

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA
Tuesday Evening, November 7, 1972

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

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Worth Report

Mr. Foster proposed the following motion to the assembly, seconded by Mr. King:

That the report of the Commission on Educational Planning be received.

MR. POSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased and very proud to move the motion standing on the Order Paper in my name, seconded by the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway. It is a privilege as a member of the Committee on Education to move this motion and say a few words about the Worth Report. It will not be my intention this evening, Mr. Speaker, to be long or, for that matter, to deal with the report in any detail. I will sketch brief outlines of the report and look forward to the discussion that I hope will take place. My fear, Mr. Speaker, it is not that I will bore you, but that many members of this House may not have read the report in the way and to the extent that I had hoped.

The commission was established, as you may know, in 1969 under Dr. Walter Worth, now the Deputy Minister of the Department of Advance Education and then a vice-president of the University of Alberta. I should comment on the matter of Dr. Worth while I have the opportunity. There were two views concerning Dr. Worth in this province at the moment. On the one hand, he is seen as the sole author and architect of this report. As a man who is now Deputy Minister, he is free to implement this report as and when he chooses. Those who fear some of the recommendations of the report, in a way, fear Dr. Worth. That says nothing for the role of the Minister, the Cabinet Education Committee, the Cabinet, the Caucus, or this House. I don't think that even Dr. Worth feels that his power, his authority, or his influence goes quite that far. On the other hand, there is a view, and it is a minority view, that the government is going to shelve the Worth Report or the Commission on Educational Planning, never to be heard from again, the process we are going through this evening is a mere exercise, and that Dr. Worth's appointment as a Deputy Minister of a department of this government is of no consequence whatsoever.

I really don't intend to respond or defend or applaud. But those views are there and I know they may be held by some of you. I would like to point out that Dr. Worth was one of eight authors and architects of the Commission on Educational Planning. Therefore it is in that sense perhaps slightly inappropriate that we refer to it as the Worth Report.

As you know, the task of the commission was huge. It was to investigate social, economic, and technological trends in our society, particularly the next 20 years; to examine the needs of all individuals of our society; to analyze our total educational requirements; and to recommend the future changes, structures and priorities necessary for a comprehensive educational system. Now I think you will agree that was and is a monumental task.

Between 1969 and roughly the early part of this year, the commission, with the help of 100 expert consultants, sponsored or co-sponsored dozens of hearings and studies around this province involving 36 public hearings and many thousands of Albertans, hearing some 330 major briefs, convening four large conferences, and launching three major task forces, which were made public in 1971. As the Minister of Education has reported to the House, the cost of the commission activities to taxpayers of this province to date is approximately \$440,000 not counting the printing or publishing of the report or the reader's guide. To put it in perspective, if that is possible, Mr. Speaker, the cost of the report to the Alberta taxpayer is roughly one 1/1000 of what the taxpayers of this province spend on education generally in this province in one year. By comparison, the Hall Dennis Report on elementary education in Ontario cost

\$645,000. And the Wright Commission Report on post-secondary education in that same province, which is still incomplete and has yet to report in its final form, is expected to cost some \$1.4 million.

In June of this year, the commission reported. I know that very shortly thereafter copies of the report, and I see a few in the House, were made available to all members of this legislature. It is an understatement to say that the Worth Report has been, since that time, the centre of substantial public discussion. As the Minister of Education previously reported, over 13,000 copies have been sold for \$5, a few have been given away, and roughly 1,000 beyond the borders of this province.

The Commission began its investigation by considering three basic questions -- and some of you have objected to these. First of all, what seems to lie ahead for Albertans. What seems to lie ahead. So the report talks about projections, trends, and forecasts. Secondly, what do Albertans really want to lie ahead. Thus the report talks about ideals, goals, and principles. And finally, among a great many others, what do we want to lie ahead. What do we, as Albertans, want to lie ahead. And so the report talked about support, adaptation, and change.

I would like to make a few comments on the first task: what seems to lie ahead. On the basis of evidence that the commission assessed and special research, the commission made some projections, some trends, and some forecasts. I would briefly like to list them for you, because they are the trends, the predictions, and forecasts of what seems to lie ahead for all of us and may be some measure of our determination in dealing with this report tonight and the legislation that we will have to consider in the years ahead.

First of all the report said that the Alberta population will double to more than three million people by the year 2005, and that the under 25 age group will decline from 51%, which it is at the present time, to something approximating 43%. The commission found that 80% of the population will be urbanized by 1980 as opposed to 71% now, increasing to 90% by the year 2005. Now I ask you, is this the kind of Alberta we want to live in? Is this the kind of future you would choose for yourself?

The report felt that the per capita income would increase from approximately \$3,000 this year to \$4,500 a decade from now, and to \$13,800 by 2005. The conclusion was drawn that the influence on our lives of religion, work, marriage, and the family will decline. Some of you have spoken to me about that specific future forecast, and I think you have felt that on that basis you did not like the report. I don't blame you. I think that on that basis you may have judged the report. I think you are wrong. The report is saying in that category what seems to lie ahead, not what will lie ahead. The report suggests that mental illness, crime, drug abuse, and alcoholism will increase. And again we must ask ourselves, surely this is not the Alberta we want for ourselves, for our families, and for our future. The report concluded that tensions between rich and poor, between young and old, between French and English, between red and white, between management and labour will all increase. That's precisely from the report. Again, we ask ourselves the question.

The report also concluded that part of what seems to lie ahead is that the use of computers in our homes and schools will become common in the 1980s and very widespread 20 years from now. We see this happening right now. It felt that school attendance will be much curtailed by 1990, and that telecommunications technology will, and it is at present, moving education out of the schools into the homes. It also concluded rather interestingly enough, that by the turn of the century the use of chemicals to improve memory and to assist learning will be common. Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the things, because there are many others, which the Commission on Educational Planning said seem to lie ahead. The commission reminds us in their report, and I emphasize it again, that these are forecasts. and projections. They are not necessarily guarantees of tomorrow. And I hope that the discussion that will take place here this evening will touch on the future's forecast.

The Commission of course couldn't stop there. They had to go ahead as they were charged, to assess what Albertans want to lie ahead. This they have done. The report deals with it and I hope that we will as well.

Following the receipt of the report in June of this year, the Cabinet Education Committee, of course, was very anxious that a feedback arrangement be established across this province; that the report get into as many hands and to as many groups as possible; and that people read it, study it, think about it, and respond to it. One of those groups was an organization of young people who, on their own initiative, chose to call themselves Catalyst. This was a group of

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

71-3

some eleven students. The two major leaders of the group, selected by the cabinet committee, one from the university community, one from the college community, who were given very broad terms of reference: "Here is the report," they were told; "We would like to know what the student community in this province thinks and feels about it and want to hear from you in four or five months." That was about all. With the assistance of Mr. Larry Shorter, who is with us this evening, they have, in my judgment and in the judgment of my colleagues in the cabinet committee, worked very thoroughly and very well in the last four months to assess, to encourage, to initiate, to activate response from the student community, and to report to us as soon as possible, preferably by the October 15 deadline.

While I'm on the subject of a deadline, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can make a couple of comments about that. It was our view, Mr. Speaker, that unless a deadline were established, there would be many people in this province, who, a year from now would be saying, "We have not yet had the opportunity of reading or assessing or responding to the Worth Report." We felt it appropriate -- I do not say this in defence of the deadline, but it's valid to comment -- that we must set a deadline; that it must be one of a short time frame; that we must somehow convey to Albertans that we were sincere in our attempt to have them respond to this report. At the same time we also wanted to respond with their reaction and get on with the job. There have been many people in this province who have complained that the October 15 deadline is too short. To them we have replied, "We agree. And so we're quite prepared to have you make your submissions to the cabinet committee, to myself, to all of us, after that time. But please attempt to get something into our hands concerning your views as quickly as possible." I really think that for all of the reaction and criticism, Mr. Speaker, we have succeeded, and I'll deal with the briefs in a moment.

The cabinet committee therefore, was, with the assistance of Catalyst, encouraging reaction and response from men and women, from students, from people all over this province. Throughout the summer catalyst held meetings in institutions, in shops, in small towns, on street corners, wherever they could find students. They completed some 3500 questionnaires, interviewing thousands of students. It's rather interesting from our meeting with them a few days ago to discover the student community, and perhaps this is typical of the Alberta committee, went through four distinct phases in developing a response to the Worth Report.

First of all, they were somewhat cynical at a time when they had heard about the report but had not read it. They then became skeptical as they heard something about the report, but still they had not read it. The third phase, after they began to read the report, think about it, talk about it, they began to show interest. Finally, and this is not the final stage I'm sure, they began to show caution and some reaction, having read the report and were now seriously beginning to deal with it.

I would like to, on behalf of my colleagues in the Cabinet Committee on Education, Mr. Speaker, publicly thank the members of the Catalyst organization for what we consider to be a very excellent job in the work they have done with students. I have a very long and detailed brief from the students, as we all do on the Cabinet Education Committee, which I would be quite prepared to discuss at a later time. The constraints of this evening do not permit it as I have a number of other comments to make.

Dealing generally with the response from around the province, I would like now to give you a sample of some of the reactions we have received from all corners of this province touching on eight or nine of the major topics dealt with in the report. And what I am now quoting, Mr. Speaker, is a summary of remarks made to the Cabinet Education Committee. It is not my intention, for obvious reasons, to indicate the names of these persons. I don't feel that that should be done, but I could give you some indication of roughly where they are from and perhaps, in some cases, what they do. On the report generally, there was a reaction from the University of Alberta where they say, "A mishmash of catch phrases and a piecemeal conglomeration of educational management ideas". On the other hand, one of the best known educators in North America responded and said, "All in all, it is a superb document".

From the University of Calgary: "The report is a botch job to a degree altogether remarkable".

There no doubt is, Mr. Speaker, a wide range of response and reaction to the various topics in the report, and I, as late as this evening, noticed the headline in tonight's paper about the reaction of the ASTA meeting in Edmonton.

71-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

With respect to the modified school year, this reaction from a small community in central Alberta: "Rural young people are needed at home in May and September. Failing this, the two best consecutive months for summer holidays are the two we have now". On the other hand, a comment from a person in education: "There is no need to reorganize the school year. It is stupid to try. What are you trying to do, break up the family?"

On grade 12 examinations, from a small community in southern Alberta: "Why base our marks on one single test? Give us a chance, man, and give us a rest". Continuing on the subject of grade 12 examinations, also someone from education: "To maintain the standard of our education, the principle of matriculation examinations should be retained. In cases where the number of applicants exceeds the capacity of instructional facilities a contesting entry exam should be used".

On the subject of teacher certification - and I am sure we will hear something about this this evening - from a small community in southern Alberta: "I would like to see certification requirements reduced to permit experts to teach in the classroom and teachers at any level to teach without degrees". From another small community in that part of this province this is teacher certification: "I question the feasibility of this proposal as I do not believe an impartial group can be formed to sit in judgment on teachers."

Well, I am sure that the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway is going to comment on the person-centered society, which is one of the main philosophies underlining the report. And on that there was a comment from Calgary that a person-centered society is not workable. We do not have enough people to do this individual teaching for the person-centered program. However, southern Alberta seems to be very well represented in the random sampling of responses, Mr. Speaker, because from Magrath there is a response: "I commend the report on this thesis, the freedom to do anything you wish and more sense than to do it".

I didn't realize this was such a serious and dull evening, Mr. Speaker. I really thought these were quite choice comments. I feel I should probably go back over them again.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You just can't tell a joke.

MR. FOSTER:

Concerning kindergartens, a comment from Calgary, Mr. Speaker. "I see no reason for kindergarten instructors to have a B.Ed. degree. Their talents should be in the area of arts and crafts and physical education. They should have unlimited patience and love of children. The organizers and supervisors of the program should be qualified teachers."

A comment from Calgary: "As a mother just recently moved to Alberta, I'm astounded to find no kindergartens or any program to prepare five year olds for grade one. This is urgent."

Concerning the Integrated Provincial Development Plan - and I hope you have read the report a comment from Leduc: "The preparation of an Integrated Provincial Development Program seems the most logical place to start implementation of the whole report. However, this proposal is the most threatening to all supporters of local autonomy. As an example, school trustees."

A comment from a school principal, concerning school councils: "A principal, in order to operate his school effectively, must be chairman, not executive secretary. The report suggests the principal should have two bosses. Decision making by such a group is slow and often impossible."

Perhaps I should interject here. As a layman, Mr. Speaker, working in the field of education, I am impressed among other things by two things and I say, as a layman: There is on the one hand a tremendous desire or movement towards change, I feel,, and on the other hand there is a tremendous resistance towards change. There is tremendous fear that change will be brought about somehow and not everyone will have been consulted, and I think that's one of the most interesting and fascinating aspects of the Worth Report.

A further comment from Medicine Hat on the subject of school councils: "The parents and students not only have the responsibility to help run schools and make decisions; they have the right."

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

71-5

A comment from both the University of Alberta and the University of Calgary on the matter of the reduction in degree programs: "We are concerned with the obvious effect that such a reduction in undergraduate preparation would have on admission centres to graduate schools."

The report, Mr. Speaker, as we all know, deals quite extensively with the matter of further education, and there are two or three comments that I would like to give you from around this province on that subject. Again, one from Calgary: "The report suggests that the taxpayers in business should be forced willingly to devote a large part of their earnings to free adult education. This type of dictatorship has no place in our society." From a much smaller community: "My husband and I are in our early forties and are in the process of selling our farm. We need retraining." And a comment from Central Alberta, from Ponoka: "I think it is parents who are most in need of education. They are operating schools in which children are taught crime and mental illness."

I'll conclude with two other sections, Mr. Speaker; one on educational opportunity and one on ACCESS in the Alberta Academy.

Concerning educational opportunity, a comment from Edmonton: "We firmly agree that schools for the mentally retarded should be incorporated with the regular school system. Then properly trained teachers, speech therapists, etc. would be available. Such is not the case today. If you, the members of the Cabinet Committee in Education, truly want to improve educational opportunities for each individual in Alberta, I urge you to consider legislative changes that would ultimately remove education from the control of government, legally, ideologically and economically, and let private educational institutions take over the job."

Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that there may be some members in this House who wonder why I am giving you a random sample of comments from around this province, and I am not giving you my own. We have gone to great lengths to get reactions from people across this province and I think you might find it quite interesting to hear some their reactions. My time to respond in substance on the report will come, and I am sure it will be prompted in some measure at least by the hon. members opposite me.

A comment on ACCESS in the Alberta Academy, from Drumheller: "ACCESS would involve a great deal of expense, and I question the effectiveness of TV from my experience as a classroom teacher." On the other hand, a comment from five students who wrote and said: "Our group can see the Academy becoming a fact in reality in a short period of time. Availability of education, disbursement of education, obsolete education and duplication of educational facilities are all serious problems which confront Albertans." And again on ACCESS in the Academy: "I most heartily endorse the proposals for a new type of educational opportunity to the Alberta Academy and ACCESS. It should go a long way towards meeting the needs of women, for instance". And one final comment on ACCESS from a gentleman in Edmonton: "ACCESS sounds like a golden goose that lays scrambled eggs."

Mr. Speaker, the response has been most encouraging, although it is sometimes difficult to assess where people's priorities are. There have been some 2400 questionnaires and letters received to date from private individuals. We have received some 80 briefs from associations across this province, some 34 briefs from publicly elected bodies and some 14 briefs from individual institutions. I have already indicated the costs of the commission. I can generalize and say that of the briefs, comments, questionnaires, and letters the vast majority of all seem to favour the 11 proposals set forth in the Worth Report, at the conclusion thereof.

The most favoured proposals - you might be interested in these - are: kindergartens and the headstart program, abolition of Grade 12 exams, further education, the revision of funding arrangements, modification of the school year, and the Alberta Academy and ACCESS.

On the other hand, some of the concerns which have been expressed, in three areas in particular - and this may be a matter of communication and understanding, but I can not judge that - the matter of Grade 12 examinations, the matter of the modification of the school year, and a reduction in the degree of length. A very strong support emerged from a free response category to the questionnaire that was sent out. This strong support emerged for support of kindergartens, revision of teacher preparation programs, better services for all exceptional children, educational leave for employers, life experience programs, and a rejection, Mr. Speaker, of the sales tax.

Now it is true, Mr. Speaker, that one decision was taken by government prior to the October 15 deadline, as it is called, and this has caused some

concern. This is the matter of the proposed dissolution of both the Universities and Colleges commissions. There is, I think, the feeling that somehow we were unfair in not at least waiting until October 15 to gain a reaction from the people of this province concerning that proposal. On the other hand, as I said in the House some time ago, the matter of the dissolution of the commissions was something with which we were concerned and which we actively inquired into for the past year, and while it was a subject dealt with in the Commission on Educational Planning it was not a subject which had not received a great deal of attention and study and time on our part. And the Commission on Educational Planning, in taking the view which it did, did nothing more in my judgment than affirm that decision which we were going to make in any event. For that reason, and for the reason that we felt it was fair that the people involved with the commission and the people in the university and college community should have notice as far in advance as possible, we felt we should move in this way.

At the same time it is very important that we understand that the Department of Advanced Education is currently going through a reorganization phase, during which we are accommodating as part of that reorganization the role of both commissions. And I was asked a question in the House yesterday on this subject, and now I want to comment a bit further on it. There is absolutely no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that we must carefully assess the relationship between the institutions on the one hand and government or a department of government on the other. There is absolutely no doubt, as we move towards an integrated post-secondary educational system on the one hand, we must be very careful and assess institutional autonomy on the other. I agree, I think it was with the Calgary Albertan, that it is surely a question of balance. In between, there must stand, as there stand today, members of the public in some relationship or role between the two. I have no feeling at the present time whether or not that should involve members of the institutions or others, but surely it should involve members of the public.

I take this opportunity to expand further on this, Mr. Speaker, because the matter of reorganization is dealt with in the report. It has been questioned in this House and I anticipate it will be dealt with in the course of remarks this evening.

Thus, we are concerned with establishing this balance. For those who are concerned that we may somehow, by the exercise of political authority, be threatening the existence or the autonomous nature of institutions, or that somehow we are challenging the academic freedom of these institutions, or that somehow we are threatening in any way the role of those institutions, let me assure you that that is not the intent, the desire, or the inclination of myself or the members of this government. It remains for time and study to determine what that relationship will be, and what organization will flow from the work we are doing. We are taking steps to ensure that that reorganization is done with the advice and comment of people from the entire advanced education community. I recognize the importance of that and I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of making that comment because I know it's currently of concern in this province.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to refer briefly to a recent commission study done by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, otherwise known as UNESCO. They established, not too long ago, an educational commission much like Alberta's educational commission. They visited some 23 countries, interviewed scores of educators, and solicited a series of special reports. The commission found, Mr. Speaker, that nearly all educational systems are antiquated, even, in their judgment, in developing countries. As a result the commission reported, and I quote:

The system finds it difficult to keep up with the demands of an expanding society. The people it educates are not properly trained to adapt themselves to change, and some societies reject the qualifications and skills being offered when these no longer answer direct needs.

Everywhere the commission looked it found students who were frustrated and confused by what the commission called a divorce between an outmoded education and the reality of the world around them.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, because in essence, that is one of the conclusions that Catalyst conveyed to us in terms of their assessment of the student community. The commission went on to conclude that all education should ideally be integrated with a workday life using flexible out-of-school approaches to make education start in very early childhood and end only with death. There must be a broad reform that makes the goal of education teaching people how to learn. The report concluded that only then can education equip people for

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

71-7

adapting to change and make it possible for them to keep updating their skills and knowledge. Such a flexible notion of education is hard to dispute.

Mr. Speaker, I referred to the UNESCO study because it sounds very much like the Alberta Commission on Educational Planning. Now I'd like to know what you think.

MR. KING:

I'd like to say first of all to the Minister of Advanced Education that while he is going to hear it King's way, it's from the Member for Edmonton Highlands. I am an as yet unfinished product of the Alberta educational system, and perhaps the hon. members in the House this evening can use my performance as a measure against which to judge the need for the Commission on Educational Planning for Alberta, or maybe as a measure against which to judge the potential of its recommendations. [Interjection] You mean you accept it wholeheartedly on that basis? I don't think I have felt as exuberant about education as Dr. Worth does since about Grade IX. Grade IX is the last year that I remember that I really felt excited about the process of which I was then a part, and continue to be a part of for some time, and I would like briefly to make a statement about that exuberance.

I have one general criticism of the commission report which I don't think is serious as long as it is appreciated, and I am going to try to help you appreciate it this evening. That is, it makes reference to some of what I would call liberal myths about our society. I don't think that any of the authors of the report accepted their myths in those entirety at the time that they were drafting the report, or that any of the recommendations which the report contains are based on a total acceptance of these; but I think that, in view of the fact that there has been reference made to them in the report, we should be aware of their presence there and we should react to the report in the knowledge that these things are a part of the context. The report says, for example, that "the poor are poor because of lack of education," and that is a direct quotation. It says that many people control their future; in fact, it says people control their future. I believe to a considerable extent that that continues to be true today in this province, but I also believe that it is not, in all cases, the trend in other developed countries; and that in many of the things that happen in this province, it is not the trend of our social organizations or our governments; and that it is not true to say that people control their future absolutely, in its entirety, or in instances related to the operations of government, particularly with respect to education.

The implications of all of the recommendations of the commission report can't possibly be known at this time. The report doesn't pretend to deal with all of the implications, and I think that it is important to acknowledge this at the outset of any debate or rather of dialogue, because I think this is what the commission report is trying to achieve. We have been offered what I think is a very comprehensive statement of the variety of futures, the variety of different future situations, future procedures, future processes that are available to us; but there is no pretence in the report, and the report should not be treated as though it is written in full knowledge of the implications of all of the recommendations that it makes.

There are four things that I would like to speak briefly about this evening. One is the futures perspective of the report, the second is what it says about decentralization of the educational system itself and of the social fabric of the province generally, the third is pluralism in the educational system, and the fourth particularly is early childhood education. I have a vested interest in that. The -- [Laughter] -- Not for myself particularly. It's our family's second income and I have a son, as well.

I would like to deal briefly with what the report says about the future. The section on alternative futures for the province is the result largely of a social science technique which is called the Delphi technique. I know this because I was one of the people who participated in the formulation of this section. Questionnaires were sent out to selected people throughout the province: people who had particular interests in different fields of social life in the province. These people were asked to predict, on the basis of conditions presently existing in society, what might be the nature of social organization 10, 20, 30 and 40 years in the future in the province. When they had completed these predictions, which in the first instance were based primarily on their own knowledge, interests, and perspectives, these were gathered together and synthesized. The common reports, for example in the area of politics, were then sent out to all of the participants who were asked to react to the comments that had been made by all the other participants in the technique. And it was on the basis of these reactions that the predictions

contained in the report were made. Now that explains two things that I think we must understand when we are talking about the predictions contained in this report.

The first is that in any case where you read a prediction, it is a prediction based on some greater or lesser degree of probability. It is not a statement that that is going to happen in the future in this province. It is a statement that, in their best judgment, people who are presumed to know believe that there is some chance of its happening. Now that explains, for example, why there are some predictions which are inherently contradictory. For example, the report says that there may be a growing emphasis upon generosity, sincerity, and service in human relationships. The same report also predicts that there will be a growing need for governmental regulations in interpersonal and intergroup relations and that there will be an increase in mental illness. Obviously, the two of them together, in the same time span, in the same province, must, to some degree, be irreconcilable. The reason that I wanted to refer to this briefly is that I am not sure that it was clearly stated in the report, and I wouldn't like to see a discussion of the report go ahead on the assumption that any of these predictions were going to happen in the province. The hon. minister made this point very well, I think. To say that these things may happen in the province in the future is not to say that they will necessarily, and it is in discussion of that that every citizen of the province has got to decide by himself and with his brothers what he wants for this province in the future.

I think that the report could have been a little bit clearer in attempting to explain why these conflicts existed in the section, and I think also that there should have been some further discussion of the implications of the human process in deciding which of these was likely to occur in the future in the province.

The other thing that concerns me with respect to their discussion of future perspectives, was that technological change could, in some cases, bring about exactly the opposite end to that predicted in the report. The use of fuel cells, computer systems, and new types of transportation could foster large scale decentralization, where in some cases the implication has been left that they will foster large scale centralization.

The third thing that concerned me about the discussion of the future, was that I think the report proceeds on a too restricted choice of futures. There is a third choice, I think, midway between the two that are presented in the report. The third choice, I think, is a more viable option than that which was chosen by the report. It has been best described, in my view, in a book by a young Canadian named Brian Hunter. The book is the Enemies of Anarchy, and I would commend it as associate reading with this report of the Commission on Educational Planning. My belief is that the report professes to reject one choice and to accept a second; but has in fact chosen to ride a third. Now I happen to like the choice that they are riding. I am a little concerned that they may be riding it unconsciously.

To move on to a discussion of decentralization very briefly: I like the concept of the Alberta Academy. I like the concept of ACCESS and the early ed. program or process. I like the concept of the regional learning centres, and I think all of them should be discussed further here and in the province as a whole. But one concern that I would draw to the attention of all the hon. members is that they have a great potential to enforce centralization upon the process of education in the province. They have not been articulated in their final form. I don't want to raise here the spectre that they will be used finally to enforce centralization. I am saying that in discussing any of these as concepts, they have great potential as a decentralizing and an equally great potential as a centralizing process in the educational system: where an Alberta Academy might be administered and where its technology might be directed primarily from the capital or from Calgary, and where its eventual appearance in the province would be as an octopus with tentacles reaching out into the hinterland, but with the body contained in a central location.

The thing that intrigued me most about the report on educational planning was the discussion of the integrated provincial development plan. I have spoken on the general topic before in the House, I expect to again in the future, and I am not going to go into it in detail this evening. I think that the integrated provincial development plan and the section on jurisdictional arrangements for which I read coterminous boundaries, rightly or wrongly -- is something which, for the greater security of the freedom of the rural and less densely populated sections of the province, must be considered very seriously. I was pleased that an initiative was taken here in terms of educational development, and I hope that it is an initiative that will be carried on by both departments of education, and taken up sincerely by other departments of the government.

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

71-9

I would like to speak briefly about decentralization with special reference to northeastern Alberta. It appears to be northeastern Alberta's day in the legislature today after our resolution this afternoon. We have in the northeastern part of the province an area which, in my view, is almost ideal for experimentation in many respects, including, I believe, the willingness, in fact the desire of the people to be involved in an experimental situation. Knowing many of the people up there, knowing I think much of their circumstances, I believe it is fair to say that they have reached the point where they desire to make something new and better for themselves and are willing to try new ways of doing it under new conditions. That can't be said for many other areas of the province, which, although they might like to change in some greater or lesser way the style of their lives, are not yet ready to give up the certainty of the way things are presently done for the uncertainty of the way things may be done in the future.

In northeastern Alberta we have, first of all, the Central Alberta Vocational Centre, in Fort McMurray, and lesser centres contained in Fort Chipewyan, Janvier, Lac La Biche, and Kikino. One of the things, which could be considered there, aside from the sum of the suggestions contained in the report on decentralization, would be the use of any of these facilities as a regional learning centre, a special outlet for the Alberta Academy, or a multi-campus community college. Again, I say that I think, because of the situation in which they presently find themselves, because of the nature of their population, because of their relative isolation from other population centres, because of their willingness to experiment, and because of the presence of facilities, it is an area which should be seriously looked at if either or both the departments of education are interested in implementing, on an experimental basis, any of the recommendations of the report.

The third thing that I would like to speak to, very briefly just to raise some highlights, is the question of pluralism as it is discussed in the report. With respect to the voucher system, I would simply like to say that I agree with the commission that no case has been made for or against it, and I would hope that it is an area of continuing consideration by both of the departments. My discussion here is based on my own personal belief that as much pluralism as we can build into the system is desirable for the students in the system and the population as a whole. I would like to see the voucher system considered carefully in this jurisdiction and with reference to happenings in other jurisdictions. I would like to see greater assistance to private schools. I would qualify that, though, by saying that it would have, in the future, to go hand in hand with a more careful evaluation of the curriculum that is used in these schools, of the standards of the teaching profession that are used in these schools, and of the ability of the products of these schools to continue their education outside of the private system or to go on to jobs.

The commission has made a comment about the position of separate schools that I would disagree with. I think that the position of separate schools in this province is safe, and I do not believe that it is incompatible with the human rights legislation, which is presently being contemplated by the House. I think that's a particular aspect of the debate that we will get into more fully when we debate that human rights legislation.

One of the things that I can see happening in the future is a combination of religious interests in the separate school system in any jurisdiction, and the abandonment of the public system altogether by religious people, whether they class themselves Protestants or Catholics, for what you might call humanism. I am aware currently of many Protestants in the city of Edmonton, who are taking advantage of the opportunity to educate their children in the separate school system because the ethical or moral perspective of the system as a whole, is as important as a particular religion class. While I would not like to see any particular action taken which would abruptly change the nature of the organization of separate schools in the province, I do think it is conceivable that we will see the evolution over time in this province, of one system which is religious, or Christian, without differentiating between the Catholics and the Protestants, and another system which is secular, non-religious or humanistic.

The desire for pluralism in a population, I think, is based on three things. One is a difference in ethical perspective, the second is an express difference in goals, and the third is a belief in the validity of different teaching methods. I think that the Commission on Educational Planning largely removes the validity of the third reason within the educational system of the province. The Commission on Educational Planning obviously hopes to engender more individualized programming and more localized programming within the state sponsored educational system. I think that the degree to which it achieves that desire for individualized and localized programming is the degree to which it

will remove the belief in different teaching methods as a justification for pluralism. I think that the second reason, that is, an express difference in goals, should be largely removed with the dialogue that follows upon the publication of this report. The Commission on Educational Planning has attempted, I think, for the first time in years in this province to articulate the goals of the educational process; while I can't say that they have succeeded completely to my satisfaction, or I think that, taking this as a base and developing on that base out of the dialogue that takes place here and among the public as a whole, we should reach a point of much greater clarity about the goals for which we have developed an educational system in the province. If it can be more clearly articulated, and if it can encompass more individualized and localized programming, I think that we will have removed a second reason for pluralism in the schools. But the first one is the one which I do not believe we will remove. It is the one to which I think the educational system and the government must continue to address itself, and that is the difference in ethical perspective. I think that the question of pluralism in the system will be much more clearly understood, and I would say tolerated when it is understood in those terms.

Very briefly, I would like to say, with respect to early education, that I am in favour of it. My wife has a bachelor's degree in early childhood education. I would not likely stand up here and say anything to the contrary. In spite of that, though, I would like to make a qualification. I am in favour of early childhood education and I am in favour of universal accessibility. I am a great believer in the potential of early childhood education to assist the children of disadvantaged families or children who are themselves handicapped in one way or another. I represent a constituency in which this is a very real problem for many of the people. The one thing that I am not in favour of, and would never stand in this legislature to favour, is compulsory attendance at any early childhood educational program.

I would like to read very briefly from a report, the findings of which I support. It may be that these gentlemen and myself will stand to be corrected over time, but I think they have raised some very real concerns. This is an abstract of research that was done by Raymond Moore and Dennis Moore, Professors of Education at Andrews University and the Hewitt Research Centre in the United States. And if I could quote briefly, Mr. Speaker,

Advocates of early schooling start from two legitimate points; the fact of incredibly rapid growth in the child's intelligence between birth and age five, and the need for the child's social development to keep pace with his intellectual maturity.

But then they go on to make two unjustified assumptions, that a child's intelligence can be nurtured by organizing it, and that brightness means readiness for schooling. According to the report, research has established that one of a child's primary needs in his formative years is an environment without tasks that will tax his brain, and another is a setting that provides warmth, continuity, and security. Normal school experience, say the authors, does not meet these needs successfully, and they go on to cite a number of reasons for this position.

I don't think their concern is incompatible with the position of the Commission on Educational Planning. Particularly they have said that brightness means readiness for schooling and they are concerned about the advocates of early childhood education who, when they are talking, are really talking about lowering the conventional schooling system one year. I would point out that when the Commission on Educational Planning deals with early childhood education, that is not what they are talking about. They purport to be saying, and I have no reason to doubt that this actually is in their minds, that the early childhood education process must be a very different one from the conventional schooling process. In the light of that, it would seem to me that this would offer many exciting and unexplored opportunities for education beginning in the home at an early age and involving as many volunteers in as small a community as possible.

I have read the Report, Mr. Speaker, and would love to comment on a number of other proposals that have been made in it. I will leave that for people who have other interests and are more competent than I am. The one thing that I would close on is the reiteration of my belief that the Commission has not intended to lay down any solutions for us for the next ten or twenty years. It has intended, and I hope that it will achieve in the minds of every Albertan, to open up the wide variety of possibilities and opportunities that are open to us, and it has sought to encourage, and I hope that it has had that effect, a dialogue, which will further the process that was begun in the report.

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

71-11

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to spend a little time this evening trying to discuss the Worth Report. The last couple of days I have been trying to stay in the legislature and at the same time spend some time at the annual convention of the Alberta School Trustees Association. This keeps one busy, just going back and forth and it also keeps one's mind in a state of confusion trying to decide which is the most important. The last couple of days I have heard a couple of very lively and scholarly dissertations on the Worth Report, so I hesitate at this time to even start, particularly, Mr. Speaker, when I look into the galleries and I see the school trustees here, the President of the Alberta School Trustees Association, administrators and so on. The experts are up there this evening, Mr. Speaker.

I think probably one of the greatest advantages of having a fall session of the legislature is that at least every two years the school trustees will be in the same city as our legislature is sitting; so therefore we will have a gallery of very enlightened people from time to time. I think this is very commendable.

The Worth Report has been with us for quite some time. It is difficult in speaking about it to know just where one should start. It just reminds you of a great big ball: you can see the thing is there, you would like to pick it up and carry it and get someplace with it, but it is so huge you don't know where to start on it. There are no handles. You don't know just what to do. It is just that type of a thing. Everyone says, "Well, where do you start on it? Everything is important and many things are unimportant." But obviously it is there. It is a massive report. It is difficult even to understand in many areas what the intent of the report was and certainly it is difficult to understand what the intent of many of the sections are. This has been borne out by a couple of the talks that I have heard recently.

Now a large percentage of the proposals in the recommendations of the Worth Report are not necessarily new, but I think one of the big tasks is to find the recommendations that are good. Let us make them operative. This is one of the big things. In many ways I look at the Worth Report and almost figure it is a sort of welfare scheme. You know, we want more. We want more for the rural, we want more for the Indians, we want more for the Metis, we want more for the lower-income, more for the underprivileged. Everybody seems to want more, so in that sense no one is satisfied. No one has enough. Everybody should have just a little bit more. The costs of implementing the programs in the Worth Report-- to me they are beyond my comprehension. It does relate to costs of education and many of the programs are priced to some extent. They are related to what they call "gross personal income", whatever that is -- more than we can afford.

But anyway, it certainly is a fact of life that we can only go as far as our dollars will take us; but regardless of that let's forget about the dollar sign for a moment, and take some of the sections of the Worth Report, and we will comment on a few of them at least.

Now in that first part, which has to do with the forecasts. We'll use one illustration only. The author speaks of marriage, he speaks of family, he speaks of religion, he speaks of declining values. He speaks of declining value and the influence of the declining value and the influence of marriage and of a family, the declining institutions, and so on. Now I agree that much is wrong. It is quite obvious, but my question is, is the author saying that the moral decay or the decline in values is attributable to our present educational system? If he is, then I would like to know where he is showing where the solution to this problem lies. This remains a big question. I think he is more likely to be saying that the situation is here, it's bad, but we are not going to be able to do too much about it so let's learn to live with it. I can hardly accept that. In that vein, I think the report is sadly lacking in setting out the Christian dimension which I think our whole educational system should be permeated with. I think he is a bit afraid to tackle the problem for fear of offending some people of various beliefs. In that whole section where he talks about values, according to the way I read it at least, he is kind of obscure in what he is trying to get at. I believe that much more could have been said in that section, and more suggestions could have been made in the area of values. I think this could have been done without any fear of theological indoctrination. We don't have to worry that we are going to offend people by talking about general values and general areas of acceptability by the public. Certainly the case could be made very easily for basic honesty. I know our social studies courses try to put this across, but who would argue with the concept that there must be honesty in business, there must be honesty in

politics, even in government, as a matter of fact? I think even a course in government wouldn't be bad. It might point out some of the hazards of unrealistic election promises and this sort of thing. I think possibly consideration for others and all these types of things really should be brought out. They should talk about good citizenship -- what is it? -- it isn't only the things that are enforceable, but good citizenship is obedience to the unenforceable. Really good citizens will look after the other fellow. I think this type of thing should permeate our whole educational system, and in no way could that insult or hurt anybody, no matter what his religious beliefs were. I think this type of thing could be emphasized and pointed out -- that this is important.

There is also a reference in the report to equality and equality of educational opportunity. One asks: according to whom, and what is the criterion? If we are going to achieve this business of equality, very often I wonder how you do it. You can take the lower income people and sort of pull them up by their bootstraps -- this goes part of the way -- but also you must knock a few people down. I'm just wondering if you would run into a little bit of trouble in that way. Particularly if you want to achieve general levels of equality, whether it is provincial, national or international, it is a pretty difficult thing to do. It is a high ideal and I think it is a good objective, but very hard to achieve. I think this would be a difficult area.

There is reference to day care centres and to early education. These areas frighten me to some extent, because I'm amazed and confounded at times as to why certain individuals will be recommending to government that there should be universal government assistance for day care centres. In the first place, I think this is a private enterprise type of situation, and I'm not convinced in my own mind that it should even come under the scope and the umbrella of education at all. We keep making these recommendations and suggestions that the government get involved in these types of programs. They make it easier and even suggest that the mother get away from her children and out of the home far earlier than what I think is good for a good family life. These types of things, I think, should not be the proper function of a government. I think they should stay out of there; they shouldn't be trying to rob the cradle, for goodness' sake. If there are situations -- and there are certain families who are in dire circumstances and need this type of service, and I am referring now to the day care programs -- we have social agencies that these people can be referred to through that type of channel, rather than an across-the-board assumption that everybody should have help in this area. I see a real danger in there, because if we are going to have the government doing our babysitting and raising our families we are in real trouble. They have enough trouble doing the things that they should be doing let alone trying to get into that area. As a matter of fact, I think that you would really have government control. This would be socialism in its most diabolical form and I think that we would want to avoid that.

Early childhood education is something that is closely related to the day care program that I have mentioned. Now I would say that early childhood seems to be receiving much support -- maybe I should say loud support, but I don't know by how many. Certainly most of the people, the advocates, naturally have been listening to one side of the story. I submit that the jury is still out on the whole area of kindergartens and early childhood education -- you could use almost any kind of name that you want. I would suggest that the minister before taking on this program -- if he was brave enough to look back, and maybe he has read the July issue of Harper's Magazine and the article written there by Raymond Moore, and also the contribution in that article by his son, Dennis Moore -- I think that he might have some second thoughts about the value of early education. In other words, there are two sides to the story, and I think that we must recognize that. Not only that, the urban-rural debate on this issue is diminishing but it is still with us. Before blowing \$35 million on early childhood I would suggest that we look at it carefully; and let's not make any political decisions on that one, because I think it is something that we get into and we don't get out of.

Life-long learning has been referred to in the report. I think we all are involved in life-long learning. We all spend more time learning and educating ourselves outside the school than we do inside the school. This is an accepted fact. I am not convinced that we need the sophistication of the Alberta Academy as I understand it to be in the report. Again, if you don't want this to come under the educational bills -- and again, education is going to be blamed for all the high costs. It is now a whipping boy and a scapegoat for all people who want to criticize education for costs and I think this would add to that. We all live and learn, and I think the idea is good, but how much sophistication do you have to put into these types of programs?

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

71-13

There was also mention made in the area of certification, and this is one that always seems to concern people. Certainly it used to concern me as a school trustee. The case is made in the report that the medical profession, the dentists, the law society, the engineers, the architects, and accountants, all have self-regulating bodies and self-licensing. Of course, we all know -- and I have sat on the committee and listened to the public hearings on professions and occupations -- everybody wants to be self-licensing and self-controlling and self-governing. After all, who is better to tell what they can do and what they can't? Well, this might be fine up to a point, but when it comes to teachers, there is something that is very significantly different; because all of us have a choice of what doctor we go to, what lawyer we go to, what dentist we go to and all the rest of them that I have mentioned, but we have very little choice as to what school we are going to go to, what classroom we are going to attend or what teacher we are going to have. I think that as long as we have that type of situation we had better keep the people who are the direct representatives of the parents and the children having something to say, at least about certification and the type of teachers whom their children will be exposed to.

There is mention also about the division of the Department of Education and also a division of the Department of Advanced Education. Now this proposal making these suggestions and re-organization of these departments could be a reasonable proposal, but the suggestion that each department have two deputy ministers frightens me a little bit. I think this is building a bureaucracy far beyond what is necessary for that type of division in our educational systems. If this type of division were carried out, certainly some appropriate official with far less rank than a deputy minister would be much more acceptable to the public. I think that is an elaborate type of suggestion.

A modified and divided school year was mentioned and I couldn't help but think that this was an endorsement of some of the more progressive school boards that have been doing this in southern Alberta for three or four years. I would have to agree that this is one way in which versatility and flexibility can be carried on with little, if any, additional cost. It can be done gradually and I think it lends itself to -- well as I say -- to a more versatile educational system, and should be done from grade I right straight through to university. They should be working together on it. There has been tremendous support for this program in Lethbridge. When you can get the parents and you can get the students and you can get the teachers to agree on things, you have a winner, I suggest. I think these types of things can be done, and it isn't so much the program itself but the way in which you arrive at doing it. The way in which you do it is really important in dealing with all those levels of people. In other words, they must be brought in for consultation, and when this is done it is surprising how much acceptance you can get; because, after all, they want to be a part of that decision.

The community school concept, I think, is good and an endorsement of what some of the schools are trying to do now and I think the suggestion is that they should be accelerated -- I would have to agree with that. I liked what it said, I think its on about page 204, on evaluation. I believe that evaluation of the teachers, of the administrators, and of the program is what we need. But, nevertheless, it leaves me wondering how it can be done so that there is a total evaluation. In other words, it is very easy for one to congratulate himself for being much greater than he really is. I can evaluate what I do and get results on how good it is. So, is there some way to get an exterior evaluation for the person who is utilizing the end product? It reminds me of something, and it is difficult to get at. When I was with the Alberta School Trustees Association at one of the conventions which is going on here right now, we brought in a Dr. Prymier who gave quite an interesting talk. He gave an example of this business of exterior evaluations, how we must get the people out there trying to decide how good something is and how bad it is. He took the example of the Ford Motor Company. The Board of Directors apparently had sat around the table from time to time and said, "We need a new type of car, something different." So after several meetings, the intellectual group of directors said, "I know what we will do; we will build a new car and call it the Edsel." So they built the Edsel. They took it out and put in on their floors and the showrooms of the garages. People came in, kicked the tires, slammed the doors, and if they really looked it over good they honked the horn. You have to kick the tires and slam the doors if you want to know if the car is any good. So they did that and it went so far that some of them even bought them and drove them. But the public said, "We don't like the Edsel," so you know what happened to the Edsel. I mean the people out there who were really the ones involved where the acid test came in said, "Thanks, but no thanks." You know what happened to the Edsel. It disappeared. So I think this is the type of thing that, if it could be done, would be desirable.

There is mention in the report that there should be, in some instances, joint public and separate school boards. I find this proposal unacceptable, and I think that the public would find it unacceptable too. Not only that, but I think in a sense this is sort of contrary to the statement that separate schools should be maintained. I agree with the last speaker that we must maintain our separate schools and the public schools. It is about the only choice now that there is and that little bit of competition just isn't going to hurt anyone. It is going to help them. And I think this is one of the big plusses, in addition to the other reasons as well. But that in itself is good.

There is one last area I would like to touch on that I think was neglected in the report and is clearly within the terms of reference the way I read them. It comes within the area of advanced education. I hope that the minister will take note. I had hoped that he would have looked at some of the needs in our universities for schools for certain training and certain professions. There is a great need for them and they just are not available in Western Canada. I'll use an example: one, I submit that there is an urgent need for is a School of Optometry. I am sure the minister is aware of this and it is no surprise to him. He has probably been approached on this, but I believe it is worth mentioning anyway. I'll just bring out a few statistics and points made available to me that would indicate the need. This is the type of thing that could have been in that report, and it would have had a lot of influence in getting this type of school in our universities in Alberta. For example, the Department of National Health and Welfare studies show that Western Canada needs 50 doctors of optometry per year just to keep pace with the attrition and population growth. Fifty per year -- that's in the western provinces. In February of 1971 one of the issues of Time magazine listed optometry as one of the ten top professions that young people should enter, because they can both serve and be sure of employment. There is a great need in that area. The School of Optometry at the University of Waterloo -- and that is the only English speaking school of optometry in Canada -- said that of the 65 places they have not more than 20% can be accepted from outside the province. In fact, this is due to pressure from the province itself. As it turned out for this next year, actually only nine from outside the province of Ontario have been accepted. Alberta has four of these; four out of the nine that are from outside the province. Just to give you an idea of the people who were trying to get into optometry and there is just no space for them: this year as of May 23, 1972, the figure I have is 999 applications, and 40% of them already had one degree. They were pretty qualified applicants. They weren't people who were just coming out of high school and decided, "We're going to go into optometry."

In the United States there are only 14 schools of optometry, and those are all full, of course. The University of Waterloo received over 400 applications from the United States, which, of course, couldn't even be considered because of the fact that they couldn't satisfy their own needs. The average age of an optometrist in Alberta right now is over age 48, 48.1 or something like that. My information is, too, that the federal government would be a major financial contributor in the capital and also, in the initial operation of a school of optometry in Alberta. Now, if this type of information is available to myself, I'm sure it would have been available to the Commission on the Worth Report and I had hoped that this would make this sort of information and these types of recommendations available, and I think it would have been very worthwhile.

So I hope that those facts, for example, just demonstrate the urgent need there is for a faculty of optometry. Now even if the program were started in 1973, which is probably not very likely, but I'd like to believe that it could be, the first class couldn't be graduating before 1978, or probably even 1979. So I'd suggest that the problem is urgent, and I think that we must act immediately if we're going to avoid a sort of a catastrophic state in the supply of vision care and eye service in the western provinces. I only wish that I could recommend that such a school would be put in the University of Lethbridge, but I am being practical about these things, so I suppose that we will have to admit that it would be much more practical to have it in Calgary or in Edmonton because they do have schools of medicine there. There are many common facilities that could be used so from that point of view, I would have to suggest that they would go into one of those universities. But for goodness sakes, I think that we should move on that quickly, Mr. Minister.

I'm suggesting that equally convincing arguments could be put forth for other schools, for example, chiropractor. I know that the medical profession cringes at that, but nevertheless it's a fact of life. They're being accepted. There's a tremendous need for them and I think we should be looking after that. Why should we leave this go to other parts of the country when there is a big opening here?

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

71-15

I think that these types of things that should have been looked at, and I hope that the Minister of Advanced Education will take them into consideration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope that some of these observations will maybe be of some help in embarking on some of the recommendations on the Worth Report.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate, I think I do so with somewhat mixed emotions. On one hand, I suppose I can recall being the person, Mr. Speaker, who was responsible for making the recommendation to Cabinet that the Commission on Educational Planning and The Worth Report get off and running. There are portions of the report that I look at, and I am rather proud that I was involved in getting the thing going, I must also admit that there are portions in the report that I would just as soon shy away from, and I will certainly make some comments in both areas this evening.

What I would like to do for just a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, is to deal with this question of participation in the whole idea of the Commission on Educational Planning, and make some comments on what I see as the basic philosophy and basic concepts involved; touch on some of the areas of concern, and at the same time touch upon some of the good ideas. Then perhaps I will comment on some of the government's action to date, and I may feel rather obliged to make comments in that area several times during my remarks, and then to make a few suggestions as to where I think the report should go from here.

If I could be permitted, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just two or three comments on the opening statement by the hon. Minister of Advanced Education. I am sure he would be disappointed if I didn't make some comments, and initially let me say this, that when the hon. minister was commenting about Dr. Worth being appointed the Deputy Minister of Advanced Education, that I have a very high regard for Dr. Worth's abilities as an educator. But let the record be rather straight, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Worth was appointed as a one-man commissioner, and if you check the Order in Council, Dr. Worth was paid in the vicinity of an addition of \$30,000 a year to his salary, which was exactly the same as he was getting at the University of Alberta as a vice-president. But let it be clearly understood that he was a one-man commissioner. The hon. Minister of Advanced Education stands in his place this evening and says, "You know we have appointed Dr. Worth Deputy Minister of Advanced Education," but suggests that he had only one-eighth of the input, that there were eight other people who really had a great deal to say and are equally responsible with Dr. Worth for the recommendations in the Commission on Educational Planning. The hon. Minister of Advanced Education may buy that but I don't. I think that's balderdash because, Mr. Speaker, when the commission was set up, it was clearly understood that Dr. Worth was the commissioner, and in dealing with this area we just have to make very clear that that is the situation.

Now on the question of the hon. minister's comments, and Mr. Gruenwald the member for Lethbridge West touched on this, and that's the question of the cost involved so far as the report is concerned. There is no question that the recommendations in the report -- many, many of them very well meaning -- will be extremely costly and the taxpayers of the province have to decide whether they want to put more of their public expenditures in the field of education. Then it seems to me that the public along with the government the legislators, and with the educators, will have to then decide how much more of the gross product of the province they want to go into this particular area.

In dealing with the question of participation and how was the report set up initially, Mr. Speaker, it was the feeling of the government at that particular time that we wanted the broadest possible public input from across the province, and as the hon. Minister of Advanced Education has said this evening, there were a large number of people who made presentations to the commission.

One of my disappointments with the report, however, is in the wording of the report. It seems to me that if we are to carry on this idea of broad public participation in the ongoing discussion of the direction of education in this province, that really the report isn't written in the manner which the average person across the province can sit down and readily understand. Early in the report, I believe it says someplace that the report isn't written in academic terms. Well, that may be the case because it says so in the report, but I recall being at a conference where they were discussing the Worth Report or the Commission on Educational Planning Report, and one of the members of the panel said, "You know, I take the report to bed with me each evening and I read it for a while. Then I put it on my stomach and it causes me a stomach ache." Now, I'm not really being facetious when I say that I am sure that she was referring to the weight of the report, but also, I am sure all members have had many

71-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

people say to them how difficult they found the report to read -- other than those people actively involved in education. I would have hoped that there would have been an abridged version of the report out much earlier -- shortly after the report was made public. The version which came out around the first part of October it seemed to me was an afterthought and I was glad that it came out. I think that we could have had much more public participation following the report had that abridged version been earlier.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to deal with the question of the appointment of Dr. Worth as the Deputy Minister of Advanced Education.

You recall that the report was made available to the public sometime in the middle of June and then the government set the deadline of approximately the middle of October when there would be a conclusion of a public response. Since that time the government has moved that date back somewhat. But I was amazed, very surprised, dumbfounded, that during July when the Minister of Advanced Education was in Red Deer, he made the announcement that Dr. Worth was going to be the Deputy Minister of Advanced Education. Let me say right now, I don't quarrel with the naming of Dr. Worth if that's the direction the minister and the government wanted to go. But it seems to me that this was an affront to the people across the province because the government was saying at that time, "We want your ideas, we want some indication how you feel about the report. We want to know what you think about the various recommendations and after the deadline has been reached, we will then deal with your recommendations and then government will make some decisions and move along". But partway through this report, or partway through the period of time for public submissions, Dr. Worth was appointed the Deputy Minister.

I ask you to put yourself in the position of someone who would be involved at the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology or NAIT here in town or some of the other institutions which come directly under the Department of Advanced Education. You are asked to give your views on the report. You are in the situation of giving views on the report which was headed up the gentleman who is the Deputy Minister of Advanced Education.

Now, we can see that Dr. Worth is a very broad, understanding person, but the fact remains the same, that if you are a Vice President at SAIT in Calgary, or you are on the academic staff at any of those institutions, how frankly are you really going to respond? I believe that the appointment of Dr. Worth at that time was a serious mistake. I believe it has hindered a number of people on the academic community from telling the government what they really think about the Worth Report.

[Laughter]

The minister can laugh all he wants. If you go to Red Deer and talk to some of the people at the Red Deer College, they will tell him that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He doesn't talk to them. He has to coast around.

MR. CLARK:

That really wasn't what they told me.

Now we go on the question of the government's decision to wipe out the Universities and Colleges commissions. During the election campaign of a year ago I think the Conservative Party's promises indicated that there would a shakeup in the field of education and I don't argue with that, but at no time, that I recall, and from doing some research on this, can I find anything to indicate that they were going to wipe out the Universities and Colleges commissions.

Then sometime after the Worth Report was released, but prior to the middle of October, when the public was to finish making its submissions to the government, the Minister of Advanced Education announced that the Universities and Colleges commissions were going to be phased out.

Here we are on one hand saying that we want the response from the public, that we want to know what the public thinks about the thing, and on the other that the minister of the government decides to phase out the Universities Commission and the Colleges Commission. I want to make really clear, Mr. Speaker, that I do not carry a particular belief in the concept of the Universities Commission or Colleges Commission. I do believe there has to be

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

71-17

some buffer between the government and those post-secondary educational institutions. But then you look at what has happened at the University of Calgary just in the last short while. We have a situation there where the Universities Commission, which is being phased out, is advising the University of Calgary that it must offer a three year B.A. program and do so very quickly or in fact the grant which would come to the university as far as students in the fourth year is concerned would not be forthcoming.

I can recall two or three years back when the Medicare debate was wrangling. Some of the ten ministers who now sit across on the other side had a number of terms for the federal government. The federal government was really saying to the provinces that the field of medicine and health is a provincial responsibility but that if the provinces would set up a program that met its criteria it would give the provinces the money to run it. On both sides of the House at that time the term "financial blackmail" was used. I refer you back to the situation at the University of Calgary. It was told by the Commission, which was going to be phased out, that it had to offer a three year program in Arts. If it did not offer that program within a certain period of time the commission not count its students in the fourth year as far as university grants were concerned. This is nothing less than academic blackmail as I see it. There was no discussion among the commission, the government, and the University of Calgary. It appears that the people involved in making that decision were not aware that the University of Calgary had its whole B.A. program under review. If people in the government had simply got in touch with the University of Calgary, they would have told them they had this review under way. So I go back to saying that the decision to appoint Dr. Worth as the deputy minister, and the decision to phase out the Universities and the Colleges Commissions, have seriously hindered and put into very open question the sincerity of the government in really getting outright honest-to-goodness participation and reaction from the people across the province. I have had people say to me, "Well, how many other areas does the government have its mind made up on and how soon are they going to tell us what they are going to do in these other areas?"

It is rather interesting that a publication that I just noticed today, "Canadian Universities & Colleges", says in comments on the report:

The title of the report raises the question as to whether or not there is a choice. The arguments, insights, assumptions and at times slick phrasing, appear so persuasive that you feel as if a big beautifully oiled verbal machine is rolling right over you, carefully steered by the provincial treasurer and government policy makers. The commissioners seem so sure that your choice is their choice. So why not just nod your head and trust that the wise, benevolent government will take care of it? On the other hand, you'd hate to feel that many of the forward-looking recommendations and suggestions are not going to be implemented.

And this is the real crux, this last sentence, "And implemented they are going to be."

This is a publication from Eastern Canada. It raises the question again, how many other areas has the government decided it is going to move on?

Moving into the area of some of the concerns, I was pleased to hear the comments of the Minister of Advanced Education when he indicated that the people of Alberta are not very enthusiastic about a sales tax. I'm not either. I must also say that on the question of student assistance, the report is quite quiet. One of the real concerns that comes from the report is the suggested structuring of the Department of Advanced Education. With the wiping out of the Universities Commission and the Colleges Commission, you really have a situation where the Department of Advanced Education will be the judge and the jury and the Crown prosecutor. I know that someone may say that this procedure has been followed in Manitoba, and in Ontario. That is right. But we should go on and say that in Ontario the post-secondary educational institutions have developed a committee of presidents and people who are geared up to constantly watch what the government is doing, and also, watch what the other post-secondary educational institutions are doing. So whether you call it a buffer or a commission, nevertheless this type of thing does come up.

One of the other concerns that I have, as far as this whole report is concerned, is with the question of centralized planning. I recognize that there is a need for overall integration of the educational system in the province. I don't dispute that at all. I think that we can be in favour of rationalization in the post-secondary educational system, and certainly in the Grades I - XII system also. But, if we are going to have the Department of Advanced Education -- or as far as that goes, the Department of Education -- not only being involved in the rationalizing of these areas in co-operation with the

institutions and school boards involved, but also going much further than that -- and if you follow some of the diagrams in the report it has a very elaborate planning mechanism set up, which, as I understand that mechanism, really makes the planning arm responsible to virtually no one -- I would caution the government very, very seriously in the area of this planning mechanism. I would remind the government of its statements on many, many occasions that it is in favour of greater and greater decentralization. So we have the government on one hand saying it is in favour of more and more decentralization, and yet in many areas in the report I see a move towards more centralization of authority, especially in the field of post-secondary education. I think this is very opposite in direction to the way in which this province has moved in the field of the Grades I - XII system in the past number of years.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I want to try to be fair about the report, and say that there are some very good things in it. I commend the suggestion of school councils. It is my understanding that among the most enthusiastic people, as far as school councils are concerned, are students themselves. That is one of the areas I would hope the government will move quickly on when they get to a period of time when they are going to make some decisions and move ahead in the manner I hope they will follow later on.

As far as the school year re-organization is concerned, the Edmonton public system is going through the problem right now. That is a matter of communication with its electorate. I commend what has happened in Lethbridge. I think that they have done an excellent job there. But once again, on the question of re-organization of the school year, we have to do this in a way that young people can move from one area of the province to another area of the province and at least not be involved in losing a half or a full year of schooling. This is a very real problem, which the department will have to face and to which the trustees in the province along with the teaching profession and parents will have to give a great deal of concern.

On the question of community schools, I strongly support the recommendations there and urge them to move ahead in that area. I am rather impressed with the moratorium on school centralization. I think that would be a good move for the government to make early.

The recommendation that there should be an educational council in the province, impresses me very much. The recommendation really says that there would be an education council, perhaps made up of about 20 people from across the province, which would serve something like an auditor-general of education. The Worth Report recommends that this council report to the Lieutenant Governor in Council. I think that if we are going to follow along properly and have someone like an auditor-general, then likely the place for the education council to report would be on the yearly basis to the legislature. It could give to the legislature yearly, an accounting of what it saw going on in the whole educational picture in this province. I believe it is important that we have some type of mechanism like that, Mr. Speaker, because I should point out that education is the province's largest enterprise. Over 500,000 students are taught by about 4,000 persons, supported by some 30,000 service personnel in a 1970 population of 1,580,000. I believe that additional expenditures in the field of an educational council in this province, which would report directly to the legislature would be very appropriate.

I would like to make about three other comments in the field of the government action to date. Once again, going back to the Department of Advance Education. I was very surprised recently, or surprised again, when we received a press release saying that the Department of Advanced Education was going to go on a two year extensive public discussion and involvement exercise. The Department of Advanced Education is now going to be involved for two years, going about the province finding out what should happen, what should be done, and what directions it should take in the field of advanced education. I was of the impression, and I thought rightfully so, that the Commission on Educational Planning spent three years in making recommendations to the government and to the people of this province, as to the directions they thought we should be moving in in the whole field of education. Now the Department of Advanced Education says it is going to spend two years in public discussions across the province. It seems to me that it isn't going to be very long before the public say, "Look, we have had three years of the Commission on Educational Planning. We've told you many of the things that we think should be done. Now for goodness sake let's get on and make some of the decisions." If we are going to be involved, as far as post-secondary education is concerned for two more years in a series of meetings, hearings, discussions, conferences, seminars, and so on, the post-secondary education system in this province will suffer immensely. With the wiping out, very uncerimoniously, of the two commissions right now, with the appointment of Dr. Worth as a Deputy Minister of Advanced Education,

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

71-19

and with what I refer to as an over-reliance on the University of Alberta in the Department of Advanced Education, there is a need to restore confidence in the department so that the community colleges across the province, the universities of Calgary and Lethbridge, and the academic community in general know where they are going and know what, in fact, is the government's future direction in these particular areas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been critical of a number of the actions which the government has taken to date. I believe, being somewhat responsible for the exercise starting, that I have some responsibility to take just a few minutes to indicate to you what I feel should have been done in a number of these areas.

First of all, I think the report should have been available to the people in the province in January or February of this year when I believe that it could have been and as was indicated to me several months prior to the black 30th of August. I also believe that the abridged version of the report should have been handed to the people much earlier than it was. Then, I believe that the public response to the government, to the Department of Education, and to the Department of Advanced Education should have been handed directly to the group established from the two departments who were not involved in the work of the report at all. In fact, I would see something like this education council that I referred to earlier, that possibly could have been pulled together for the job of getting the response and monitoring it. It might even have been an area where some of the conservative M.L.A.s could have sat on in the new expanded role of member of the legislature. Then I think that the government should have taken no action in the areas of major recommendations as far as the report is concerned. We should have waited until the school trustees and the ATA people in post secondary education and the taxpayers had their opportunity to put their case before the group assembled. And then, following that, the government should then have got on with the job of implementing those areas of the report that they feel inclined to move on.

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West touched on the question of the two philosophies in the report. To somewhat oversimplify, on the one hand the report talks about a second phase industrial society and it talks in terms of the person centred society. From my standpoint, I believe that that oversimplifies the future of this province. In my reading of the report, I get the impression that because we have drug problems, because we have alcohol problems, because there are increasing amounts of crime, and because there are increased problems with the family, that we rather throw up our hands and we move on to the kind of society that says, "these things are coming whether you like it or not, and we have to go from there." I don't agree that those things are inevitable. I would rather like to have seen in the report a frank statement saying that there is a need for reorganization of the government and that is the government in a non-political sense: reorganization of the cabinet structure. Frankly I am impressed with some of the things that are going on in Ontario where they have done some major reorganization of cabinet operation. Education has the problem of attempting to be all things to all people. You cannot separate many of the problems that the Department of Health and Social Development has to face, that the Department of Culture, Youth, and Recreation has to face, or the Department of Manpower and Labour. You cannot separate those problems from the things that go on in education. I would strongly support and urge a cabinet reorganization or government reorganization so that you have those kinds of people services in one area. Maybe you have to move to some sort of a super-minister type of approach, but whatever the route is, I am convinced, from my limited experience in government, that it is absolutely necessary if we are going to do a reasonable job of priority and are going to do a reasonable job of over-all coordination in these areas.

In the field of education, health, and recreation, I feel that there are a large number of volunteer people who can play an increasingly important role not just in education but in the areas of health and recreation also.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, really what I have attempted to do is to utter some very direct and very forthright statements on the government's action to date on the report. I think that the appointment of the Deputy Minister of Advanced Education can be likened to the federal government is taking the chairman of the LeDain Commission on drugs, appointing him the deputy minister, and then asking him to make recommendations to the government as to what should be done in that area. Or I suppose I could use the comment which was passed on to me over the weekend when someone said, "It appears to me that it is a shotgun marriage which was carried out with indecent haste." I want to emphasize the point once again. I am not attacking Dr. Worth as an individual. I believe the government made a serious blunder in the appointing Dr. Worth as a Deputy Minister of Advanced Education, given the fact that he is the sole commissioner as far as the report is concerned, and given the fact that people in the whole

post-secondary educational operation in this province now find that in fact when they're commenting on the report, they're really commenting on the recommendations of the Deputy Minister of Advanced Education.

MR. PURDY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure this evening to get in on this debate on the Commission on Educational Planning. At the outset I'd like to congratulate the hon. Minister for Advanced Education for his presentation to the House, and the Hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands for his remarks. The remarks from the hon. Member for Lethbridge West were also well-founded, especially on the early education program. I go along with some of his comments. As for the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, I don't know if he's running a campaign speech or what he's doing, but I can't make up my mind at the present time. Or, is it leadership? In his comments, he stated that during our election campaign we said there should be a shake-up in education, and I was wondering if he was agreeing that that should have been at the campaign time or as it has happened now? Then, another remark that he made was "black day in August". Well, that's the day the lights went out on Social Credit. I'm just wondering if the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury did have any input into this report as there were briefs available. He could have made a brief to the department on this before August 15. I don't know whether he did this or not. I have a couple of areas in the report that I would like to speak on. I'm not going to be critical, but I'd like to have my input into them.

One of them is moving the agriculture schools from the Department of Agriculture into the Department of Advanced Education. I have my reservations if this is a good move or not, but I'm still thinking about this. The report goes on to say that these should be moved, or that the agriculture schools should become fully integrated into the public college sector. Another statement: that agricultural schools or colleges tend to offer programs for farm use isolated from the main stream of educational opportunity. I wonder what they mean by the main stream of educational opportunity. We've always had freedom of education, and if a boy or girl from the farm wants to attend an agricultural school, the choice should be theirs. How else is the farm community going to survive if this right is taken away? Farm families may not always have resources available to attend university and if they want to attend the agricultural schools they should have that choice. The author of the report says that agricultural colleges are isolated from the student. I personally do not think so. Maybe Vermilion and Fairview could be closer to Edmonton, but Olds is situated in an area which is adequate to the people of central and southern Alberta.

The report also goes on to state that the Fairview College is not being utilized, and maybe as the report outlines, should be used for the higher education of Metis and Indians. But I would suggest that if the college is going to be turned over to higher education it be used to educate in the agricultural field. At the present time farm workers are required in many parts of Alberta and we have an extreme shortage. What better way to help agriculture in Alberta than to make Fairview a training centre for farm workers? Our government in the past 15 months has certainly helped agriculture in Alberta as it has never been helped before. And this further step to train farm workers, I believe, will work.

In fact, within my own constituency, and I've been getting feedback from the people out there, we have no farm workers. "I'm getting to an age; what do I do?" the farmers tell me. "Do I sell my land, or do I cut down? I am fifty years of age. I must sell part of my assets so I can continue on. My boys don't want to continue and I can't get any farm labourer that is knowledgeable in the field. If I bring somebody off the street they want to get top wages and most of them are not worth the money at the lower rate."

The report states that Olds is the only college specializing in agricultural education and the program should include a more sophisticated program in technology, marketing and marketing management suited to the change in the agricultural industry. I agree with this, and the more graduates that are knowledgeable in agriculture, the better off the agricultural sector will be in the Province of Alberta. This will stabilize our industry and our agricultural industry will survive. The report further states that maybe if the Fairview College does not increase or fulfill its role as an agricultural college it should be turned into a place to treat alcoholics or a facility for the handicapped. I think, Mr. Speaker, that alcoholism starts in a city, or at least 80% of it. Let's treat these people in a centre closer to the city. The idea of using it for the handicapped is absolutely flimsy. Why take the handicapped people away from their loved ones to an extreme part of the

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

71-21

province, especially after our government has put so much emphasis on, and done so much for, the handicapped in Alberta?

Mr. Speaker, I want to dwell on the community-school use for a minute. The report states, and I will quote: "The community-school concept must not, however, be introduced to the detriment of the fundamental purpose for which schools exist." The word that upsets me is "introduced." In a town in my constituency, Spruce Grove, the community-school concept has been a reality for four years. I believe that the members on the Commission on Educational Planning should have taken a page from the history of Spruce Grove and incorporated it into the report, as this facility does exist and operate. The report says that maintenance costs of such a facility could skyrocket; and they could go up a bit, especially if you are using a school building for community-school use 16 hours a day seven days a week. But it certainly wouldn't if you start to consider other buildings within a town that are being utilized just for school or for community use, if you can separate them. The report says that a recently completed Alberta Recreation Plan Study supports the development of more community-schools, and it says, "Why not go further? Is it not an ideal to which all schools might aspire in the future?" I believe the last word "aspire" is probably contradictory to the complete page that the commission put forward to community-school use.

As an M.L.A. from a rural area I believe that the community-school concept will work for all areas of Alberta. It may not work in the urban areas, but why not? I can't see any reason why it shouldn't. We have many, many facilities, and it's about time that we stopped thinking about rolling up the sidewalks of these schools at 4:00 o'clock in the afternoon and rolling them back down at 8:00 o'clock in the morning. The taxpayers of Alberta, through the Alberta Foundation, are having the buildings built for their use and they should not only be used just for primary education purposes but should be used for adult education programs, and many other community facility programs which I have spoken about earlier. There are many more aspects of community-school use but I don't want to elaborate on them at this time.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I think that the commission and both departments of education, the Department of Advanced Education, and Mr. Hyndman's Department of Education, should take a more serious look at the matter of community-school use in the province, and I think they will come up with some real good findings here. I've got to get to work on this word "aspire" again, because it will work and it is working. I think that this is wrong and we can go forth with the concept that there will be more community-schools throughout the Province of Alberta. Thank you.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, I too want to extend my congratulations to the hon. minister, and to my colleague, Mr. King, for the very excellent manner in which they have introduced discussion on the report tonight. I too have read the report and have taken the opportunity, as I hope a number of people here have, to present my comments to the cabinet committee. So tonight I am going to restrict my comments to a particular area. In responding to the motion to receive the commission's report, I wish to place emphasis, not so much on the impact or the philosophy of the report itself, such as Mr. King has done, more on some of the situations and conditions that we now face in its implementation. To implement administratively the provisions of this Report, there are proposed four divisions within the two departments of education, and these are early, basic, higher and further education.

Early education has been covered very adequately in debate on the resolution for priority institution of early education experiences which was presented in the spring by myself and the hon. Member Mr. Appleby. Basic and higher education are established in function as an historic fact, although extensive changes are proposed for these two areas. But the one area that has not been administratively developed in a widespread manner throughout the province at this point, one which has not been given extensive treatment in the early dialogue on this particular report, is that of further education. This is the topic on which I wish to speak and comment now. It is sometimes referred to as life long, continuing, adult, work study or recurrent education, and I shall use these terms in a more or less synonymous fashion tonight.

The Commission Report deals very adequately with the concept and the philosophy of lifelong education. However, I feel that the report does fall short on certain aspects of implementation in this area, and I shall discuss further education from this aspect. Like my colleague from Highlands, and I hope like all of us, we are all unfinished products of an educational system. Really this is the concept of lifelong education -- that we are all unfinished

products. But, traditionally, education has been conceived of as a preparation for life, wherein the individual goes to school for a certain amount of years, finishes his education, and then takes up the life of living. But now the illusion of education being completed at any particular phase of life is no longer tenable. It's no longer a matter of going back to school, but of continuing to learn. I am going to pursue much the same theme as the Commission Report: that lifelong and further education can, in fact, become the vehicle by which individuals throughout their lives participate in education, training, retraining, upgrading, updating, on a recurrent basis, without postponed employment, but as a process in which a flexible use of modular units, conferences, workshops, institutes, short courses, evening classes, and other arrangements and resources and facilities can serve an adult community in a more total flexible manner. And in doing so, I want to comment on four components of continuing and adult education. These aspects are: 1. The Administration; 2. Financing; 3. Resources; 4. Content of further education.

Administratively, first of all, at the Provincial level, further education presently functions under the general supervision of a division of continuing education within the Department of Advanced Education, which provides now a co-ordinating and a facilitating role between the various agencies of continuing education throughout the province. A number of regional councils have been established in certain parts of the province under the encouragement of this division, and some joint advertisements of offerings, especially in the two metropolitan centres, have been carried out. Also, education councils have been established to facilitate a certain amount of co-operative programming.

Secondly, the division of vocational education, once again within the Department of Advanced Education, develops programs largely of a 'training on the job' nature where implementation is within an industrial or an agricultural setting and often in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture through its extension division. In addition, they are involved with the sponsorship and programming for a number of disadvantaged groups. For example, this division co-ordinated in an implementation manner the priority employment training program last year for the province. It also acts to a great extent as an interface with the federal government in certain programs of adult education. It might be noted though, that most of the programs within this division are of a full time educational nature, whereas within the Continuing Education Division there are mainly part time offerings. And finally, thirdly, the Colleges and Universities Commissions at the provincial level provide a basic administrative funding for activities to be carried in the various institutions within the province.

Now these three divisions unite, along with various school boards throughout the province and a number of private associations within the Alberta Association of Continuing Education, acting as, really, the professional association for continuing education personnel in the province. The Commission Report has recommended the establishment of a separate division of further education, replacing the present Vocational Education division and amalgamating the division of Continuing Education, or so it seems to imply. Its role would be that of facilitating, co-ordinating, and establishing returned education in the province. However, the creation of this somewhat centralized separate division of further education may be an over-organizing of a provincial activity which traditionally has functioned best within a flexible framework where maximum benefits have accrued by an emphasis more at the local level in a co-ordination of resources, personnel and facilities.

My hon. colleague for Highlands commented on the possible danger of this kind of centralization when he was discussing the Alberta Academy and ACCESS which are, as proposed, just components for this further education division. I also share this concern on this possibility. Moreover the establishment of a separate division of further education within the Department of Advanced Education does not adequately consider the very extensive historic achievements which have been made by various school boards throughout the province under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education. These initiatives, I would think, will continue in the future to be a very significant part of adult educational programs despite the placement of the further education division. The province at this point may not be ready for a complete division between these two areas of programming; that of a part time recurrent nature, as provided in Continuing Education, and that of a vocational full time nature as provided in the Vocational Educational Division. I personally, at this point, feel that this development would be somewhat premature. So I would make two recommendations at this point. First, that the division of Continuing Education under the jurisdiction of what was called the co-ordinating committee of the two departments of education be retained and that its authority be expanded with its role being that of facilitation, co-ordination, research, and the allocation of funding within the adult and continuing education jurisdictions. And secondly,

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

71-23

the Division of Vocational Education should be retained, with its main emphasis, under the Department of Advanced Education, being that of implementation of pre-employment vocational training and retraining programs, although in a more expanded manner than it now functions.

Now this deals with the administrative framework at the provincial level, but nowhere is the impoverishment of continuing education programming more evident than within certain regional areas of the province, especially in the rural areas. Some services have been provided as satellite activities by existing post secondary institutions and by certain school boards in the province, but to no great extent.

In large, there are no standard procedures by which a total education program can be delivered to the adult community in all parts of our province. Most ambitious initiatives to date have occurred through the extension division of the Department of Agriculture -- I am glad to see my colleague just arrived back -- in providing a number of programs in co-ordination with the Canada Manpower Corporation and the Vocational Education division in Advanced Education for certain parts of the agricultural community. But here, once again, this is not really in a completely uniform manner. Now one of the major difficulties is that when the division of Vocational Education or continuing education departments of post secondary institutions, different provincial departments, do want to establish educational offerings throughout the province there is no really effective liaison or identification with the needs of a particular community, outside those that are now served directly by a post secondary institution. Consequently, some standard administrative structure is required to expand educational opportunities to all parts of the province. Now a program involving regional educational councils, learning resources centres, the Alberta Academy, and the expansion of educational television is recommended by the Commission Report. However, these recommendations in themselves, although very creditable, may be premature in that no real priority of treatment has been emphasized in these areas. I would recommend that first of all we must set the infra-structure, and then develop these various programming components.

So I would make a third recommendation at this point: that regional educational councils be established within all areas of the province through the facilitation of a division of continuing education and consisting of representatives of existing school boards, industry, business, continuing education divisions of advanced education institutions, the vocational education division, the Department of Agriculture, the Canada Manpower Corporation, and other agencies which are educationally active.

The fourth recommendation is that school boards, community colleges, technical institutes, and universities increase their educational opportunities in areas outside their immediate campus jurisdiction through these regional education councils. These, then, might be some of the second phase programs that we could bring in after establishing these regional education councils:

1. We could establish more extensive satellite post-secondary offerings.
2. Learning resources centres. The actual physical structure could be established or built to provide a physical facility for adult day courses, satellite course offerings, educational television, the Alberta Academy, and a regional centre for the housing of learning resources such as libraries, audio-visual components, and so on.
3. The Alberta Academy could then be developed, perhaps chartered as a community college, and administered as a member, maybe of a college's co-ordinating council, to work through these regional education councils.
4. A more expanded educational activity could then be developed, as termed 'ACCESS' by the report.
5. Finally, other departmental offerings such as agricultural educational programming could then perform in various parts of the province, functioning once again through these education councils.

But this co-ordination in itself is not the whole answer. More administrative flexibility is required right within individual educational jurisdiction. Administratively, now, most initiate continuing education activities only as an extension of their regular day program within a very rigid policy framework involving a minimum assignment of staff, facility, and resources. This second best treatment is often reflected in its programming, and excellence is approached more through the initiative, the imagination, the entrepreneurship, of individuals than through the institution itself and its policies. More provisions are required for those individuals who can't fall

within this regular operation of campuses, on weekends, evenings, summers, and other irregular periods of time. Thus working people and those who might be involved with home and other activities could be better served educationally.

Undoubtedly this flexibility is going to create problems within these institutions involving the offering of courses in this manner, but these can be overcome by an imaginative program development and a recognition that it is the purpose of educational agencies to serve students, whether they be young or whether they be adult. It's not the other way around. To date, most programs in lifelong education have evolved more as appendages of educational aims and objectives tailored primarily for younger clientele. With the recognition of lifelong learning this emphasis, I feel, can be adjusted. So I would make this recommendation: that within all post-secondary and educational jurisdictions the development of a community services or a continuing education division, both in school boards and in post-secondary institutions, provide for maximum possible flexibility and educational timetabling for adults to accommodate at all times of the day, week, and year a larger number of adult students on a continuing intermittent basis. Now these would work, once again, with the Regional Educational Councils and we could draw from a wide spectrum of professional, occupational, trade, and volunteer groups in putting this together and presenting these activities, in addition to giving more extensive assistance to these groups and to the development of their own professional development programs, as we have discussed in our committee on professions and occupations. In this way, I think, our public institutions can be utilized to better serve the community at large.

The second aspect of lifelong continuing education, and I will dwell on this a little more briefly than at first, is that of financing. First, I would say this, that the financing of further education doesn't have to be at the expense of basic and early education. The major expenditures aren't involved in the development of a philosophy of further education. Some incentive planning could be initiated to assist in the facilitation of certain aspects of curriculum development, research, and perhaps a larger administrative staff, and channelled, I would hope, through the division of Continuing Education. Now there are methods of financing and budgeting which I want to describe which can eliminate an excessive draw on the public purse. It involves more a change in the rationale to the administrative structure than an extensive budgeting. Generally at present, lifelong continuing education is not funded in a consistent manner. Courses offered, usually at night, are expected to carry their own weight through the charging of fees with only a very small staff, usually one director and a secretary, available to develop programs. These are publicly funded but beyond that fees would pay the whole shot. Moreover, there is very little co-ordination of funding with the regular day programs to the extent that any profit which is realized from the Continuing Education Division is immediately, or at the end of the year, funnelled back into the general revenues of the institution or the jurisdiction. Now this, to a great extent, presents a regressive note to continuing education programming in that programs, if they have to pay their own way, can't be provided for groups that can't afford them. Certain disadvantaged groups such as the aged, women on welfare, the unemployed, will usually be given a last priority in further education programming. In some jurisdictions, a certain "Robin Hood" principle does operate where activities, such as conferences, may gather a fair amount of profit; as long as course offerings are prepared within that budget year for these disadvantaged groups, they can be offered, but usually, and almost always, they are the end of the budget year and very often this development doesn't occur. At the end of the budget year, we often see extensive expenditures on conferences, travel, and other staff activities which might better have been utilized for program subsidization for these groups. The staff know full well that within the next couple of weeks that money is going to be funnelled right back into general revenues and they will never see it again.

There is also a certain amount -- just on another related topic -- of inequity in the fee structure that is established for part-time students. To give an example: a part-time student may enrol in one or two courses in the term but it is a much more costly procedure than for that person who enrolls in a full-time program. Just to give you an example, a part-time student at the University of Calgary pays \$135 a course while a full-time student will pay \$400 for five courses. There you can see that the costs here for a part-time student are somewhat prohibitive. Therefore, I would make these recommendations in regard to financing:

First, that a co-ordinated system for the financing of lifelong and continuing education be developed, administered by the Division of Continuing Education, wherein fee payments will continue to support the majority of programs; but that a slightly expanded administrative, developmental and research staff be employed in this area.

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

71-25

Second, and I think that this is the crux of it, that provisions be established for budgetary changes wherein profits incurred within jurisdictional divisions of continuing education would remain with that division so that course programs may be more adequately developed from year to year allowing the inclusion of programs from groups which may require subsidization; and at the very least, budgets should be established on a longer term basis. I believe in the commission report it was recommended on a three year basis.

The third recommendation is that financial assistance be established for satellite educational offerings for facilities and activities in rural parts of the province.

The next main topic in this area is the utilization of resources in lifelong continuing education. Right now the general characteristics of the operation and the use of resources in further education. The main vehicle now for continuing education is short course work usually offered at night on a non-credit basis. And I think all of you have picked up the paper, perhaps in the fall, and you have seen extensive offerings within the Edmonton School Board or Calgary. In addition conferences, seminars, and institution workshops are used to a certain extent only to a very uncoordinated limited degree at this point. The philosophy now of offering continuing education is basically on the supply and demand, pay as you go basis, not within an integrated philosophy of education as access of a basic education level, but simply as the traffic will bear. Consequently, if an individual or an association should request a course, it will probably be offered. An instructor would be hired to teach the course. I shouldn't say hired, but would be contracted and, if a certain minimum registration is reached, the course would run. If not, then the contract would be invalidated and the course would be eliminated.

Generally, there is a poor utilization also of the total campus facilities. A certain "ivory tower" complex still does operate to the extent that facilities are scheduled on a supply and demand basis and only as a supplement to the regular day program within the campus proper. Outside the metropolitan areas of Calgary, Edmonton, Medicine Hat, Red Deer and Lethbridge, there is generally a poor offering of continuing education, with poor facilities for educational community use and limited support resources such as libraries, educational television and audio-visual support materials.

The personnel employed as instructors in continuing education are generally staff members from the day program. Some initiative now has been carried on in using personnel from outside the campus, but there is no extensive development in training programs at universities for people who exclusively want to teach in the area of further education. At present, it is difficult and almost impossible for the individual to obtain information about continuing education programs. To find the right courses of study he must either see the ad that runs maybe one or two nights in Calgary or Edmonton or certain jurisdictions or contact each institution, often with efforts meeting an inadequate response. Very often the registrar's office doesn't even know what is going on in the continuing education division. Provision for vocational counselling is massive gap, especially for the individual who has not yet made a career choice and sees these course offerings as merely a start of a training program of updating or upgrading experiences. Counsellors are available at most institutions, but they are usually knowledgeable only about the day time credit program within the institution. In fact, there is at present no one place in the province where an individual can obtain public comprehensive information about all opportunities and vocational counselling uncommitted to any particular agency.

Although the resources, facilities and the staff are available for continuing education, the day credit program is always given first priority and what is left over is then allocated to continuing education. The facilities are usually designed mainly for the development of classroom courses, and very little is available for live-in conferences, seminars, workshops, and short courses. This is where the Banff centre and perhaps the extension of its service to the total education community could be facilitated, perhaps we may need another Banff centre down the line as this kind of modular treatment of education grows.

Most media resources now used are those that have been developed for reading -- books, periodicals, and journals. However, more emphasis is now on educational television, computer-assisted learning, and other audio-visual components are now adding to the resource package that is available for education. The commission report has recommended that in the development of resources we develop regional learning centres which will use various combinations of computer-assisted learning, the new ACCESS network and other resource packages. This is, in part, the answer. But mustn't we first develop more flexibility within those resources that we already have, those resources of

staff, facilities, and programming that are available mainly to the day program but could be extended to the evening. And then later on, after we develop this flexibility, then let's plug in those innovations of ACCESS, Alberta Academy and so on. So my recommendation in this area would be regular post-secondary program use of facilities, staff and media packages be adopted in a more flexible manner with continuing education programming expanded and established in a more flexible manner through days, weeks and years, both on and off the regular campus within industry, senior citizens' homes, jails, rehabilitation centres and so on, and probably programs through continuing education divisions.

Finally, the fourth area that I want to discuss just briefly, I promise, is the content of lifelong and continuing education. At present, most courses that are offered in continuing education are on one of two bases. First, credit courses may be extended from the day into the evening through what is called the Division of Extension, usually at the universities. The second area is that of the one that is now offered the most through continuing education divisions, noncredit, short courses, conferences, seminars, workshops and institutes. In some cases, credit is granted within this Division, such as last year in the PEP program, there were some short unit courses within the program which also were given credit towards a certificate or diploma in the day program, but it's not very common.

The actual content of continuing education ranges from recreational and personal development courses on the one side, basic education offerings usually at our Alberta Vocational Centres, creditable, generally, towards a high school diploma; and up-dating and retraining courses specifically built around professional and occupational needs. But in general, there is no institutional philosophy of continuing education in practice. Most offerings are as earlier stated, become more of an accidental nature than under a co-ordinated program and philosophy.

The present system of day programming also acts very much to the disadvantage of those individuals who want to undertake learning on a part-time or recurrent basis. Most programs of study are organized towards certificates, diplomas, or degrees, which are granted generally after full-time attendance at an institution. This is the case from the apprenticeship level, where apprentices must leave their jobs for a certain number of times, six to eight weeks per year, through to the professional level, where such professions as law and medicine are not certificated until the completion of extensive full-time studies. During this period of time, the individual is placed in somewhat of a serf-like position, with little choice other than to accept lump-like offerings of training and career preparation. Perhaps more emphasis on modular units in further education could add more flexibility to this system. In addition, there is very little opportunity for individuals to package their own programs of learning and career preparation.

And finally, many courses are too extensively vocational. For example, this is reflected in our Canada Manpower Purchase Programs, where courses are packaged to provide vocational skills, with heavy emphasis on vocational, and those areas are not only identified as specific career preparation aren't allotted within the program. Consequently, certain supplementary areas, which really might be the reason that the person is unemployable in the first place, such as poor money management, or some inability to handle his family relationships aren't available to him, and this may be the crux of the problem.

So my recommendations in this final area would be as follows:

First, that community colleges, school boards, and other educational jurisdictions be encouraged to develop an institutional philosophy of community services where responsibility for educational programming is accepted for a more total community population.

Next, that educational jurisdictions be encouraged to utilize smaller modular educational units or courses for implementation in a variety of settings, and employing a variety of personnel and facility resources.

Next, that more provision be implemented in existing institutional programs for part-time study within credit programs and as extensions of the regular existing programs.

Finally, that a more extensive presentation of what is known as life-skills programming, and as spoken so well the other day by my colleague, be encouraged within all programs of continuing education involving such areas a personal money management, learning skills, career and vocational decision-making, effective interpersonal relationships, and communication skills.

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

71-27

These are just some of the aspects relating to the administration and the development as I see them, of further education, provincially-based and available to all individuals in the province.

I am very interested in the statement which was made by Mr. King regarding the northeast part of the province. I can see something like this fitting very well by beginning with a regional education council and then plugging in an awful lot of programming. But if you don't establish that regional education council it's just going to be the provincial government horning in again, and it just may not work.

The Commission Report recommends really the same philosophy. But as I mentioned, in its implementation proposal I feel that it sometimes places the cart before the horse. It's my feeling, and if we've got a strong framework let's build on those programs that we now do have and strengthen them and then move on to the next phase; the development of the academy, the ACCESS and learning resources centres. In my comments I haven't really discussed other related areas here. For instance, specific proposals for the presentation of programs to disadvantaged groups or specific outreach innovations. But these are dissertations in themselves, and I won't dwell on them tonight. I hope that my comments tonight, and the recommendations that I have made will set the stage for a flexible, co-ordinated approach to lifelong, continuing, further education wherein all Alberta citizens can benefit from the current and continuous learning either in vocational or leisure or self-development sense.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, if it's the government's intention to carry the debate on another day, then I would like to ask leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it the hon. member has leave to adjourn the debate.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 10:37 p.m.]

