involved, as to what they mean in relationship to the previous practices, is just about nigh on impossible. Appropriation No. 1102, for example, is not even complete. The total on the appropriation is correct, but some of the details were left out. You go on down here to another one -- some of the appropriations have been shifted five and six ways. So I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, while certainly the government is at liberty to muddy the water and confuse these issues at their liberty, I think we would like to hear an explanation as we go through these estimates, as to all the juggling that has been done with each one of these appropriations. Then we won't have to dig our way through this supposedly simple layman's explanation of the juggling that the hon. Provincial Treasurer has done with the provincial accounts. It is not going to be a simple task to do it. If the hon. minister thinks it is so simple, it would expedite the affairs of the House to hear them stand up and explain each appropriation we go through, whether there has been a change, and outline the appropriation. That I could understand, but to sit down and go through this document which we have received today and try to intelligently use it for discussion of agricultural estimates, there have obviously -- by his own statements -- been tremendous changes. It is just about an exercise in futility.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, with due respect to the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc that is nonsense and he knows it. Basically, what has been presented in the estimates book before, are the estimates for the upcoming fiscal year and the previous year's estimates. By supplementary information, some additional information has been provided in past years. The key comparison -- I appreciate that there might be some lack of financial wisdom on the other side of the House -- but the key comparison is between our government's first

24-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

budget and the level of expenditures of the previous year. That is really the only valid comparison of new government thrusts in terms of degrees. Any other comparison is not as valid, but is there for the purpose of information of the hon. members. So, I just repeat again. As far as the -- in the case of the Department of Agriculture -- that with many of the things that were undertaken that we were placing much more pressure on departments with respect to budgeting than had ever been placed on them before, and that it is reasonable information, the hon. minister will, in his discretion provide it, if he feels desirable to do so. Mr. Speaker, I think that that speaks for itself.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I am sorry, I believe the hon. Member for Bow Valley has been trying to get up.

MR. MANDEVILLE:

I just want to make a few brief. . .

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if, on a point of order, we can settle this point before we get into. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I thought it might be on this. It is not on this point of order. Fine.

MR. HENDERSON:

With all due respect to what the hon. minister has just said, I respect they have a lot of brilliant people sitting on the benches over there. We may all be rather ignorant over here. But if this explanation is so simple, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is not up to a question of whether the hon. minister wants to condescendingly provide an explanation of the juggling that has been done with the estimates. It is his responsibility to do it. As we come, for example, to -- and I just use this for example -- to Appropriation No. 1104, there has been a lot of chopping up done with it. I hope that we are not going to have to pry out of the hon. minister, a detailed explanation of all the butchering they have done with the appropriation -- how much they shifted here, how much they shifted there, how much they have eliminated, how much they have juggled the percentage increases, and so on. I think it is incumbent upon the hon. minister to provide that explanation regardless of all the magical bookkeeping that the hon. Provincial Treasurer comes up with, which really does nothing but add to the confusion that already exists in the situation. I have pointed out even Appropriation No. 1102. The comparison, as far as the details, are not correct. That is the second appropriation we have been into. The figures are not correct. I say it creates a doubt about what is in the rest of these documents.

DR. HERNER:

Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member should take it a little bit cool. We'll give them all the information that they require to understand the transfers and to understand the thrusts that this government is taking in agriculture. And I'm sure that even the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc will be able to understand it when we get through.

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-25

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Member for Wainwright has been trying to get ...it's on the same point, is it sir?

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, just to give an example, and I'll use two appropriations here to show what creates some of the confusion and that goes into No. 1101 and No. 1103. You have the estimates for this year. True enough. You have the estimates that we dealt with in the Legislature a year ago. And then thrown into that is the forecast of '71-'72, and in No. 1101 that is considerably higher. Now your percentage change from '71-'72 is based on the forecast. Why wasn't it based on the actual estimates of a year ago?

HON. MEMBERS:

(Confusion).

MR. RUSTE:

And you'll see in No. 1103, the forecast was considerably less than the actual estimates and I think that the estimates that were dealt with a year ago are the ones that they should be compared with this year.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, on the point the hon. member has made. Surely he understands that the column '1971-72 Forecast' is the forecast of actual expenditures in the department in relation to that particular vote. In other words, to make it quite simple for him, under No. 1101, the actual amount of money spent in 1971-72, or the forecasted actual amount spent is \$39,710. The amount that was estimated to be spent was \$29,460. I can give the member the actual amount in that department for '70-'71. It was \$26,756.33.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Excuse me. I wonder...Just one moment, sir. I wonder are we now disputing the percentages that are being used? Because my understanding is that this is really additional information. I hope that we can leave the question of percentages, please.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, we're discussing the estimates, and I think it's proper discussion and we are endeavouring to understand what has happened. In No. 1102, I can't understand why misinformation is actually given, because that's what it is. Well, let's look at it.

In No. 1102, in the estimates for last year, there is \$50,000 shown for grants. Now here you say in '71 there is nothing shown for grants. Now that isn't accurate. We voted \$50,000 last year, and here we have nothing voted. Now this gives the members who are not here a false impression. It just isn't accurate.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, on that point, as I suggested to the hon. member last night, that the other expenses of \$75,550 in that column includes the grants and travelling expenses and materials and supplies of the estimates of last year. Again, the question of why it was done that way was simply because we have been breaking down this appropriation into a variety of areas and that's the only explanation I can have for it, but the \$75,550 is, if you'll total it up, you'll find that it covers the entire amount.

24-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

MR. TAYLOR:

On a point, Mr. Chairman. I've totalled it up and I still suggest that this is giving misinformation. Because when I read this it says other expenses last year were \$75,550. Other expenses last year was not \$75,550. Other expenses last year was \$11,950. So the thing just isn't accurate. There is no explanation here saying that the grants for last year and the materials and supplies were added together with other expenses. If you were going to do that, why was grants put in at all? And why was it shown as zero last year? Because that isn't right. Last year there was \$50,000 voted under that item.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Member for Calgary North Hill.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Chairman, on the point of order I think they've done a very difficult job of comparing apples and oranges of one year. How many years do the hon. members of the opposition expect them to go back? We'd be here until next Christmas. You've already got the estimates to compare with the actual forecasts as far as can be seen, before the audit for the preceeding year, and now you're asking that this should be a reworking of the 1970-71. I think it's unreasonable.

MR. FARRAN:

It is difficult enough to compare the apples and oranges when the system is changed, so there may be some area of discretion here, where you may think it should be under one heading and they have done their best, and put it under another heading. But if you are going to go through this exercise, we will be here until Christmas.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, if we have to be here until Christmas on the people's business, let us stay until Christmas. The hon. member didn't listen to what I was saying. I am not comparing apples and oranges, I am comparing oranges and oranges. It is all under grants. You have a space in there. If you just look at your estimate and follow a dash meaning 'nothing'. Well, it wasn't nothing last year -- it was \$50,000. Can you explain that?

MR. FARRAN:

I can ask you a question since you are so good on the accounts. In the public accounts for the year ending 1971 you have a mass heading, "Grants and Prizes". Now, I agree that they are very much alike. So, could you tell me what is a grant and what is a prize?

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is confusing himself. We are using the word "Grants" and I understand in No. 1102 "Grants" means the same thing in 1972-73 as it meant in 1971-72. The same word was used; the Provincial Treasurer chose the word. I am suggesting it is not accurate information the way it is on this sheet.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I appreciate your comment, hon. Member for Drumheller. But in the meantime, your question has been raised and I think it has been answered. We should be dealing with the estimates, and I think the debate should continue with the estimates here. If there is a question . . .

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-27

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with the estimates. If there is no explanation from the Provincial Treasurer, I am prepared to accept what the Provincial Treasurer says. If they have made a mistake, let them say so. Let us not just sit there with our mouths open and pretend there is nothing wrong, because there is.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

This question was raised by yourself last night, as I sat here, I felt it had been answered. It has been answered again today by the two hon. ministers, to the fact that it . . .

MR. TAYLOR:

On the point of order, it is not the place of the Chairman to defend the ministers. They are quite able to defend themselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I am not defending them. I say, the answer has been given, sir.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, what the hon. members are saying, I indicated earlier that we can provide supplementary information to the maximum possible degree that is humanly possible to do, and we will do so. In the estimates we have, in fact, done so. In the case of the items they are talking about, we were able to provide it to the extent of the total appropriation. I think the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill indicated it. You will have one appropriation that might refer to three things, but in fact, it might be only one item in that appropriation that it is utilized for. You are splitting hairs if you are saying that this is simply giving you the total for 1970-1971, with no further breakdown. If you want to split hairs, fine. In future years we don't need to provide you with that information, even that extent of information. All we have tried to do is provide additional information to you and if you want to split hairs on it, that is fine.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, this is public money . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I'm sorry. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. Is it on the same point?

MR. NOTLEY:

Yes, it is on the same point, Mr. Chairman. I find myself in complete agreement with the hon. Member for Drumheller. I think that, while it can be argued, that there may be certain appropriations where it will be difficult to make the comparison, the point surely is in No. 1102, that in this case, there would have been no great difficulty in making the comparison completely accurately. I find myself at a complete loss to understand the government's reason for not, as the hon. Member for Drumheller quite correctly points out, comparing oranges and oranges.

MR. STRCM:

Mr. Chairman, further to the point that has been made by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, it isn't a question of splitting hairs because I notice the government has seen fit to give the breakdown on 1972-73. There was a breakdown for 1971-72, and all you would have had to do was to copy it in, in the identical form that it was there in order to make the comparison. Had you decided

24-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

not to break it down for 1972-73 and make it a new form there, and use the same form on the other side, I could say there would be some logic to your argument. But you have in fact taken the column that was used in 1971-72 and you have changed it, but you maintained for '72-'73 the same breakdown as we had previously. I say this is not presenting it in the correct fashion.

MR. KING:

As it happens on this particular issue, I agree with the hon. Member for Drumheller and the hon. Member for Cypress and the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. But I think clearly that it is a matter of interpretation. It is not a point of order which has been raised. It is not something on which a motion has been made in committee. It being a matter of interpretation I think it might be sufficient, if it is possible, for the Treasury Department to provide, as supplementary information, a copy of the income estimates of last year, so that those people who are dissatisfied with the interpretation which has been provided for information by the estimate book this year can compare the estimates of this year with the estimates that are provided in the estimate book of last year. I can't see continuing the debate over a long period of time on what is simply a question of interpretation which is never going to be resolved here, because people have honestly held differences of opinion.

MR. STROM:

I appreciate very much what the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands says, but the thing that concerns me is that if someone outside of this House were to review the estimates for this year, that we have been looking at, they do not have the benefit of the interpretation that we are placing on it. And I suggest that there is going to be nobody there necessarily to give them the interpretation. So they will draw a wrong conclusion. And I say that had the change been made for 1972-73, and the 1971-72 presented in the identical manner, then there wouldn't have been the same concern and interpretation. But in 1972-73, we go down on Appropriation No. 1102 and we read grants, \$50,000, and in 1971-72 there wasn't a red cent provided. And there is no one to give the interpretation and I simply say, it is a matter of concern, and rightly so on our side of the House.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, if I could make one further comment. I think people throughout the years and through the evolution of the British system of government have come to expect budgets to be absolutely accurate, absolutely accurate. And I am suggesting that whoever did this calculating, adding all the items, were correct as they didn't make any change in the total, but anybody reading this item would think that last year there was \$75,550 voted for other expenses. This isn't right. There wasn't \$75,550 voted for last year for other expenses. These were broken down; \$50,000 of it was grants, \$8,500 was materials and supplies, \$5,100 was for travelling expenses, and the other expenses were \$11,950 - quite a bit different from \$75,000. So I am suggesting that this is not accurate.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, we are not dealing with last year's estimates, we are dealing with this years. The hon. gentleman has a copy of last year's estimate book and that book is generally available to the public and I want to suggest that the argument that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is making doesn't hold water because, in fact, it is already public about the breakdown in relation to grants which are salaries, supplies, travelling expenses and so on for the 1971-71 year. If, in fact, this is really hanging them up, I agree that

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-29

there was an error made in the breakdown - it should have been there. But it is already public information in any case from last year's estimates which were voted on, on the breakdown structure.

MR. TAYLOR:

Yes, this is correct, but if it was going to be shown at all why shouldn't it be shown accurately? The hon. Provincial Treasurer sounded as if they are making a concession by showing this. This has been practice in British parliaments for years and years, to show the last year's estimates and this year's estimates. Now, I'm not criticizing some of the other things he had added, some are good. I like particularly the little space at the side for notes. Certainly there has been some improvements, but also there has been some errors, and I think that if we are going to show next year in the next budget what was spent this year, it should be exactly the way it is in this year's budget. Unless it's combined with something else. But here there was no such combination, no reason at all for joining them all together that I know of, unless the hon. minister has some explanation.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Well, my understanding is that in this discussion this information is made available now and you have it in the estimates from last year, I appreciate the hon. Member for Drumheller's comments. Does the hon. Member for Vegreville have a point on this?

MR. BATHURST:

Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Member for Drumheller mentioned that this may be seen by people outside this House, I am sure that every box holder did not receive one of these. If anybody does get this information it's very possible it's from one of the Legislative members and I think that we, as elected members, even if there is an omission, it's our obligation to explain it to our constituents.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Thank you.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, just a further note on this. Has the hon. Provincial Treasurer seen the supplement that was along with the estimates last year?

MR. MINIELY:

Yes, I have and as a matter of fact they are prepared in total, basically total actual expenditures when you go back two years. This is the point that I'm making to the hon. members is certainly that the hon. Minister of Agriculture, if you have a question regarding a further breakdown of 1970-71, I have said that twice, that you may address that to the hon. minister, and the minister may, in his discretion provide the information to you. Certainly, we have included it because it was not humanly possible to break it down further when we go back that far - two years ago - with the extensive re-organization that was undertaken. However, if you want it broken down further, then in the hon. minister's discretion he will attempt to do that for you and I leave that to his discretion.

MR. RUSTE:

A further question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Does the combined information contained in the estimates last year plus the supplementary compare to what you have provided this year?

24-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

MR. MINIELY:

It does, except for the additions of percentages and the percentages are, in my view, the real indication of degree of the level of expenditures tabled in our first budget, over the level of expenditures in the previous year.

MR. RUSTE:

A further one, wouldn't it have been clearer if you had used the percentage based on the estimates of a year ago to the estimates of this year, which are the same?

MR. MINIELY:

No, clearly not and I would like to make this point very clear. In terms of communicating to the public the new thrusts, in a new budget year over the previous budget year, it has to be related on the basis of our budget to the level of expenditures of the previous year, not estimates of one year ago which have been exceeded in terms of expenditure.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one more word because there is no purpose in prolonging this. The hon. Minister of Agriculture did say that these things could have been put in there the way we are suggesting. I'm suggesting to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that if he wants the new thrust to be accurate, and people to understand where the items are the same, they should be put in figure for figure from the previous year if it's going to give the proper picture to those who read the item. And they should not be combined under items that create inaccuracy and that's the only point. We are not asking for further breakdowns, we simply ask that the information on the previous years estimates be shown as they were voted on by the Legislature of that day and I'll be just as insistent on accuracy next year if I'm still around.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

In other words you can now make these notes on the column here if they are provided by the hon. minister?

MR. TAYLOR:

The items shown are still not accurate.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, I have just changed my book here and maybe some of the hon. members would like to bring their books up-to-date. In the column - this is under No. 1102, and under the estimate for 1971-72 - I have amended that column and the first item is grants and that should be \$50,000, materials and supplies should be \$8,500, salaries - \$198,990, travel expenses - \$5,100, other expenses - \$11,950 and if you total that it will be \$274,540, which is the same total which it gives in the book. I thought this might help the committee if they would change their books.

Now my question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, sir, if I could have your attention for half a minute. Would it be possible, I have changed mine with respect to No. 1102. As we go through would it be possible to give us the changes that we could just put in the book as we go along?

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-31

DR. HOFNER:

What changes are you questioning?

MR. FRENCH:

The changes, Mr. Chairman, that I just gave, I mean the proper figures in this column could have been the ones I have given. Now I could give it again.

DR. HOFNER:

What was the question?

MR. FRENCH:

Well, my question is simply this; would it be possible as we go along through the estimates to give us these so that we could write them in and it might . . .

DR. HOFNER:

Yes, where it is possible we will. In some of the votes . . . because of re-organization in the vote themselves it is not possible but we can give you, and if necessary I will send you over my last year's estimates book so that you will have it available -- well, I thought you should have it -- and I have additional information as much as we can possibly get, and we will get all the information that is necessary to show the thrusts that we are taking in the department. It seems to me that in the last half an hour, and the last half hour last night, we didn't do much for agriculture in Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Member again, for Wainwright. Is this again on the point?

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, referred to the last half hour and the last half hour last night. May I submit that the estimates of the Department of Agriculture went through at the last session in about fifteen minutes, without any questions.

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Chairman, looking at the time up there and the hon. House Leader from the government's side indicated we would be going on to bills at 4:00 o'clock, so if it's in order I would like to adjourn the debate on this vote.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report some progress [laughter] and beg leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

It has been moved by the ministers and agreed.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Chairman left the chair.]

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 4:12 p.m.]

24-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain estimates reports, some progress, and begs leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the report, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

BILLS FOR SECOND READING:

Bill No. 19: The Department of Education Amendment Act, 1972

MR. HYNDMAN:

I move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Miniely that Bill No. 19 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker, dealing as it does with the whole general area of education. In this debate, I would like to pose some questions to the Assembly with a view to stimulating debate and perhaps looking for some avenues to attend in the future in education, generally, in this province. This is the first occasion, Mr. Speaker, in which I have had an opportunity to make remarks in this House concerning the Department of Education, and certainly I would have to say at the outset that the many hundreds and thousands of youngsters in the schools of our province always give rise to a great number of chuckles and humorous stories which come to my attention with some regularity.

About three weeks ago I introduced to the House the three winning Grade IV, V and VI, students of the Deputy Minister For A Day Contest. I had occasion just before that to ask the youngster in Grade IV who won the best essay on the subject "What is A School In Alberta?" out of 800 entries. I said, "Well I suppose you spent long hours preparing that essay. He said, "Well, not too much actually, I did it when I was watching Disneyland on Television." The new media child is able to pick these things up and use both senses very quickly!

I recall I was talking to a teacher a couple of weeks ago who was noting the quick and alert minds of some Grade VIII's whom she had come in contact. Apparently they had a spelling contest and the teacher asked the students, three of them, to name the occupation of their father. The first student said; "banker -- b-a-n-k-e-r." The teacher said, "That's fine," and went on to the second student. The student said "electrician -- e-l-r-e." The teacher said, "Well, you think about that a little more and we'll come back to you." She went to the third student. The third student said, "My father is a bookie -- b-o-o-k-i-e, and I bet you two to one the previous kid doesn't know how to spell electrician."

So they are pretty bright.

Another occasion -- in a highschool it was mentioned to me that highschool students always have some answer for an exam question, no matter how difficult. It was recounted to me, that in one case, it was a health class, the teacher had a question on the paper -- "name two ancient sports." One student was a little buffaloed but then thought for a moment and wrote in "Anthony and Cleopatra," really they never miss a trick in these areas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before moving into the minute detail of education, before we go into things like teachers' qualifications and the school foundation fund, curriculum details and this kind of

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-33

thing, I think also before the estimates, that this Assembly should deal or paint with broad strokes on a canvas what is happening in education in this province, and perhaps where we're going -- which I doubt has been discussed thoroughly in recent years. Only then will the details fall into place.

At the outset, may I assure hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that I don't intend to submerge them in a quagmire of educational jargon, and believe me, as a lawyer I can recognize professional jargon when I see it! I have found that in education as in many other disciplines, one finds a certain lingo peculiar to that particular discipline. I don't think it would be difficult for me to bamboozle the Assembly if I wished to with a number of abbreviations and jargon in education -- I see that the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View has been speaking, I was hoping that we might be spared some Ludwagian remarks this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, but I -- You know, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman for Mountain View has been trying for some years to make noises from the chest sound like messages from the brain. I would have to say that he has not distinguished himself by reaching success in that endeavour in recent years.

However, for example in education, I was, during my first days and weeks, and even months subject to an onslaught of abbreviations and statements such as -- "will PPBES point to variations in the CRU and SSG so that there will be less truncation while maintaining an acceptable PTR?" Or, "will AV Branch VTR dubbing assist MEETA and CARET or should AECA investigate UHF as an alternative?" Now this is the kind of thing that one can come across in education. I've been telling people in my department, the purpose of communication in education -- and we need more of it, Mr. Speaker, is to communicate to the taxpayer and the citizen and not simply between professional educators.

Let us, Mr. Speaker, right now perhaps apply our collective minds to some of the basic educational questions of 1972 before we get into details. Perhaps in introducing these remarks, I should say that at this point I believe my purpose in talking is, not so much to produce action as to provoke thought.

A few basic facts, Mr. Speaker. Over \$1/3 billion was spent on education in the Grade I to XII system in Alberta last year. When members in the mornings drive by a school and see some school children they should realize that these are but a few of the 430,000 youngsters in the Grade I to XII system in this province. When they talk to a teacher, that is one teacher out of 23,000 in this province. Looking at those two figures we can see that really one out of every three persons in Alberta is involved in education, either being educated or doing the teaching or involved in a service industry allied thereto. In addition, the department and the government -- and I have many agents in carrying out education in the province -- more than 200 elected school boards.

I want to suggest a few warnings, Mr. Speaker, when we talk and think about education. I have to apply these warnings to my own thinking frequently and I believe all members should. Firstly, be careful about assuming that what goes on in schools today is the same as what went on when you were in school. It is a very different place and I do not feel it is wise to always draw our conclusions on our own experiences when we went to school 10 or 20 or 30 years ago. It's a very different situation today. Don't look for, because you will probably never find any easy or simplistic answers when you start considering the complex question of education, because in the final analysis, each of those 430,000 students in this province is a complex different individual person.

Try to think beyond one dimension, for example, on the subject of examinations we normally think "what kind -- when are they written -- will they be departmentals?" But in Denmark, for example, we find

24-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

that the most important examinations are oral examinations, not written ones, carried out by a panel of teachers who fire questions individually at a student. This, on the thesis, which may well be right, that most of our knowledge is used in speaking, rather than writing. So think in three dimensions whenever we are talking about education.

Also beware of the myths which one comes across fairly frequently in education. I recall a statement that a Ford Foundation researcher was somewhat concerned about the universal acceptance of the fact that the ideal classroom ratio was 25:1. He was curious about that so he dug back into it and found that the original statement to that effect was found in the book of Talmud in the Fourth Century B.C. Apparently it just continued as law. There is no magic number perhaps and maybe 25:1 is simply there because it has been there for six centuries.

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly no professional in the educational field -- I have no professional training. I have no special wisdom. That is an advantage in the sense that I can sit on the mountain top and look down at what is sometimes called, "the great controversy in education". In a way it is entertaining, in a way it is of concern. We see, for example, the critic who shouts -- and there are many -- the schools are lazy and the educators are fools. Then we have the educator shouting back that the critics are reactionary and that their criticisms are ignorant, and each group can prove its case by quoting something from the other. Both of these groups play before well organized cheering sections in society. The concern I have, is that in their desire to score points, sometimes they all forget what education is all about and what is actually happening in the schools. This, I think, is the concern of the citizen and the taxpayer in this province and the person to whom we must speak as to where education is going.

Some of the questions we might ask ourselves; just what is education today? Is it that formal period of 12 years; is it that plus post-secondary; or is it all our lives? Are we thinking in a capsule if we think of 12 years being really education? What do we want education to do today; what do we want it to do in 1984? The graduate in 1984 -- and let us hope it is not an Orwellian world -- will be the youngster who is in Grade I today in this province. We have to look that far ahead.

What is the definition and how do we define learning? B. F. Skinner has tried to define learning; there are hundreds of theories. But is it the same learning as it was 40 years ago or even 10 years ago? Should a school be piling up and increasing the areas in which learning takes place with greater and greater numbers of courses, and a multiplicity of subjects? Or should some of them perhaps be given back to the family, or the church, or the community? This is a basic decision we must make if we are going to look ahead to the expenditure of what is now a third of a billion dollars, and what will be increasing massively over the next ten years. Will formal education be continuous or should it be a continuous period of 12 years, or 16 years if one takes post-secondary education? Maybe the human animal cannot really accept that much continuous formal education and there should be a break at Grade IX or Grade X. The work-experience programs are an example. Or a mandatory break after high school or after Grade XI before proceeding further.

I think that if we do this and make these decisions, Mr. Speaker, then the rest will fall into place. But if we start by trying to decide what the curriculum should be in Social Studies and then work back upwards, we will never reach any useful conclusion. We will be bogged down in administrivia -- in other words if we want a picture, don't put the window frames on the school before you paint the background on the canvas.

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-35

I have done a fair amount of reading, Mr. Speaker, on the question of what are the aims of education. Quite frankly, my readings suggest that these discussions are among the duller and perhaps the most fruitless that I have ever found in human literature. They are what we see personally, they are very much subjective. Whatever the ideal aims of education, Mr. Speaker, they certainly are not found in a school. Because education is an individual thing and schools necessarily are collective entities. So let us bear that in mind to start with.

In the last analysis it may be, Mr. Speaker, that everybody educates himself, whether he goes to school or not. The extent to which one finds education in a school varies, I suppose, on his or her individual ability, his drives, his motivations, the location in which he lives, the socio-economic class he is in, and maybe even the luck he has regarding the capabilities of the teachers in the 12 years.

In exploring the goals of education, perhaps we should look at some of the goals that have been mooted in the community and in Alberta recently.

Firstly, some people say education should be really a part of the gross national product, that education, and that an educated person is a cog in the industrial machinery of a country or a province and should be measured in that way as part of a graph or chart. We know a great number of young people today object to that, and I think they may well be correct, and I would endorse them 100%.

Secondly, we have a group of people who suggest that really education is to enable one to sort of "do his own thing", for personal satisfaction in viewing and experiencing the world, and whether or not that person is part of productivity of the nation or the GNP is of no moment whatever.

Thirdly, some people say, no, those are both wrong. The real reason for education is training in a skill or trade or occupation or profession, and that's all.

And then of course, we get another group who say, "well you have to look at education because the world is going to be a pretty terrible place if we're going to be polluted throughout the entire world very soon." There will be atomic wars, there will be overpopulation, we have the ZPG people, and your thinking on that point is going to have a great variance on what you think education should be doing over the next ten years.

Others, of course, are more optimistic and say that we're now at a stage -- we're hopefully intelligent enough since we came down from the trees -- that we can enjoy and have more leisure, that we'll be able to end war and care for our environment and learn and adapt in a Darwinian way to our world, which may have just reached the edge of a cliff.

I'd like to refer, briefly, Mr. Speaker, to some statements and observations that are made by students these days. I think they are part of an equation which is sometimes missed. One notes, for example, in a western Canadian school one youngster in high school was asked, "what do you feel about school?" This young lady said, "School and the rest of my life seems to be a paradox. Out of school I'm a person, respected, and I know how to get things done. In school, for the most part, I'm just one of the kids. Respect for the individual person is lacking. I hope someday educators will start teaching for students instead of teaching at them."

Another student says: "People say school is a place of learning, and I suppose this is true, but what students learn is very different from what the school tries to teach. We learn our most

24-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

valuable lessons through association with other people, and not through the curriculum."

Now, Mr. Speaker, some have indicated, and there are a number of research papers suggesting that schools today, or until very recently, have really been a reflection of the industrial model of society that we've had for the last 100 years. They make comparisons. For example, they say; "really if you think about it, a school is this: you assemble masses of students, and those are the raw materials; then they're processed by teachers, and those are equivalent to the workers; in the centrally located school and that is the factory. Several people have suggested that this is the derivation of our present school system, and in, for example, Galbraith's book, this is suggested as well. What this, of course, has is as its hallmark, this kind of organization, is a regimentation, a rigid system of seating, of grouping, of grading, of examinations, of marking, and a degree of authoritarianism in the teaching and professional staff.

What sort of changes could be made? Well there are things like mobile education. The concept that education doesn't simply take place, or shouldn't, in a classroom. The concept of attaching a bus to every school as really part of that school and part of the classroom activity, taking youngsters out of school at all grades, not only to observe the world around them, but to participate in it.

Then, there is the concept of who should do the teaching. I don't endorse the concept that only certificated teachers can teach in the schools of Alberta, because it seems to me that in the community we have professional people, people with skills, people with any number of occupations who should be available to come into the schools and assist under the guidance of the teacher in showing students, and relating the abstractions of what they learn in the text book to the real life outside. This may be the real problem and the real challenge of the next few years.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I think of that famous educator, John Dewey's statement in 1937 about the schools, when he said: "School education is but one educational agency of many, and at best, is in some respects, a minor force." Now, what about the concept of learning -- a difficult idea to approach. We note today, that increasingly, parents and students and individuals are constantly changing their jobs, their residence and their social ties. Surely, we cannot really be training students much longer for endlessly repetitive jobs, but I think, perhaps, youngsters should be trained in future to make critical judgments, to weave their way through novel environments. I think it is perhaps no longer sufficient, Mr. Speaker, that students simply study history to understand the past; it is difficult enough sometimes to understand the present, it is moving so quickly. Some students have said to me, "We are living anachronisms in the world of 1972."

Perhaps we have to engender in students an ability to learn to anticipate the directions and the rate of change; to make repeated long-range assumptions; maybe even instead of organizing teaching the way it is now -- around fixed disciplines of English and social studies and mathematics and biology, that should be changed to rotate around the life cycle of man -- or courses in birth, childhood, adolescence, marriage, career, retirement and death. Maybe these are the new guidelines or parameters for curriculum study. Maybe we should be studying, instead of these things I have mentioned, things like logic and probability, philosophy and aesthetics and mass communication, because these will be the assets needed for a student in the years to come.

I think we probably have to teach students how to discard old ideas and how and when to replace them. This requires, of course, a

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-37

student to have some understanding of his own values. But really, it means that students have to learn today, perhaps, how to learn, how to unlearn, how to relearn, how to classify and reclassify information, how to move from the concrete to the abstract very quickly, and maybe how to teach himself.

Someone said -- and I am unable to find who did -- "Tomorrow's illiterate man will not be a man who cannot read; he will be a man who has not learned how to read." That may be the key to education. We must have students who will be able to make successful choices, who can be forewarned as to what is going to happen in future weeks and years -- perhaps the game of three-dimensional chess will be part of a curriculum because there is a game which teaches learning by looking ahead. We have to teach students, I think, how to speculate freely and how to create curiosity and awareness.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it may be thought that some of these ideas are far out. That has been deliberate. Perhaps some of my remarks have been provocative, and that has been by design. Maybe there are inconsistencies, and these will appear on purpose. Because this is the only way we can look at the broad issues of education. As I said earlier when I started, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of talking today was not so much to produce action, as to provoke thought. I hope I might have done that. I invite other hon. members to offer any comments they have, and there are indeed many in this Assembly who are able and knowledgeable. One thing with all the inconsistencies of education is clear, and that is all of us here have a stake in education because we are trustees for Alberta society in the decades ahead.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word or two in connection with Bill No. 19. First of all, I enjoyed the discourse given by the hon. Minister of Education. I think he spent a lot of work and a lot of study in preparation. I believe we have to be analyzing education all the time. I don't think we can assume that everything in the past was bad and that everything in the present is good, or vice versa. There have been tremendous advances in education, and at the present time I think we have gone too far in specialization of teachers.

I was speaking to a school board a short time ago and suggested that it would be logical in this particular village to combine Grades I to VI and the board said, as a matter of fact the school superintendent said, "Who could we get to teach Grade I to VI?" I recall during my lifetime where I had 11 grades and 40 pupils in a country school. I know other teachers who had heavier schools than that, and most of those youngsters have gone on and have made a place in life and they are the present generation of today. Teachers today have specialized to the point where they want to teach one subject. It's nice from a teacher's point of view. In my last teaching days I, too, preferred to teach one subject or two subjects. It was much more enjoyable, not exactly the same challenge but there is still a challenge there too.

But I think we have specialized to the point today where the desire of the teacher has become paramount rather than the ultimate good to the boys and girls. There is a lot of incidental learning in the old country school, a lot of incidental learning that was good. A teacher who had 4, 10, or 11 grades utilized the older students to teach, to mark. They secured an experience that they otherwise would not have secured, and it became a pretty valuable experience. Each class was refreshed with the material of the other class because in a classroom of 30 or 40 students and 10 or 11 grades, it is almost impossible not to listen to an interesting lesson going on in another division or another grade.

24-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

I think one of the things that I would like to see the hon. Minister of Education pursue in regard to teaching, because the whole educational system revolves around the teacher, the success of the school to a large degree revolves around the teacher. I would like to see the Minister of Education use his influence to have some of the old courses revived where teachers are specialized to teach division I, grades I, II or III or divisions 2, 4, 5, and 6, or the intermediate school, grades VII, VIII and IX, or even grades I to VI, because this would be one of the greatest advances in doing away with the trend towards centralization that we have today. You have to have teachers, and if we are going to have any consideration for the taxpayer, grades are going to have to be combined in many of our rural areas and it is going to be necessary to have grades I to VI in some schools. The buildings are there, the students are there, and what we need now are teachers who are prepared to teach the subject matter in grades I to VI.

I think that our universities who are teaching our teachers could well spend some time in organizing the teaching of a number of grades. I think this is essential if we are going to make real advance in doing away with the centralization trend which I think has gone far enough. I think, I shouldn't say I think, I believe, and as far as I have been able to ascertain, the centralization of schools has gone to the point where it is now being resented by many parents. And I don't think any of us support the idea of boys and girls spending an hour and a half or two hours on a bus. It takes from their home life, it takes from their school life, it is wearying, it is tiring, and it is even dangerous. And if we are going to reverse that, particularly for divisions 1 and 2, and maybe for the intermediate school, we can provide an equal education in my view, and perhaps a superior education in schools with grades I to VI equal to that where there is only the one grade with the one teacher. I do think that is going to have to be some time spent on this. There may be some resistance on the part of some teachers, because the desire is to teach one subject, to specialize, to become a complete master and a specialist.

The other point I would like to see our time spent on in our teaching facilities is on the psychology of childhood. When I went to normal school I believe I had the advantage that perhaps many others did not have, in the fact that the late Dr. E.W. Coffin was the principal of the Calgary Normal School. He was a tremendous psychologist, and a tremendous man when it came to understanding a child before you tried to teach the child. If there was anything he drilled into the hundreds of students that he taught and sent out to the schools of Alberta in the hungry 30's it was the fact you cannot teach every child the same way. That if you are going to be successful in teaching there has to be an understanding of each particular child. Many teachers in the old rural school made it a point to visit every home at least once a month so they could see the home environment, the home background, and they became better teachers because they did that - they also became better fed because invariably the farmer invites you to stay for dinner - but the main point was to see the home environment of the child. And without knowing the home environment a teacher is not able to teach as well as he could if he or she does know that environment. I think there has to be more time spent on psychology, the psychology of childhood, the psychology of adolescence, the psychology of teaching. Whenever I hear a teacher say, "I hate psychology" I shudder, because I don't know how that teacher can ever be a success in the classroom if he or she doesn't make it a point to study each one of the pupils whom he or she is charged to teach.

The hon. minister posed the question: "What do we expect from education?" I remember in the old enterprise days when the enterprise system came into favour and we had special summer school courses for teachers to learn how to teach the enterprise way. You did it through projects, and you did it through committees. This was

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-39

strange at the time, but after a few projects, and a few lessons, and a few weeks on a project where you got the group and the grade or the division from a point where they didn't know anything about the subject to the culmination - there's a lot of satisfaction and there's a lot of incidental learning in the enterprise system. Some claim the enterprise system was not successful, I think the enterprise system was successful, but that it took a better teacher to teach the enterprise way than to teach simply the straight three R's. I don't think we'll ever get to a place where it will not be necessary to learn the tools, so then we can do our own things. I believe it's essential for the younger boys and girls to have that guidance; they have not yet reached the age that they know what tools they need. They need the three R's and they need the tools that will enable them to delve and to do the things they want to do later on. When we get to the high school stage I think we've reached a different period, where boys and girls then have a general mastery of the tools. And then we sometimes say to them that if you want to be a nurse you have to pass trigonometry or analytical geometry, and I know people today who are housewives who were disillusioned and frustrated, who didn't proceed with their chosen profession of nursing simply because they could not understand, could not comprehend some of the higher mathematics. They had no interest in math whatsoever, and I'm not sure at all that successfully passing a course in trigonometry is going to make a young lady a better nurse, or a doctor a better doctor. The important subject, I think, are those which are inviting and which the person himself chooses. So I rather lean, in a way, towards some of the newer methods, where young men and young women are able to do their own thing, to pursue the thing that interests them the most, to pursue the subjects that they want to follow, to study the subjects that have an interest for them, that will make them realize their greatest potential in that particular field.

We must have the tools before the freedom and, I think, our educational system now is leaning that way, is leaning that way perhaps too far in some cases, but perhaps the pendulum has to swing too far before it comes back to a proper balance.

The young people of today, I believe, have greater advantages than they ever had in the history of the world in regard to educational facilities. They have highly trained and competent teachers. We have more degree teachers in Canada today than we've ever had in the history of Canada. 20 and 30 years ago, many people were able to teach with third and second class certificates. Many of them were excellent teachers because they learned the psychology of teaching, but today the teachers, who have the same privilege of learning the psychology of teaching and the additional training, should become tremendous teachers, and the boys and girls should benefit from that education. But I think we have to realize that we are living in a different age today. You don't teach Grade XII today like you did 20 years ago. They are young men and young women, maybe several years older than their years, compared to people of the same age 20 years ago. So they should have some choice to pursue the things they want to; and I think we should watch some of the experiments, particularly one in Ontario and some in the United States, where colleges are now being conducted with the student deciding what he is going to study, deciding what his hours are going to be. One of the amazing things that came from a school in Toronto, a student who was there was telling me this -- that he never worked so hard in all his school days as he did at that school, because he was pursuing the thing he wanted to pursue and he became an excellent student -- excellence became his goal in that particular thing. He was not being forced to study something because it said so in a curriculum. I think we have to lean this way, where our young people are given a choice to study the things that appeal to them most. I think the education of our boys and girls is one of the most important items that will be discussed in this Legislature. It is one of the most important items in the future of this province and in

24-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

the future of this country, and I am very pleased that the hon. minister took time to outline some of the trends in education. And I think every hon. member has a responsibility too, to make sure that we leave no stone unturned in using the best of the past and the best of the future, so that boys and girls in our schools today can reach their highest and their greatest potential.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly am in agreement with what the hon. Member for Drumheller has said, and it's true that our system of education must change, and we must recognize that the young men and women coming into the system now are far greater advanced than when we chose to go to college and university.

But there is one problem that has not been brought out and that is the problem in the rural areas where the children have to go through the very severe, trying days of getting an education. And I'm referring especially in my constituency where children have to go onto a bus at 7:05 in the morning. They have to walk a half mile first before they get there and they do not get off the bus in the evening until 5:20. Mr. Speaker, I believe a person riding a bus for one hour and forty-five minutes, especially a child of seven or eight, or even a high school student, returning at 5:20 in the evening does not have sufficient time to do his studying and most of the time he is also expected to do some homework, and still expected to get up next morning and meet the bus at five minutes after seven.

The thing I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, is clearly this. In my area, people living on the east side of the North Saskatchewan River are only five miles away from a beautiful consolidated high school that has, I think, all the accreditation of most of the high schools in the Province of Alberta, and yet these students, because they live in another jurisdiction, have to go 30 miles on a bus and spend one hour and forty-five minutes on this bus through all the hardships of the spring and the blizzards in the winter time, to get their education.

Surely, I think, we must be able to convey to the local jurisdiction, although we would like to have them run their own business, certainly they should, in all the sake of humanity and for the sake of these children, at least give some consideration to having these children attend the school nearest to them. Just because they happen to be in another jurisdiction does not mean that they must go through all the other hardships to get their education and go to a lesser standard high school.

I certainly hope that the hon. minister will do something, and I think he is aware of it. I'm going back again this weekend and I know that I'm going to be confronted with the same thing. I have spoken to both authorities to try and get together to alleviate the hardships on those children. I certainly hope that we can resolve it, but I know that this happens not only in my constituency, there are other constituencies in a like manner and I know that in the constituency of the hon. Member for Stony Plain, there are children that are getting on the bus at 10 minutes after 7 -- trying desperately to get an education. I think we must realize that these children should not ride that distance to school. I know in the constituency of the hon. Member for Stony Plain they drive a distance of over 35 to 40 miles on a bus to get an education, and in this case these pupils in my area probably have to go somewhere else. They are 30 miles from the river, and I think the hon. Member for Drumheller will know that he at that time, being Minister of Lands, opened that bridge. They have the bridge crossing there, and the pupils living just on the opposite side of the river have to go 30 miles to a school to get an education. Now this has to be the worst crime that we can commit on those children.

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-41

I thought, Mr. Speaker, I'd bring this to the attention of the House because I do believe that we have a responsibility to these children, not only to those children in my area, but I know that in the rural areas of Alberta we have other students in the same situation.

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Education has put quite a bit of work in Bill 19 to try and bring out a new direction for education in Alberta. I concur with what the hon. Member for Drumheller has said, and also what the hon. Member for Drayton Valley has said.

This afternoon I'm going to speak on the democratic system of getting our children to know what the democratic process is all about. If democracy is going to survive in the modern world, it demands a thoughtful and informed electorate. Thinking minds are developed by a good liberal education. The emphasis of the previous administration seems to have been on enabling people to earn a living or improving their technology while badly neglecting the development of minds for the pursuit of a democratic process. A whole generation has grown up in this province with a distorted philosophy of education. We have at the present time high school children who do not know what the machinery of democracy is about. Certainly the necessary skills and training for holding a job must be made available to the population in general and this proposal would seem to facilitate that. But I hope that it could also provide something more for the average mind than has been done in the past. The adults of Alberta have some catching up to do for adult training.

I would then ask -- does this plan better enable our universities to be societies that flourish new ideas -- and does it facilitate the incorporation of these new ideas into a wider society outside. Does it, in short, provide a better educational organization for the upgrading of adult educational standards in a liberal as well as technological and practical field.

The previous administration, I believe, erred badly by placing the teaching profession under the Labour Act. This should have been changed and it has led to bitterness and friction between professors, administrators, school teachers at local levels. I think that to achieve a better educational philosophy we must look seriously at this change in the act. In the past seven months, school strikes we had in northwest Alberta, Bow Valley were probably started by this. I would hope we can act quickly before similar damages are not done on our post-secondary education.

The hon. minister, a couple of weeks ago, proposed that we be looking seriously at school books made in Canada. I think there is a contribution, because we have lacked badly before for actual books produced in Canada for Canadian education -- for Alberta education. It has been American oriented and I think we have failed badly in this regard.

We have, in my constituency, children -- as the hon. Member for Drayton Valley said -- being bussed about 35 to 40 miles because of the theme of decentralization. I don't know if we should think of going back to decentralization, but centralization has certainly played a major role in its effects on rural Alberta. The children in my hamlet ride approximately 35 miles to school, some of them on the south side of Lake Wabamun have further than that to go and it is a hindrance. One of the biggest hindrances is the rural road conditions.

I think that is about all I have to say, except I would like to read into the record what Dr. Claude Bissel said last year at a lecture he was at in Edmonton:

24-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

"The justification for liberal education is that it provides an opportunity for cultivation of the mind which is no less honourable a goal, than cultivating of the body, and it creates a society in which, from time to time, individuals make discoveries or enumerate ideas that help all of us to live more securely and more wisely. One of these due justifications is that second is far more important. The university should be a society that nourishes new ideas and men and women through these ideas come. It is a society that should come for a model of the wider, outside society. This is crucial to the strength of our universities, but it is where the university falls short of the new idea. The universities, as our society, should be of particular concern to those who teach and study the liberal disciplines, for it is the liberal disciplines above all, that strive to enumerate concepts of community, of how men should live, both with themselves and with others."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MP. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, there are just about three comments that I would like to make with regard to Bill No. 19 which is before the House. I appreciate the fact the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane is pleased I am only going to make three comments. Please don't count that the first one.

Might I say, as far as the bill is concerned, I would be interested in hearing from the hon. minister and to use the term the hon. Member for Stony Plain just used, what new directions are specifically set out in this particular bill? We have had the opportunity of sending it to some members of the teaching profession -- people interested in education. The major response that we have got is the question, really, what is the reason for including section 3B especially in the legislation, because in fact the minister has the power to do this previously under the old legislation. Is it a matter of simply putting this in the legislation rather than doing it through regulation? I would be very interested in the hon. minister's comment on that, because as I interpret the old legislation there was that authority through regulation.

The second comment that I would like to make deals with the comments made by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley, who is not in his seat at this time. There are many occasions in the course of the session that his remarks rather make me wonder. But on this particular occasion I say to the hon. member and to other hon. members that the hon. member touched on a real problem that is prevalent in a number of areas across the province. This matter is the matter of youngsters living on the very edge of a school division or a school jurisdiction, having to go many miles to a school in their own jurisdiction rather than going just a few miles to a school in the jurisdiction neighbouring.

All the legislation that we passed in this Assembly is not going to enforce common sense upon school trustees, or chambers of commerce, or local interest groups in various areas. I simply say that I appreciate the problem the hon. member refers to, but I suspect that one of the areas that the present hon. minister and I might agree upon, is that many, many of the groups that come to the hon. minister's office want the hon. minister to step in and say you must take our children over here and so on and so forth. And you have to go along with having a locally elected school boards working out something there or not. It is frustrating, and the member's problem is frustrating, but nevertheless, those are the rules of the game as we have it now. If the rules aren't right, we'd better change them.

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-43

The third area that I'd like to comment upon, and I see a smile beginning to appear on the face of the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane, deals with a few of the comments made by the hon. Member for Stony Plain. I'm looking forward very much to the estimates of the two Departments of Education, and will have some comments in that area with regard to educational philosophy and education direction. I've heard many things said about education in this province over the past number of years. I've even had the opportunity of being to one or two conferences outside the province. I even had the opportunity of chairing the Canadian delegation to an OEDC conference in Paris. And at that conference, we dealt with this question of adults and continuing in life-long education. I was a bit surprised there to find that, other than Sweden, that Canada wasn't doing too badly and that among the provinces in Canada, Alberta is in most regards, head and shoulders above other provinces in what's going on in the field of adult and continuing education. And so I look forward to the hon. member participating in the debate when we come to those estimates in either the Department of Advanced Education or the Department of Education. And I was rather interested in his remarks about Canadian content, and how for many years, we've used too many books made outside of Canada. I think he named the United States. I support the move that the minister talked about a week or two ago in greater Canadian content. But I also would commend to the hon. Member for Stony Plain some work done by that organization the government is phasing out, the Human Resources Research Council. And if you check there, under a Dr. Sabey, who was working at the research council, you'd find that a project known as Project Canada West was commenced, and the Alberta Human Resources Research Council, in co-operation with the Department of Education, was instrumental in getting the four western provinces together to develop for the first time in Canada, courses of study and information to assist teachers on urban problems in western Canada. And so I wouldn't want you to think for very long, that this question of Canadian studies and Canadian content just came upon the scene as of the 31st of August or the 10th of September. I'd commend the reading on Project Canada West to you as either bedtime reading or early morning reading. You'll find it interesting either time of the day.

One of the latter comments the hon. Member from Stony Plain made with regard to the question of the teachers being in the labour force -- No, this isn't the fifth point I'm raising, for the information of the hon. Member for Banff-Cochrane, this is just the fifth section of the third part. The hon. Member for Stony Plain dwelt on the matter of teachers under The Labour Act. I'd point out to the hon. member the teaching profession and school boards have operated under The Labour Act in this province for many, many years. Secondly, I'd point out to the hon. member that when The School Act was revised two or three years ago, there wasn't very much representation made by the teaching profession, the trustees or other groups, to have the teaching profession removed from The Labour Act completely, as far as negotiations were concerned. It should be pointed out that there was some question, though, on the matter of regional bargaining, and the question really came down, should The Labour Act, in its entirety, apply to negotiations between teachers and trustees, or should it be exempt from some places, and previously it had been exempt from regional bargaining.

I would say that if you'd care to go back and check the transcripts of the hearings before the Legislature, you would find that the government at that time had the support of a number of eminent members who sat in the opposition. I think you'd find a speech -- and I don't know the page right off hand -- by the present Minister of Tourism, who just happened to have been a school trustee for Jasper Place -- the town of Jasper. I apologize, Mr. Young, I apologize, Jasper, in the National Park. But he got up and strongly supported the concept of regional bargaining. Now some of the other members -- I'm not sure whether they spoke or not -- but it is interesting to note that on this matter that you have rather strong

24-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

feelings. That there was not a standing vote on the matter of regional bargaining. The now Premier, at that time, if I recall the discussions properly, commented on the plebiscite matter on two or three occasions, that not even the now Premier made a comment with regard to the problems of regional bargaining. If I have made a mistake, sir, I am sure you will correct me.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the debate on The Department of Education estimates and The Department of Advanced Education, but I would ask the hon. minister to comment for a moment or two on the matter I raised first. That is, what is the new direction here? As I understand Section 3 of the act it really is a matter of changing from regulations to legislation, and I'd be interested in knowing the new direction involved there.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks, more in line of a question than a suggestion, to the hon. minister. I was most pleased to hear his talk, I thought it was a good constructive talk, and an encouragement to hear, as far as the educational field in our province is concerned. He touched on something which is very close to my thinking, and I think something the government in his department would do well to look into. It was the suggestion he made when he was speaking early in his remarks, that a student wishing to leave school and rather than to go on to university or technical school or college immediately after graduating from high school, if he could find himself a job for two years and successfully stayed on that job for two years; or if he took military training for two years, and then decided to go on to college; if some sort of credits couldn't be given to him at that time towards his course, that he might have picked up, if he hadn't decided to go the other route.

The other thing I feel, it would have a lot to do with a more mature attitude when he does decide to go to college or technical school. I feel, too, that military training is a good thing. I think we should encourage some of our young Canadians to take part in military training, or at least home defence training, or whatever else you want to call it, but something to do with our country. I think it has good effects, not only in patriotism, but in experience. I would be pleased, if the hon. minister, in his closing remarks would enlarge a bit on his suggestions. I was wondering if his department was giving any consideration to carrying out a pilot project, which I feel would be one of the first in Canada, and I think, a very worthwhile project.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate, just briefly, I think I am obliged to many members of the House for some excellent and productive observations on this general area of education. The remarks made, especially by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican just at this moment, are deserving of further study and in the concept of a pilot project, I think, is a useful one. I believe, we should, perhaps, move out from the area of feeling that a continuous 12 or 16 or more years of education in a theoretical way is really helping the learning process. We've got to more efficiently demonstrate to the student that what he learns in the abstract in text books can be applied and has a relationship to the real world. I think this may be one of the problems we have had. I think the suggestion, including that of military service, by the hon. gentleman for that riding, merits consideration.

Concerning the question posed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, I do believe that is more properly dealt with in Committee under Section No. 3. I assure him I will have detailed information for him at that time.

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-45

[Leave being granted, Bill No 19, The Department of Education Amendment Act 1972, was read for a second time.]

Bill No. 5, The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Amendment Act 1972

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Athabasca, Bill No. 5, The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Amendment Act 1972.

I hope that the hon. members will permit me to go into the history of this legislation in rather a brief way. This legislation was first introduced in 1947 as The Automobile Accident Indemnity Act. It set up what was then known as The Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. It also provided that a fee of \$1 would be collected on each application for registration of a motor vehicle. The legislation received numerous amendments over the years and a new act came into being in 1964, and this was known as The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act. This was the act which hon. members will recall set up the so-called green card legislation with the payment of a \$20 fee where you did not carry insurance. The act, of course, also changed the name of the fund to The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Fund. The green card legislation, of course, was taken out of the act last year effective March 31, 1972.

This matter of the cost to the province of this legislation has been raised in the questions on the Floor of this Assembly and perhaps it would be appropriate to mention how much it has cost the province over the period of some 25 years since 1947. And up to Dec. 31, 1971, the total receipts have amounted to \$16,542,310.56. Now those receipts are made up of the \$1 registration fee at the time of registering a motor vehicle and also the recovery made by the fund over this period of time. The fund has paid out on claims, some \$17,514,999.34 with the result that there is a shortage of \$972,000 approximately. In 1970-71 the shortage was actually was \$753,000 odd dollars which is the largest loss over that period of 25 years. With the introduction now of amendments to The Highway Traffic Act and The Alberta Insurance Act last year regarding compulsory insurance, it is hoped that the expenditures will be greatly reduced as a greater percentage of motor vehicles, it is hoped, will be insured. The act itself, of course, is designed to recompensate those who suffer loss, damage, or expense, and who are unable to recover from a guilty party.

The legislation that is contained in this amendment which has particular significance relates to claims under section No. 13 which is the hit-and-run provisions and last year from April 1, 1971 to March 8, 1972, there were 129 claims processed. Those are claims under \$500 and there had to be paid out some \$18,350 covering that item, and the additional amount of \$3,000 of costs. The amendments that are contained in Bill No. 5 are there there to streamline the procedure and particularly to take away the necessity of going to judgment in order for a plaintiff to obtain money from the Fund, in those situations of hit-and-run, situations where the department can find out and knows the exact situation and circumstances, so that the actual cost to the province is thereby cut somewhat.

I think the legislation in itself has been extremely useful in the province and its effectiveness from here on will depend on how effective the legislation is with regard to compulsory insurance.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on this act and first of all I would like to commend the government and the department for bringing in the major amendment contained in the bill. At the present time a person may claim from the Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Fund in two ways; one, if the person who is the cause

24-46

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

of the accident will assume that responsibility and sign the agreement with the department to repay the fund; then, the administrator of the fund may pay out of the fund the amount of the damages, etc. If there is any dispute, however, regarding the claim, then the only way to solve it is to take it to court, the court gives the decision, and payment is then made out of the fund in accordance with the direction from the court. The department had been considering, and I certainly had been considering, the necessity of making a further amendment in line with the one that the hon. member has brought in. Particularly on hit-and-runs, and once the principle is established there, it may well be adopted in other types of accidents. When the amount is under \$500, by giving the authority to the department -- to the administrator -- to pay that without the necessity of a court judgment, I think, is an excellent move and an excellent advance. So many of these claims are not exactly black and white, but through careful analysis of each claim I think reasonable and fair justice can be given and a great amount of money saved through fighting such cases through the courts, because somebody was at fault and in a hit-and-run case, in most cases it's very evident that the car that was parked was not at fault. To have to proceed to court on such cases appeared to be very unfair. So I think this amendment is very good and I commend the government for bringing it in. I think it will strengthen The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act and make a better act than it was before.

The second point I would like to deal with is the general principle of The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act. Only today a motorist said to me, "Surely now we won't have to pay our dollar into The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Fund since we have compulsory insurance." When I outlined to him that even with compulsory insurance there will be victims of automobile accidents who are not covered by insurance, he began to see the light. And that's exactly what the situation is. Even if every vehicle on the highways and streets of Alberta become insured there will be occasions when somebody steals a vehicle and it is not covered. Or somebody uses a vehicle that he places the wrong license plates upon and is not covered; and the case where people come into the province without insurance; and somebody is injured, somebody is killed. If there isn't a Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Fund then that person is left to charity and that is not right.

MR TAYLOR:

I remember the speech made by a member who later became the Lieutenant Governor of this province, the hon. Percy Page, in 1945 or 1946 in this Legislature, in which he outlined a case where a person had been run over by a driver. Incidentally the driver was intoxicated, but the girl was ruined for life and there was no recourse except through charity or through welfare. I remember his eloquent plea for some type of legislation that would enable a case like that to be looked after. I had a few examples too, and many other members did as well, and we were happy when The Unsatisfied Judgment Act came into being in 1947.

In connection with the deficit, this fund has been carried by the motorists of the province and in the final analysis I think it will be entirely carried by the motorists of the province who pay their one dollar into the fund every year. It's operating at a deficit now but after the two-year backlog of claims is over, that backlog will gradually be picked up and it will operate again in the black and we will repay the loans advanced by the Provincial Treasurer. In time it may even be possible to reduce the fee, three or four years from now, depending on the number of claims in the next two years. Certainly the number of claims from April 1st will be greatly reduced through the compulsory insurance features.

There is one other point with which I would like to deal, because there is so much misunderstanding on it. Many people claim,

April 7th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

24-47

"Why should I have to pay a dollar to the fund when I have my own vehicle insured." And yet there is actually really no other way of doing it. In Nova Scotia where the insurance industry took over the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, the insurance industry immediately put an extra charge on the premium of every person who was insured, and there is no other way the insurance industry could do it. Its really extending the insurance benefits because that's really what insurance was intended for, to cover those who have accidents.

I remember the industry coming to this province at one time and asking to take over the fund and requesting that it be permitted to take over the fund. I said to them that I was interested and I would like to hear your proposition, and if satisfied, I would certainly take it to Cabinet, I would take it to Cabinet anyway, but I certainly wanted to hear the proposition. The insurance industry pointed out that the first thing it would do would be to eliminate the special features that are carried in the Alberta Motor Vehicle Claims Fund. And those special features are hospitalization, for those who are injured, the payment of ambulance charges, the training of the widow whose husband has been killed in an accident, as a stenographer or hairdresser, etc. These are benefits that are very, very valuable. They said the first thing they would have to do would be to cut out these extra benefits. I said, "I don't like that, but that's understandable why you want to keep it comparable to that of other provinces." And I said, "What would you do in regard to the fee?" The representatives from Montreal said, without even flinching an eye or without any hesitation. They said, "We would immediately have to raise the fee to two dollars on every public liability and property policy in the province."

So really, by the province operating this over the years the policy holders of the province have been saved many hundreds of dollars. I don't know of a cheaper or better way of dealing with this type of a situation than through The Motor Vehicle Claims Act, than the way it is being done in this particular act. The amendment that has been brought in will strengthen the bill and make it a better act.

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to agree with the comments made by the hon. Member for Drumheller, the former Highways Minister.

I'm particularly excited by the amendment which will permit claims of under \$500 to be paid out without judgment. I think there will be four particular classes of people that will benefit because of this, and as a result, the citizens of the Province of Alberta and this Assembly will benefit.

The first, of course, will be the lawyers, and being one of them, I can speak on this point. A \$500 claim to be processed through the courts is nothing but a loss leader and a waste of time and a waste of money for most lawyers and I think they will all welcome the removal of this particular headache. The second, of course, are the courts. Now, the hon. Member for Stettler mentioned there were 129 cases handled in this fashion last year which had to go through judgments. Now you can imagine what happens when you have to tie up a judge, you have to tie up a courtroom, you have to tie up witnesses, you have to tie up clerks. The amount of administrative and judicial expense that this province and the government has to go through in prosecuting a case of this nature to the point where judgment is reached. Of course, the plaintiff, the person who suffers damages as a result of, and not being able to collect as a result of the other driver not having insurance also suffers to this point, and this will remedy it. The lengthy process that must take place before judgment is reached and monies paid will of course, again be eliminated. In all of these cases, as I understand it, the claims that are processed are uninsured claims. In other words they are claims where the person who has been involved in the collision is

24-48

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 7th 1972

suffering the entire brunt of the loss. He doesn't have an insurance company to cover his collision portion of the claim. So we have that person who is probably out of pocket anywhere up to \$500, who receives his funds sooner, and receives more of them, because he doesn't have to go through the lengthy process of a court action. And also, the last person, the fourth person along the line who will also benefit is the defendant. The person who is uninsured, who caused the collision, and who now does not wish to pay. Quite often this defendant is in some circumstances perhaps out of the jurisdiction, moves about quickly. This creates increased costs, and ultimately when judgment is entered and the judgment assigned to the administrator, his license is withdrawn. At this point a day of reckoning comes and he must then make arrangements to repay that judgment.

Well if we add on all these costs and all these steps we've gone through, this is all going to be paid by him. So this ultimately benefits the individual who was responsible and against whom the administrator will be seeking to collect and be reimbursed. So I think that this is very exciting legislation because it benefits all the various people involved and it's something that should have been done years ago.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, owing to the hour I beg leave to adjourn debate on Bill No. 5.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member leave to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until Monday afternoon at 2:30 p.m.

[The House rose at 5:30 p.m.]