

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Monday Evening, April 16, 1973

[Mr. Diachuk resumed the Chair at 8:00 o'clock.]

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (CONT.)Executive Council (Cont.)

Northern Development (Cont.)

Appropriation 1440 Emergency Measures Organization (Cont.)

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of Supply will now come to order. Appropriation 1440 was deferred until 8:00 o'clock. No further comments on it? Agreed?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, I take it that the hon. member is not going to take advantage of the opportunity to reflect on his remarks and therefore --

MR. LUDWIG:

I am going to make a statement ... [Inaudible]...

AN. HON. MEMBER:

Nobody asked for one.

DR. HORNER:

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I intend to bring the remarks of the hon. gentleman to the attention of the Speaker at the earliest opportunity.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Deputy Premier once more gets worked up over something that he doesn't quite comprehend, I'd like him to read the words from Hansard that would indicate that I in any way impugned the integrity of anybody in EMO. That is the specific charge that has been made over and over again, that I impugned somebody's integrity. And all I want is specifics. I happen to have Hansard here; I reviewed it; I did not impugn the integrity of anybody. If the Deputy Premier wants to make it look as if somebody did, that ball is in his court. Read the words that I used to impugn the integrity and if I did, I will apologize, but not before then.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the further wiggling done by the hon. member, my position stands.

Appropriation 1440 agreed to:

\$686,710

Appropriation 1446 Bureau of Public Affairs

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to advise that the hon. members of the committee had raised the point about whether the government placed all of the advertising through agencies or whether they handled some themselves.

In checking over this dinner hour, it appears that roughly 90 per cent is handled through agencies. Now and then the bureau places advertising itself. Usually this would happen when there is no time for an agency to be used, when an ad may have to be in the next morning. Or if there was virtually no production or creative work required, there may be an occasion then for the bureau to place the advertising directly.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Chairman, is that to say that this represents about 10 per cent of the advertising?

MR. GETTY:

No, I was responding Mr. Chairman, to a question as to the general advertising practices of the bureau, which was to place advertising directly into the media or to use an agency to place it.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Chairman, in the notes it says to provide "total two-way communication programs for all departments..." I take it it is 1 per cent 1 way and 99 per cent the other.

The remark I want to make is no reflection particularly on this government, but it does become so easy for the government to use such a vote as this to get out information which in the end turns out to have political intent. I think we are all aware that we receive from the government a whole host of things that we know nobody reads.

I don't want to blame the government for that. Maybe we should read it all. But I, on occasions, have kept it for a month and weighed it and it has run up to as high as 16 pounds. This has happened when my own party happened to be in the government, too.

What I am concerned with is the two-way communication. If there is some way of getting feedback to the government, and if that feedback, too, can become known to the people, then it serves a useful purpose. I warn once more against how easy it becomes to use this vote in a way that in the end is always open to the accusation of political manoeuvring.

On the other hand, I don't want the government to think that I am opposed to the people being informed. If we can get them to accept the information, then certainly it makes it much easier for government to govern and should make for a much happier province.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS (CONT.)

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Chairman, may I have the permission of the committee to introduce visitors?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is it agreed by the members of the committee that Mr. Ashton may introduce some visitors?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Chairman, it's a pleasure for me to introduce 14 Scouts and 3 of their leaders from the 133 St. Thomas Scout Troop. I understand that this is part of their citizenship training. I'll ask them to please stand and be recognized by the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

At this same time I wish to announce that someone driving a Chev, licence number EZ 5137, left his lights on. Continue, Mr. Barton.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (CONT.)

MR. BARTON:

There was a half-hour program this morning at 10:00 o'clock a.m., and it quite extensively covered the election of the hon. MP, Mr. Roche. It said at the end of the program that this was an Alberta government deal. I was wondering what this cost the Alberta taxpayers?

MR. GETTY:

I'm not familiar with the show and I would tell you and all committee members, Mr. Chairman, that, without knowing what the hon. member is referring to, there is nothing I know of handled by the bureau that would result in them in any way sponsoring a show covering the election of any member, let alone the hon. MP, Mr. Roche.

MR. BARTON:

It did close with the Alberta government, and I was wondering if you'd look into it and report back to advise if there was any cost to the people of Alberta.

MR. GETTY:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd be glad to.

MR. BARTON:

It was on CBC.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Chairman, the former government had several publications. One that you were opposed to was quite notable -- the larger one -- but one, Within Our Borders, was quite popular. It was non-political, and in view of the number of loan programs the government has under way, I was wondering if the government would consider something like this again. It was non-partisan, more of an information sheet.

This is one of the problems a lot of MLAs run into, whether you are on the government or the opposition side: have you done everything you could for your people or have you forgotten some program where you could have helped somebody and it's not covered? I was wondering if a publication like that could come out -- I think it was every two months -- for example, after this session. It gave a resume of what acts were passed and what help was forthcoming to the people generally. Would you consider something like this?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Chairman, I think that's an excellent suggestion. I recall the pamphlet Within Our Borders, and at times I felt it was helpful and at times it seemed superfluous. But that wouldn't mean that it couldn't, with some additions, be a potential publication. In any event, I will take it up with the bureau to see whether they have fully assessed the value of that pamphlet.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister. I had a Motion for a Return for some information from the Bureau of Public Affairs. One of the top officials in that bureau came to me and advised me that there was such a volume of material to give me now that it would be rather wrong to file six copies of everything required. So I told them that I would agree to just have them submit to me one set of all the materials. But I understand that since then it has grown so rapidly, there is so much action in that bureau, that they would almost need a truck to give me that material. There was some agreement made that rather than to go to that -- because they apparently can't keep up to their own productivity in that section; it seems it got away on them. They had agreed I could go there and review this material without putting the government to any expense. I was very agreeable because when I thought we could save the taxpayers some money I agreed with that. Knowing how costly the whole bureau is, and in my opinion, it has gone quite beyond what is necessary for informing the people, I wonder if the minister could advise whether he is prepared to give me an undertaking that I can go into the section and go through the correspondence that was going to be tabled or whether they want to take the responsibility of the cost and table everything in the House. Because I do believe now, in speaking to someone

recently from the bureau, that it has become so great that I doubt whether I could catch up to the correspondence that is coming out.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Chairman, there are two things there. One of course is that the Motion for a Return was for a certain date. So there is no idea of catching up because the Motion for a Return ends at a date and therefore it is information leading up to that period of time. So all the activity of the government would not in any way cause that to be a bigger return.

I don't have the right, Mr. Chairman, as a member of this Legislature once the House has ordered a return, to cancel that return. When the matter was debated, as I recall, I pointed out to the hon. member that he was in fact asking for an almost unbelievable amount of material and an unbelievable amount of work, which has been going on now since he insisted on the motion. The government is forced to go through almost every file in the various departments looking for the kind of correspondence that he insisted that he had to have to make an adequate check on the government's operations.

Having been ordered by the House, much as we, now with second thoughts, might like to restrict the tremendous expense the government and the people are being put to, I have no choice except to proceed with the orders of the House.

MR. LUDWIG:

Well, Mr. Chairman, the minister has to proceed with the orders of the House; that it is a long time now and I haven't got anything. We're almost into the middle of the next session, or well toward the middle of the next session. But whatever the government can blame me for it can't blame me for the great volume and the masses of material and paper and everything that goes out of that department. That happens to be the way they are running that department. Nobody who has any regard for where the taxpayer's dollar goes would imagine they would have truckloads of that stuff going out. That is why I refer to it as a publicity bureau or a propaganda department instead of a worthwhile agency for informing the people.

But when the minister admits there is such great volume of material there now, then why didn't he stress this very fact before the House so that the House might have reconsidered giving that order? There was no such statement by the minister that there was literally trainloads of this stuff. Now perhaps it is just as well I requested that information just to show what the government is doing, that they need a pulp mill all to themselves to keep going. Maybe we'd better find out now so that we can make a few adjustments in the future and not swamp the whole province with propaganda.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Chairman, it is probably going back over a debate that went on in the House when Motions for a Return were called and that motion was originally up. But I remember, and the hon. member may wish to check Hansard on the matter, that it was pointed out to him at the time as to what he was asking for and some request that he reconsider and he insisted on getting the information.

I'm not sure whether the hon. member is now saying that he would have wished not to press the Motion for a Return, but it is a fact and we have an order of the House.

The second point he is making, I gather, is that he wishes the government did not send as much information out as it is attempting to to communicate with the people. That is a judgment matter as to the need and the desirability of a government to communicate as much as possible with the people that it serves, and it is our judgment to err on the side of sending too much rather than too little. We always would like to have it pointed out to us where it appears that this is superfluous and if there are areas of adequately communicating with the people and saving some money, we certainly will do that.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the hon. minister's remarks that no member in this House can alone order any kind of an expense by anybody, it has to be an order and the responsibility of the House. So when the hon. minister feels that maybe I have had second thoughts, I have no second thoughts. I want that return. The people ought to know what is happening in any department. It's not the fault of one member who wants information, it's the responsibility of the House to order it or refuse it. It's the responsibility of the

Legislature who ordered it, and not that of some member who wanted some information and maybe, therefore, we should deduct it from his salary because he wanted it. If you don't feel that the people ought to know it, then don't give it. But when the minister makes a statement that we erred on giving too much than not enough, I can say that this an understatement of the year, that they really did err on giving too much.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the hon. minister again on this matter of the publicity campaign against drinking or driving while drinking.

Has the government given any consideration to any other means of trying to control the problem that we are presently facing in drinking drivers being on the road?

MR. GETTY:

I say it is fair to say, Mr. Chairman, that the government has considered a variety of alternatives. There have been some discussed at the cabinet and I'm sure others at various cabinet committees in conjunction with the hon. Attorney General and the Minister of Health and Social Development. There have been a variety of alternatives. One part of those alternatives is the advertising campaign. I know it has mixed feelings from many people as to whether it will be successful, but we are hoping that it will help in what is a difficult problem.

MR. STROM:

I would like to state very bluntly and very directly that I don't have much hope for a publicity campaign in trying to do anything about the problem that we are presently facing with drinking drivers. Mr. Chairman, I want to say too that I recognize that it is an individual's right as to whether or not he drinks. I'm not here to argue that in any way, shape or form. But I am saying that, if they decide that they want to drink, it then becomes the public's business as to whether or not they are also going to be drivers.

I think that we are going to have to take a much more serious view of the problem that is presently facing society of the number of drivers who are on the road when they shouldn't be. I am particularly disturbed by the reports that the RCMP for example are giving us, and I'm sure the hon. the Attorney General is facing this from day to day when he receives the report of the number of accidents in which alcohol is a prime factor. I think it's a well known fact, Mr. Chairman, that in many of the countries where they have very liberal drinking laws, they also have some very, very strict driving laws pertaining to drinking drivers. I would like it to go on record this evening that I wholeheartedly favour taking a much stronger position against drinking drivers than what we are at the present time, and to say again that I don't hold out much hope for a publicity campaign that will be spending funds and really not coming to grips with the problem.

MR. SORENSON:

On that subject, I was interested, a week ago this evening on a local talk-back show. The host is reported to have said that Canada's number one problem is alcoholism. I was interested in a clipping which came to my desk, and it's entitled Hungary Proposes Work Therapy to Cut Down on its Alcoholism:

The Hungarian government is planning drastic new steps to reduce alcoholism. It wants to withdraw confirmed alcoholics from society and subject them to work therapy in closed institutions. They might spend up to two years at the institutions, but they would receive regular pay and benefits for their work.

I'll not read the rest of it. I hope it doesn't come to this in Canada, but it certainly is a problem that I think we have to watch very closely.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Chairman, there is no question that it is a problem and I'm sure we could get into some debate as to the variety of ways in which we might, from complete prohibition to various steps in between, be able to control the problem. I know there is a problem of apprehending the drinking driver prior to the accident, the problem of keeping him off the streets and highways altogether, and the problem of convincing him that it is too dangerous to drink and drive. There's a whole combination of using either force or persuasion to

try and solve the problem. I appreciate that nobody has the solution and, imperfect as it may be, this is one attempt.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the hon. minister that there is no royal solution to this problem as long as we have human nature. I also agree that we would not get very far if we went back to prohibition days, and consequently it's the abuse and not the use of alcohol that causes the problem. The difficulty is that out of every 1,000 persons who drink, so many turn out to be alcoholics and cannot control their appetites and it becomes -- I don't think a disease, but it becomes something they can't control. So it's really the abuse that we are dealing with.

I frankly think that any solution that is going to go very far has to have a number of points. First, I think a campaign does help. As a matter of fact if a campaign persuades one person not to drink and drive and saves one boy or girl from being crippled or killed, I think the \$175,000 is worthwhile. A well run, carefully thought out campaign, I think, does convince people and it does some good.

So with all respect to those who think the campaign may not be of value, I certainly believe in the campaign because I have come across people who have said, I made up my mind when I heard such and such story that I would never drink and drive again. I think it does have an effect. So I'm personally glad to see the campaign underway. I think there are also stricter laws and tougher enforcement of laws and so on, and probably as a combination.

But the point I wanted to speak about is something we don't hear very often. I think we have to change our basic laws in regard to drinking and driving. About three or four years ago in Calgary a man was acquitted after he had run -- he was sickeningly drunk or completely inebriated -- onto the sidewalk and killed two or three people. He was acquitted because he was drunk.

I think this is getting to the nub of things when a person can simply avoid the penalty to society because he was drunk. I don't think that's a reasonable excuse, and it certainly wasn't a reasonable excuse to at least one relative of those people who were killed.

There was a little girl run over in Sherwood Park a few years ago by a man who was completely inebriated, who thought it was smart to drink and drive. The girl was killed, but what happened to him? He was acquitted because he was drunk.

I think this is getting to a ridiculous point. A change has to be made. If a person is drunk he takes the consequences of what he does when he is drunk. I can't see anything wrong with that. If I am going to get drunk and kill somebody, why shouldn't I take the responsibility for what I do while I'm drunk? I shouldn't be acquitted and given my freedom because I was drunk, inebriated, when I did this act. It wasn't as if I was mentally ill or something like that. I was inebriated through my own act and I should be required to take the responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the government, particularly the hon. the Attorney General, take a look at what has to be done with our laws to enable the courts to punish a person for the crime he commits while he is drunk. He shouldn't be acquitted simply on the pretext that he was drunk. He got drunk of his own free volition and he should take the punishment he properly deserves for the offence he commits while he is drunk.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make one other point. I should have done it while I was speaking, but I would like to bring it to the attention of the House now. That is, there are countries that are applying very rigid laws and they are successful. I think of Norway, for example. There are other European countries in which they practise very, very rigid control. There they have certainly been able to come to grips with it.

Let me pose a question to those who suggest that it is only a problem if they get drunk. I wonder how many of us would feel comfortable if we thought they had relaxed the law governing the use of alcohol for pilots. I am afraid there would be a great number of us who would decide that we would rather walk or drive than fly. And it works. All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is let's not treat it lightly. There is a way to come to grips with it and let's not be afraid to do it.

I realize I may be rated as one in a minority but I suggest that the problem will become increasingly worse as we continue to liberalize our liquor laws. All I am saying is, let's stop and take a real good look at it and see if there is not another approach.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Chairman, just for clarification, is the hon. minister going to report back as to the amount of money for that CBC documentary? It was on television today.

MR. GETTY:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, as quickly as I can obtain the information. It may be possible that we can do it this evening. I don't think it interferes with the vote, but I would like to get the information for the hon. member.

Appropriation 1446 agreed to: \$1,868,690

Appropriation 1450 Consumer Affairs

MR. TAYLOR:

I wonder if I could ask the hon. minister if the legislation for this department will be introduced at this spring session? Secondly, is it being modelled after the Canadian government consumer affairs legislation?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Chairman, no, the legislation won't be introduced until the fall sitting. We have accumulated quite a lot of material from other jurisdictions across Canada, all the provincial jurisdictions in Canada as a matter of fact, plus the federal jurisdiction on the organization of their Consumer Affairs Department. In addition to the types of legislation they have under that department, what we have been looking at is how we can organize our structure, bearing in mind in what way other provincial structures are organized.

At the moment the Public Service Commission is doing an extended amount of work in making a proposal for the Consumer Affairs Branch, and we will be visiting other jurisdictions when the session is over to find out exactly how they operate and the extent of their operation. We have just received from the Quebec minister, Mr. Tetley, some additional information which I find very valuable. Some of the publications they are presently turning out will, of course, be presented to the Bureau of Public Affairs for their advice on what we can do.

Appropriation 1450 agreed to: \$147,135

Appropriation 1460 Human Resource Research

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, could I ask whichever minister is in charge of this, which department looks after this? I see it says, "...contract on education and/or other matters." Is most of this money being allocated for educational research, or is there still going to be any social research under this appropriation?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Chairman, as minister responsible for coordinating the research under this vote, there is some education and some social research being done on assignment.

MR. NOTLEY:

Thank you. Mr. Chairman, can the hon. minister advise the committee what criteria are used to allocate research studies and who does it? Is it done directly by you through your department or is there some sort of trust committee that is set up to determine how much goes to which particular consulting firm on what particular project?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Chairman, the various departments apply and I coordinate and allocate and, of course, the amount of the vote is \$200,000. So actually the decision is

mine and I negotiate among the various departments to determine which ones will get priority under this particular vote for the current year.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. minister, was there some research on educational matters conducted last year by contract under this vote?

MISS HUNLEY:

We didn't have this exact vote last year, Mr. Chairman. Last year we were winding down the Human Resources Research Council and there was a vote under that and there were a good many educational studies going on at that time through the Human Resources Research Council.

Appropriation 1460 agreed to:	\$200,000
Office of Program Co-ordination	

Appropriation 1461 Central Office

MR. BARTON:

Who are the ministers in charge of this?

Appropriation 1461 agreed to:	\$216,100
-------------------------------	-----------

<u>Appropriation 1463</u> Project Offices	\$175,550
agreed to without debate	

Appropriation 1464 Lesser Slave Lake Projects

MR. BARTON:

Just one question, Mr. Chairman. On these appropriations, this will be spent in a special area only?

MR. GETTY:

Those, Mr. Chairman, I gather he is referring to under Lesser Slave Lake Projects?

MR. BARTON:

[Inaudible]

MR. GETTY:

That's right, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COOKSON:

On this Appropriation 1464, it doesn't show the total. Perhaps I could suggest that the total allocation, if you take the estimates in the other departments, amounts to about \$5 million for this area and though I'm not familiar with the area, my people would certainly be curious to know just what this amounts to per person in the area.

It may be that the funds allocated for this area are warranted but there have been a lot of questions asked as to why the province is spending amounts of money such as this in a specific area. We have taken a fair amount of criticism over the past while as to the lack of expenditure in the area, the lack of facilities and I'd certainly like to know what we are paying in the area, on a per capita basis. I wonder if any one of the ministers could answer this.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that the comparison has ever been worked out, and I would have to get for the hon. member an estimate of the population within the area that most of these funds will be spent in. It would be an interesting comparison.

I am sure the hon. members are aware that it is designated as a special area under an agreement with the federal government in order to attempt to provide a greater economic impetus and assist the people in the area to reach

the full potential of their area, which has both human and natural resources. It is hoped that with this impetus it will then be able to maintain a satisfactory growth in the future.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Chairman, has the program ever been evaluated by your government?

MR. GETTY:

In a variety of ways, Mr. Chairman, all of them which I have found deficient in one way or another. I think so have members of the Executive Council. It's a very difficult evaluation to attempt, but there are several going on.

I think it would be helpful for the House and for the federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion when these evaluations -- deficient as they may be -- are completed, to take a look and see whether or not the expenditures were justified. Perhaps we may find -- well, it may be difficult to justify them -- that there will be a great deal of information that has been gathered which would allow the expenditure of funds in areas like this to be handled in the future in a slightly more advantageous way.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister. I am sure he is aware that these are federally initiated programs, that is, the whole DREE program. My question to him: is it the intention of the provincial government to try and cancel out of programs of this nature as proposed by the federal government, or is the provincial government prepared to accept federal dollars for programs of this nature?

MR. GETTY:

Well, Mr. Chairman, the provincial government does not want to enter into any more agreements with the federal government where a part of our province is designated arbitrarily as different from another part. And while it is true that the part within the special area, as we have mentioned in the House before, obtains considerable benefits, there is an automatic sort of disenfranchisement of those just outside of the boundary who suddenly find that it's almost impossible to compete with those inside due to the funds that the federal government, and in some cases the provincial government, is putting inside that area.

So the hon. Member for Cypress, I am sure, is aware of the government's stand on DREE areas which we have debated and discussed in the House in the past. We are going to attempt to have those programs of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, or others that the federal government may come up with, administered in our province to the greatest extent possible, not by creating any special areas or drawing any arbitrary boundaries within the province.

MR. STROM:

But the provincial government is prepared to accept federal money to use on programs of this nature, providing they cover the total province?

MR. GETTY:

I didn't get the last part of the --

MR. STROM:

Providing they cover the total area.

MR. GETTY:

The total area of the province? Well, that's what we would hope to do, Mr. Chairman. We would hope to have the total area of the province a potential site for projects which might be funded by the provincial government or the federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion. Then those projects would be funded based on their individual merits, and not because they happen to be in any special part of the province.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, one further question to the hon. minister. How does he then propose to get away from the unfair competition that results from an industry that gets help competing with one that doesn't get help?

MR. GETTY:

I'm not sure of the unfair competition the hon. member referred to. How did you mean that question?

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, if I may enlarge just a little bit. We'll assume that an industry is already in an area and operating, and they have started on their own without any help from anybody. Then under a program of this nature a new industry is brought in receiving help under a DREE program, or call it whatever you want. Does the hon. minister feel that that is a fair proposition and one that the provincial government is prepared to support?

MR. GETTY:

Now I understand, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member has touched on one of the automatic problems you run into when the government becomes involved in this type of assistance for industry. I suppose we would have to rely on the management ability of those deciding on the assistance -- that they are not, in fact, moving an industry into an area that's already serviced by the same industry, or if they are, that they are not providing unfair competition.

It should be recognized, Mr. Chairman, that each of the western provinces has now agreed, and I think it was mentioned in the House one time, that they would all endorse the "no area" approach to having the Department of Regional Economic Expansion's funds spent in western Canada.

I'm sure there would be new structures necessary to control where those funds are spent. But under the proposals that the provincial government has been making to Ottawa certainly such things as industrial-development incentives would be under the control and the guidance of the provincial government and not under the control of the federal government. I would hope that in that way, knowing, I suggest, our business much better than people in Ottawa do, just because of the fact we are here and elected by the people, the funds would be administered more within the priorities of the people of Alberta.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Chairman, just following on these questions and noting that a number of appropriations come under this vote, is there available, or is it possible to have a coordinated information sheet or pamphlet dealing with those areas that are designated special areas, to give us a better appreciation and understanding of the overall programs, expenditures, benefits and the needs that fall under these special areas so that we might be better versed on the whole matter?

MR. GETTY:

I think it's something we could well work out with any of the members, Mr. Chairman. There are really only the two areas now. One is a special area, the Lesser Slave Lake area, and the other is the area that is designated by the federal government for industrial development grants, which is the area that runs through the southern part of our province, comes up and touches around Drumheller, and then switches back below Calgary. We have maps that the hon. members could easily see. I believe there is a brochure and pamphlets that would be helpful in that regard and I would be happy to get them for her.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Just a comment on that. Why I'm asking about the availability of this coordinated information is because it seems that the various members representing areas that have the designation of special areas make the kind of dialogue here as though they are not getting any kind of consideration or assistance from the government. I think perhaps we need to have the matter drawn home a little bit more.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with the minister that as far as the DREE program is concerned, the whole business of drawing boundaries creates a host of

problems, all sorts of artificial problems within the province. I know he has told the House in the question period that the other three provinces in western Canada tend to agree with Alberta, but I wonder if he could take a moment and advise the committee where things stand with the federal government.

I know you are not going to be in a position to discuss this perhaps in as much detail as we would like to hear, but it has been about a year since this matter was first raised in the Legislature. Have you noticed any change in the attitude of the federal government, especially with the new minister? Is the government taking a somewhat more flexible attitude towards the whole concept of, for example, providing DREE funds directly to the province?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Chairman, the time problem, of course, was accentuated by an election and a change in ministers. I would say that while we were making considerable progress prior to the election with the hon. Jean Marchand, we are equally as encouraged, or even more so, by the approach of Mr. Jamieson. Mr. Jamieson appears prepared to accept, with perhaps some problems of working out the technicalities of approvals and so on, a much broader kind of function for DREE in western Canada. Mr. Jamieson is coming out to present his up-to-date reaction to Alberta's proposals within, I believe, the next two or three weeks. Shortly after that meeting we would probably have a great deal more of value to provide to the House, but I guess in a general way we could say that we are pleased with the progress we are making with Mr. Jamieson; he does appear to accept a greater role for the provincial government in the expenditure of DREE funds and will also try and have the department operate without boundaries within the province.

Appropriation 1464 agreed to: \$450,000

Executive Council Total Income Account agreed to: \$13,193,977

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Chairman, I have a note regarding the question on the CBC. I'm not sure if it will satisfy the hon. Mr. Barton or not, but information from an official in the Bureau of Public Affairs is that the CBC would not sell any time to a provincial government for political subjects in any event, and there was no provincial government sponsorship by the Bureau of Public Affairs for any federal MP today or in the past.

MR. BARTON:

I would like to follow that up. Would it be any other department other than public affairs? You are talking for all the departments in government? I'm not saying buying the time on the TV. The cost of the program is what I am little bothered about, because if it cost five cents it was too much.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Chairman, I guess that is a judgment factor; it could be a difference of opinion within the House. But what went through my mind when the hon. member raised the question, and knowing the bureau would not be involved in any way supporting or purchasing time for a federal MP, was the possibility that the hon. member may have been watching an educational television program having to do with an election to educate students who would be watching these shows. One specific election, I suppose, or it might in a broad way have been supported by provincial funds through MEETA or some television production such as that, for educational purposes.

Legislation

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 1902</u>	General Administration	\$336,105
<u>Appropriation 1903</u>	Sessional	\$1,141,200
<u>Appropriation 1904</u>	Library	\$112,572
<u>Appropriation 1905</u>	Auditor's Office	\$1,384,583
<u>Appropriation 1908</u>	Data Processing Centre	

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask a question for general information. Is the Data Processing Centre still under the Auditor's Office or has it been separated? Under the jurisdiction of the Auditor's Office?

MR. MINIELY:

No, jurisdictionally it's under the Auditor's Office. The Auditor cooperates with Treasury in processing of certain financial information and that's as required. But it's actually under the management of the Provincial Auditor at the present time.

MR. HENDERSON:

Is the government considering removing it from the jurisdiction of the Auditor's Office and setting it up more as a service-oriented department serving all branches of government rather than being under the jurisdiction of the Auditor?

MR. MINIELY:

Well, Mr. Chairman, the situation is much more complex than that because the function of pre-audit in itself requires that you would have to set up a system of priorities for the Data Centre. I've had conversations with the Provincial Auditor on this, but at the present time we are just trying to work things out so that the Data Centre does in effect provide a service to departments within broad government priorities. But in doing so the Provincial Auditor and I have agreed that the first priority has to be to the audit function and to the financial processing function. After that we are trying to allocate the services of the Data Centre on a priority basis of providing statistical information for various government departments within broad government priorities. But it is necessary in whatever we do with the Data Centre in the future, which at this point is just speculation, that we certainly do not have anything but audit as the first priority.

MR. HENDERSON:

No change then?

MR. MINIELY:

No.

Appropriation 1908	agreed to:	\$3,411,300
--------------------	------------	-------------

Appropriation 1910	Leader of the Opposition	
--------------------	--------------------------	--

HON. MEMBERS:

No, no, no.

MR. COOKSON:

I wanted to ask a question on 1910, whether the Leader of the Opposition feels he's getting his money's worth?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I thought we had agreement to that, Mr. Cookson, you're a little late on that.

MR. WYSE:

It's the other way around --

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, on that point alone, on the basis of attendance, I believe that the hon. Leader of the Opposition --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I've already ruled Mr. Cookson. We've dealt with that one already.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, you shouldn't be heckling a person who's --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I'm not. I say I've already ruled against Mr. Cookson. We've agreed on 1910.

MR. LUDWIG:

I got up before you called the vote, Mr. Chairman. In dealing with the Leader of the Opposition's Vote --

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh come on, sit down.

MR. LUDWIG:

I would say that on the basis of attendance in this House perhaps the Premier's ought to be cut a little bit.

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Chairman, I was ruled out of order on that, so I don't think you can accept his --

Appropriation 1910 agreed to:

\$70,636

Appropriation 1911 Ombudsman

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Appropriation 1911, Ombudsman, or otherwise we will bring him in here.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, on that one, I raised with the Premier earlier the matter of a Zenith number for the Ombudsman. Has there been any decision on that as yet or is that still forthcoming?

MR. LEITCH:

I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I didn't catch the middle words of the question.

MR. RUSTE:

Earlier in this session I raised with the Premier the matter of a Zenith number for the Ombudsman. You are setting up a sub-office in Calgary and I raised the point during the first of the session and now, about having a Zenith number so that let us say somebody out in the northwest part of the province or southeast part, by dialing, could get directly to the Ombudsman's office.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Chairman, it is my memory that that is the intention but to be certain I would have to check.

Appropriation 1911 agreed to: \$194,410

Appropriation 1912 Office of Mr. Speaker and Deputy Speaker \$49,330
agreed to without debate

Appropriation 1914 Hansard

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I don't know to whom to direct this question, possibly to the hon. Government House Leader. I was wondering if the government has weighed the advantages and disadvantages of having a Hansard under a minister with an editor-in-chief, as compared to being under the jurisdiction of Mr. Speaker?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, the government has, Mr. Chairman. I think it's our conclusion that similar to the situation in most other legislatures I think, in the British Commonwealth, the office of Hansard insofar as it relates to the very critical issue of accurate reporting of the Assembly, its proceedings should be under the jurisdiction of the Speaker who is assisted by the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly.

We understand that the Speaker is prepared to accept that obligation and we feel that is the place where it belongs, insofar as the Speaker is the neutral chairman of the Assembly.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, just a question on the appropriation. My understanding was that the original estimate was considerably less than what the first year's operation cost. I note here, now, that the appropriation is up considerably. Is it the feeling of the minister or those in charge of the operation that it will be able to operate within the figure that is in the budget now?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'm informed by the Speaker that he feels that the figure for 1973-1974 of one hundred and six some thousand dollars will be adequate and that as experience is gained it may be even possible to reduce that by some percentage. But there's no question that the amount, in fact, spent last year and budgeted for future years was something more than the original estimate of some \$48,000.

MR. STROM:

Has there been a change in the administrative organization? I understand there have been some considerable personnel changes in the past year. Is that correct?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, I believe that the Hansard report, being Sessional Paper No. 49 of this session, and the Speaker speaks to that. There were some administrative changes to sever the question of the editorship which requires judgment and discretion as opposed to the question of effective administration, which I believe has now been placed with the office of the Clerk of the Assembly who has had wide experience in that.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, is there any consideration being given to lowering the subscription rate to Hansard in light of the federal one being \$3? I am thinking here of making it more readily available to citizens of Alberta.

MR. HYNDMAN:

No consideration has been given by the government, Mr. Chairman, insofar as it's not within the government's discretion to do so. However, I think if the hon. member perhaps would canvas his caucus and the suggestion were made to the Speaker, that he would perhaps suggest to both House Leaders that a resolution be placed on the floor, maybe a follow-up to the one which changed the Hansard charges for various additions, which was passed about four weeks ago.

April 16, 1973

ALBERTA HANSARD

44-2265

Appropriation 1914 agreed to: \$106,250

Appropriation 1916 Election Act

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Deputy Premier: it appears there will not be a general election this year?

DR. HORNER:

It's not likely, Mr. Chairman.

Appropriation 1916 agreed to: \$11,695

Total Income Account Legislation

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, on the general total I had one or two questions to ask and I didn't know where to ask them so I was holding it for the total vote. The number one question is the staff, the page staff and sergeant and so on, connected with the Legislature, are they on a salary basis? I understand the question is yes.

At what time do they start to get overtime? Do they start to get overtime at a certain time of night?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I don't know, Mr. Chairman. Maybe if the hon. member would consult with the Clerk, Mr. MacDonald, he could ascertain that information. I don't know what the overtime situation is.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, I feel -- we have had two sessions this year, one that went close to 4:00 o'clock in the morning and another session well after midnight and if regular staff are not being paid overtime after a certain time, I feel that some consideration should be given by the government or whoever is responsible to see they are paid for their time. I really think they are entitled to overtime after a certain time, but I'm just asking a question.

Mr. Chairman, do I understand the government is going to take it under consideration?

MR. HYNDMAN:

[Not recorded]...Mr. Chairman, and provide such information as we can.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest not only give consideration, but if they are not being given overtime that consideration be given that they will be given overtime.

MR. HYNDMAN:

The hon. member has made his point. I think the first thing is to ascertain the facts. When we have the facts we can draw conclusions and consult with those appropriate.

MR. STROM:

I should have asked it on the appropriation, but possibly the Provincial Treasurer could explain his arithmetic: a 24 per cent reduction in the cost of operating Hansard.

MR. MINIELY:

I have explained several times in the House the comparison of this year's estimate as to last year's level of expenditure. Last year's actual expenditure in Hansard was \$140,000. This year our estimate is \$106,000.

Total Income Account agreed to: \$6,818,281

Appropriation 1981 Equipment for Data Centre \$5,775,000
agreed to without debate

Department of Education

Appropriation 1301 Minister's Office \$76,900
agreed to without debate

Appropriation 1302 General Administration

MR. GRUENWALD:

Could I just ask the minister a question here? On the total salary bills there seems to be quite a large increase, about 28 per cent or 29 per cent. Mr. Chairman, is this for the same people, or is this for additional staff, or how do you explain that big difference, Mr. Minister?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, the total increase in Appropriation 1302 under General Administration is 7.6 per cent, which relates, I think, very largely to normal salary increments, but there certainly are some new personnel involved, particularly in association with the early childhood services program.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Chairman, if you will notice the salary items though, they went from \$263,000 to \$287,000. That's more than 7.5 per cent.

MR. MINIELY:

I told several people in subcommittee and the subcommittees I was in, that one of the things in all departmental salary figures this year, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that pay roll burden which was formerly handled through a central pot in the Treasury Department has now been transferred to all the various departmental appropriations. There is an element of Unemployment Insurance, Canada Pension Plan, that formerly was paid out of a central pool, that is in all the departmental salary figures. The reason for that is to put more budgetary responsibility in the departments rather than through a central pot.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, this is just general. The minister realizes the vote was taken in my area back over a year ago. The concerns that have been expressed to me are that because of the, shall we say, restrictions or the restricted amount of money available to them, there are certain programs that are having to be curtailed or even in fact eliminated, which gives concern to the rural areas when they compare themselves to many of the urban areas. I realize that even within the cities there are cutbacks being made. But because of their large school population they are able to have these classes go on, these courses go on. Some of them are being cut out in the rural area. Is there anything that the minister sees that can be done to alleviate this and give a better opportunity to those in even some of the larger, smaller centres I'll say, in the rural areas?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Firstly, Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we do not bandy about the term "cutback" when we look at an increase in the foundation fund moneys to schools of some \$27 million. This is at a time when the school population in the province is dropping and will drop from its present figure of approximately 423,000 down to 402,000 in about five years.

One of the basic problems is there just aren't the kids around, and because the grant follows the pupil this has caused the problem. However, one of the ways we attempted to alleviate that this year and for the next two years was, instead of providing grants on the basis of a group of 26 students whereby the school division suffered if it couldn't get a unit of 26 students or a multiple thereof, the school division now gets a grant for each student and this assists the problems of school boards. In addition there is a 7.5 per cent increase this year in the foundation fund moneys and a 7.5 increase allowed in the supplementary requisition. If a school board can show a very special or unusual

case or circumstance, it can apply to the minister for a review of the rate base.

In addition to that the former feature of the plebiscite, which was a barrier in preventing the school board from going to its ratepayers for further supplementary requisition money, has been changed from hard-controlled to soft-controlled in the sense that the board can pass the resolution to increase its 7.5 per cent supplementary ceiling and go for a higher figure unless there is a reaction from the electorate. So I think probably the school board does feel it had a difficult year last year. They have more moneys this year than last year, but they still will have the difficulty of setting priorities as to what they want to do in terms of spending money, on what sort of teacher mix, what sort of support staff mix, what sort of school building, curriculum, materials, and this kind of thing will be needed.

MR. RUSTE:

Just a further question then, Mr. Minister. Do you feel then that with these alterations or changes in the granting of the moneys this will assist the difficulty they find themselves in?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, I think it will assist them, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON:

Yes, just one question. Is the government going to look into the serious problem of school bus transportation? I believe it has been frozen since, I think, 1970 and if I remember right it was one of the major planks of the hon. Premier, come election time, that they would actually bus the teachers to the pupils. I was wondering if there is going to be an increase because one particular colony is finding it pretty tough, and in my area it is pretty tough too to meet the commitments that transportation is causing.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well some months ago, Mr. Chairman, we began a very intensive study, probably the most intensive of the decade, into the whole question of pupil transportation. It has been calculated -- the hon. member is correct -- on the basis of 90 per cent of a moving three-year average. This has been moving up, so to say that it is frozen is not entirely correct.

We've been trying to assess and weigh the effectiveness of the Alberta school transportation dollar against other provinces, and we find that in Alberta we are spending a higher percentage of the total budget on transportation than the other four western provinces. What we will be looking at, also because we indicated concern, as was mentioned with transportation and with the formula -- wondering whether or not it provided an incentive to centralize in the sense that if a school board finds that through the transportation formula it can get many more dollars than it can by leaving half a teacher or a full teacher in a small school, then it is going to opt for the economic, which may not be the educational or the societal, benefit of transportation. This necessarily causes the centralization of school systems.

So we would hope in the fall of this year to have an interim report and early next year probably a full and comprehensive report which we probably will make available to the Legislature.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might make some general comments. I was going to make some comments under the grants under Appropriation 1303, but I could make them here. But first, just a question to the hon. minister. You mentioned, Mr. Minister, that the grants for transportation are on a three-year average, based on 90 per cent of 1969 moving upwards. I'm wondering though, if that is true, why the grants that I have seen for transportation to the different divisions, at least in my area, are exactly the same this year as they were last year?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I wonder, have we completed the discussion of 1302 before we go into 1303? Any further question on 1302? Have we agreement on it? Fine.

Appropriation 1302 agreed to:

\$414,280

Appropriation 1303 Grants to Schools

MR. HYNDMAN:

I think in answer to the question, Mr. Chairman, that may relate to the factor used of the number of pupils being transported, or the costs which the system has. In other words, the system may have consolidated a bus line or moved four into three or may have fewer students. At any rate its actual costs may have gone down but the amount of money has been on an increasing average, for example, in 1971 it was \$68,970. It has moved up. It hasn't moved up that much... [Inaudible]

MR. NOTLEY:

The increase then, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister would be very, very marginal over the last three years, taken as a whole in rural Alberta?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I think that would be a matter of one's individual interpretation, Mr. Chairman. The problem is that if you base transportation grants on the actual cost, there is no way to assess whether the moneys are being spent wisely or not wisely. We're trying to find out what is, for example, the average cost in certain areas of the province where the configuration is hills or flat lands or good highways or bad; what's the average cost per student or what should it be?

One of the other reasons for differences is that in some cases the individual trustees in a school division will each have a bus route in his subdivision. In other larger divisions they have established the principle of a bus route manager who can consolidate and rationalize the whole situation.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, there are several observations I would like to make and also pose some questions, too.

In terms of questions, I am wondering whether or not we have any overall provincial study that provides us with some sort of inventory, Mr. Minister, on the equality of education, that is, the relative opportunity of a youngster in a rural area to progress up through the educational system and on through it, compared with the urban areas?

I am thinking of a study which would be somewhat similar to the study of your colleague, Dr. Hohol, with respect to inner-city schools, a study which I thought was quite an excellent one, that compared the problems of educating youngsters in the inner-city region and the inequalities that exist within the city school system. I am wondering whether or not we have any overall study that has done this on the province as a whole?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I can't recall, Mr. Chairman, a recent province-wide study. I think there have been studies, as I recall, on various aspects of this. For example, the rural high school has been studied and, I think, it has been monographed by Dr. Downey of the Human Resources Research Council a few years ago.

I would think if you could pin down the particular area in which answers are desired, that might well be something worthy of consideration. Certainly the Educational Opportunities Fund, that aspect of it which provides for disadvantaged youngsters -- one of the aspects of support there is for situations where a child is isolated, where a child is lacking a dimension in his education, where there is a history of drop-outs or low school attendance.

MR. NOTLEY:

Following on, Mr. Chairman. While the new grant structure has certain advantages, let me take first of all the change from the cluster system to the per pupil system. This is of considerable advantage to the small school unit, the very small school units, for example, in my area the separate school system, because they were so tiny there was no way that they didn't come out losing part of the remainder under the cluster system.

However, the change from that system to the per pupil system hasn't been appreciably helpful to the larger rural school divisions with 1,500, 1,800, 2,500 or 3,000 students because before they usually had enough students that

they could somehow come out so that they didn't really lose appreciably under the cluster system. But because of the problem that this system posed for the separate schools, I support the change. I think that is a step in the right direction.

I noticed in your speech during the budget you suggested three areas where you felt the government was going to slow down centralization. One was the elimination of the cluster system; a second was a slow-down in the school building program, and again I tend to agree with you here. The third, and you mentioned this tonight, was with respect to busing, school busing. I really question, though, whether or not the busing of students is an incentive to centralization at this stage of the game.

In my area again, in talking to the local trustees, there isn't a division where the grant for school busing actually covers the cost of school busing. There is a loss in the case of all three of the school divisions. Now I suppose when you compare the loss of operating a school versus the loss on the bus system, there may be some slight incentive, but I really doubt that it's a major question.

It seems to me, Mr. Minister, that there are a number of problems that are more acute in the rural areas -- perhaps they exist throughout the province, but they are more acute in the rural areas.

The first is dropping enrolment. This is going to cause a real problem for a rural school division, especially with the per pupil grant, because if the enrolment is dropping, even though you increase the average by 7.5 per cent, the net 'take' of the school division will be something less than 7.5 per cent.

Again, we are referring to the three divisions in my constituency. One division will have an increase this year of 5.1 per cent, another 6.7 per cent, and the luckiest one will have an increase of 6.9 per cent. But all of them will be under the 7.5 per cent that is permitted in the increase in the per student amount. So that's going to be a problem.

The second problem, it seems to me, that rural divisions are going to face, even more seriously than the urban divisions, is that as we demand higher standards for teachers, this is going to mean that the teachers will be seeking more university education. It will mean higher increments, and this is going to increase the wage bill by more than the negotiated salary grid with the ATA because there will be not only the normal increase that comes from years of experience, but you add to that the demand for upgrading of profession skill, then you have a further increment which is going to impose a hardship on the local division. I'm not saying we shouldn't do that. I think we should be trying to upgrade the standards and qualifications of teachers throughout the province. But I suggest to you that as we do that, it's going to provide a rather serious hardship on the rural division where you'll find that there will be a larger percentage of the teachers who will be trying to improve their qualifications.

The shift from the high school and junior high to elementary is frankly one which I support in principle, but again, in many of the rural divisions you find an enrolment pattern where the number of students entering Grade 1 is, in some cases, fewer than the number of students leaving Grade 12, and that the projections of the enrolment over the next six years shows that there just aren't going to be that many students coming in at the bottom end of the scale.

Now as we shift the emphasis from secondary and junior high to the elementary, this again is going to cause a problem for those rural divisions. It may cause a problem throughout the system as a whole, but I suggest significantly less serious in the larger urban areas than in the rural areas where, because of the aging population in the first place, you are going to find dwindling numbers of students entering the system. As your per pupil grant shifts to the elementary, this is going to make it extremely difficult for the divisional trustees.

I also feel that the moving three-year bus allowance -- I know you are going to be assessing this -- but I would submit that with a number of costs going up, the salaries of school bus drivers going up, now with the fuel costs going up, there is really no doubt that the costs of operating a school bus system will mount in the years ahead. This causes problems as well.

The difficulty, it seems to me, that many of the divisions were in this year is that, all right, the first move is to lay off a couple of teachers here and there. You can cut back and then you can live within your grant structure. Now in a larger school, cutting two or three teachers from a high school with a

staff of 21 or 22 doesn't significantly alter the program. It cuts it down somewhat, but it doesn't significantly alter the program. The problem, however, arises in your smaller high school. You've got a high school with 50 students if you've got four teachers and you cut one of the teachers, then you have very significantly affected the quality of education in that particular school.

Again, looking at one of the divisions in my riding, the move was to cut 1.5 teachers in one particular high school -- I think you probably know the high school I am referring to; the board finally reassessed the position and found they could live within the grant structure this year. What will happen next year is a very open question. But the person they were going to lay off was a physical education instructor. Now there are some who may say that physical education is very much an extra, a frill we don't need. But I really question that. If we are going to provide something like equality of educational opportunity, having a physical education instructor in a school to provide proper physical education for junior and senior high in my view is a necessity.

I feel that what will inevitably happen if the enrolments decline and we are caught within the 7.5 per cent ceiling is that at some point, this year, next year, three years down the road, the school division is going to have to close the smaller schools. Frankly I think we have gone too far with centralization of schools as it is.

Now the irony of it is that we have the Minister of Agriculture who is saying we've got to stimulate rural development, and I think most of us in this House agree with him in that respect. But you are not going to encourage younger people to settle in the small villages and hamlets or to get back on the farm if it means that their children have to ride many, many miles a day in a school bus, or if the quality of instruction is so poor in the local school, or so reduced, that they don't feel their children will have a proper educational opportunity.

I mentioned this during the Speech from the Throne debate because it illustrates the problems that divisions find themselves in. When the first announcement was made, Mr. Minister, one of the superintendents in my area felt he would have to close down a rather remote high school 40 miles away from the next high school. That would mean that the students would have to leave at 7:45 and come in on a feeder bus. Many of them would be on the feeder bus for an hour. They would get into the central point, get on the bus and take an hour to get to the other school where they would arrive at 9:45. They would miss one period. They would have to leave three-quarters of an hour early so they would miss a period at the other end. The superintendent, in a very enterprising way, suggested that perhaps what could be done is that the school bus should be wired for sound and the students could receive lessons through a sound system installed in the school bus. With great respect to the superintendent, and I don't blame him, I think most of us who come from rural areas know that you may learn many things on a school bus, but you don't learn English literature. Yet this is the kind of situation that it seems to me school divisions may find themselves in, unless in the next period of time we make some adjustments in the grant structure.

My suggestion to you is that first of all, when it comes to rural education, I believe your department and the Department of Agriculture have to work very closely together, because there is really no point at all in developing programs to encourage people to settle in the rural areas unless our education system works parallel with these programs.

The second point is that despite the \$2.4 million which represents the remainders from the cluster system, I don't really think that is going to solve our problem or tide us over the period of time in order to keep these schools operating.

It seems to me we are going to have to accept the principle that costs would be higher, because inevitably there is going to be a lower pupil-teacher ratio than would be the case in the province as a whole, and maybe even lower than we would like to see for a period of time. But there will have to be some adjustment in the grant structure to permit the school divisions to come over this period of time, and then if our rural programs do begin to take hold and we find that young people go back to the land or begin to settle in our smaller communities, eventually we will right ourselves. But I suggest in many respects, and I don't say this just to make a few partisan points, that the proof of our rural development programs will rest less in the Minister of Agriculture's Department than in how we deal with the education system. Because the success of these programs is contingent in many ways on the rationale for indefinitely subsidizing the rural systems.

If the programs aren't going to work and we are going to have a depletion of the rural population anyway, then it just doesn't make sense to provide an extra incentive to maintain these schools. But on the other hand, if the reverse is true and if we can revive rural Alberta, then it makes sense in the intervening period of time to pour more money into the rural divisions -- Mr. Cooper mentioned this in his budget speech last week -- so that eventually, as young people start coming into the system, they will be able to go to a school 6, 8 or 10 miles away rather than 30 or 40 miles down the road.

MR. GRUENWALD:

On 1303, does the increase here guarantee every school district at least 7.5 per cent increase in instructional grants?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, it does, Mr. Chairman, based on the number of students. But if the number of students drop, say by 20 per cent, then the total amount of moneys that the board saved last year as compared to this year wouldn't increase by 7.5 per cent.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Well, have you got any idea how many boards will receive considerably less than that? Do you have any idea at all?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, they are calculated, Mr. Chairman, on a per pupil basis, and the total figure they received there is somewhat meaningless, although some of them I know, are receiving up to a 15 per cent increase by reason of the changes.

MR. GRUENWALD:

It's partly, I suppose, because of getting rid of truncation too, wouldn't it?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes.

MR. GRUENWALD:

I should like to mention that I agree whole-heartedly with getting rid of that truncation system. I certainly was never in agreement with that type of agreement for per pupil grant, that truncation thing, because that really caused a problem, as the point has been made on this CRU business.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I would just like to offer a few comments regarding the statements by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

There is no question we are into an unusual, unique and difficult period in education financing by reason of this no-growth situation and in fact, decline in student population for the first time in some 25 years. The basic problem as mentioned is the dropping enrolment. That's something which personally I can't do much to change or improve. But, by 1976, it is anticipated enrolments will increase again and with the government agricultural programs in the rural areas that may well happen.

However, there is an intervening period of four to six years which will be difficult. We are now looking into a number of alternative suggestions made by school divisions in the province, rural ones especially, with a view to suggesting mid-course corrections in the finance plans which we have indicated we would be prepared to do.

Certainly the question of school bus costs is one which has to be looked at very carefully because they just vary all over the waterfront in terms of the cost of transporting a given pupil a given mile in Alberta. I know the resources of the department have been used very effectively in a number of cases where boards have called in someone from the department simply to offer advice as to how transportation moneys could be more effectively spent. We hope, realizing the present situation doesn't provide us with the facts we need, that the study will give us some indication as to how to have a fair school transportation and busing costs.

Higher standards for teachers: there is no question that the increment which arises by reason of teachers getting more education is a built-in cost to school boards. Certainly the general qualifications of Alberta teachers are among the highest in Canada, and we feel they should be kept that way, insofar as the quality of the teacher and the extent of his knowledge and sensitivity to a child is perhaps the greatest guarantee or factor in respect of providing quality education. So good education costs money.

There is no question that the link-up between departments of Agriculture and Education is necessary to carry through a program of rural development. We have that link-up being carried forward by a committee. What it really boils down to, Mr. Chairman, is a lot of dollars and when you are talking about the educational changes, they may seem small but they always cost in the millions. For example to change the present pupil-teacher ratio of 20.5 to 1 in Alberta, which is the lowest in Canada, by just one point to make it 19.5 to 1 would cost \$10 million. Certainly that is something we want to keep down and keep as the pupil-teacher ratio leader in Canada.

But I appreciate the remarks made because the rural areas, not only in the north but in the southeast and other parts of the province, have brought this matter to my attention and we are going to be giving it intensive and new study, bearing in mind that it's a new, unique problem not found since about 1948.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I think I spoke to you at one time about the cost of busing in the County of Parkland. Going over the figures again with the county officials, we found an increase of students of about 441 after they had taken the number of those who were within the mile and half pick-up. I understand they are picking up some now and the reduction of that was 61. Consequently, the amount of money that was expended in the past year was about \$90,000 in excess of the busing allocation of the budget the previous year. I think I can readily understand it, because they have about 441 students more on their buses than they have had since 1971 and 1969.

My question to you, Mr. Minister, is this. If the survey you are going to come up with shows that additional funds will be needed by this county to transport the children, because they are actually employing 8 to 10 buses more now than they did in 1970, will this need be recognized for the year 1973 - 1974? Will this be taken into consideration: although their need for additional funds is discovered in December, will this be retroactive for the year 1973 - 1974?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I couldn't make a promise in that regard, Mr. Chairman. It's somewhat hypothetical to predict what the report will say, but we hope to end with a formula that is fair, one that doesn't penalize efficient districts and one that doesn't provide a special bonus or incentive to inefficient districts.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I think perhaps when we take a look at the busing of the county in itself, they are now employing 10 more buses than they did before because the number of children is now in excess of a 400 increase. I'm wondering if there will be a need to look at that in the very near future, because certainly \$90,000 in excess in the past two years is almost \$200,000 to be considered. I think this is the problem that the county finds itself in now, that they are trying to budget within the 7.5 per cent, because this is a considerable amount of money that they have to expend. If this can be recovered at a later date, I think they can probably budget for a deficit while looking forward to the possibility that this will be recognized in the year 1973 - 1974.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I wouldn't be able to give a commitment, Mr. Chairman, that it would be recovered at a later date because we are dealing with the estimates of a year, for which in a future year it would be impossible to find a special warrant. However, if there are special situations and problems not of the county's own making that have happened over the last two or three years by reason perhaps of policies made in previous years, we are certainly always open to making special cases. Educational finance funding is such that while you can make general rules and regulations for the province, with 126 school boards there is always a special situation that has to be looked at. So in the interest of equity and fairness to all, we are prepared to look at those who put up a special case.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister this. Due to more and more double busing in rural areas where there is no high school provided and the students are bused to the local school, then put on another bus half an hour earlier and leave the high school at 2:00 o'clock, would it not be cheaper or has your department considered paying the teachers mileage and moving the teachers to where the students are?

MR. HYNDMAN:

The suggestion is unique, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, the problem is I think this gets right into the question of the internal housekeeping of the school division and relates to the way in which the authority which school boards now have delegated to them to work out their own mixture of the way they want to run bus lines and the teacher-pupil mix and whether they want to put a certain number of pupils in a small school or a large school or move them.

So I fear it would be considered quite an intrusion into local autonomy if the province, in effect, prescribed and proscribed a plan of that kind. But it is something which, I think, local school boards, if a model could be developed showing it saves some money, should well consider.

MR. BENOIT:

I realize that 1314 is the grants for private schools. I am not asking about that now particularly, but we have three school systems, the public schools, separate schools and private schools. In these three school systems we have a standard of education that, I presume, is to be the same.

Now, what assurance have we that the standard of education in all three systems is kept the same? Have we superintendents who oversee it? Has the department got certain people who inspect it? Is there any way of determining it?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Of course, in most public and separate systems the education leaders are the superintendents who advise the board. With regard to private schools, there are certainly inspections done by the department and the position I think we take is that any school, be it public or private, should have -- and public schools must have and private schools in our view should have -- 'certificated' teachers and should follow the base guidelines of the provincial curriculum.

Now, really if there are 'certificated', well trained, thoughtful teachers and a basic curriculum mandated by the province which is followed, then the general standard, in our view, can be maintained. This, I think, at the same time allows for a degree of diversity within a school system and a number of choices to parents which I think is also important.

When we get to the stage of having achievement, benchmark measuring tests where we can measure not simply one student against another, as the departmentals did, but rather against an objective standard of how well certain schools are doing, what our education system is doing, that would be an even greater addition of information and assessment.

MR. BENOIT:

There is one other question while on this particular appropriation. You said a moment ago that under the present system the grant follows the pupil and this is true within each of the systems. I think it would be true if the pupil went from a public school to a separate school. But that is as far as it goes. If he goes from a public or a separate school to a private school then the grant doesn't follow in the same proportion.

MR. HYNDMAN:

That is right. It is the opinion of the department and of myself that it is crucially important to maintain a public, non-sectarian school system because that democratic method which has only developed in the last 150 years is the only guarantee, in the long run, of equal opportunity, although equal opportunity is something which we may never attain. But we will always strive for it.

Appropriation 1303 agreed to:

\$255,080,240

Appropriation 1305 Textbooks and Readers

MR. RUSTE:

Textbooks and readers? Would this be where the Canadian content in the school books is considered? If so, have you any comment to make on that?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, a number of the materials -- I think, the figure, as I recall it, is about 40 per cent of the materials we have now -- could be construed to be Canadian content in the sense that they are authored by, or on the subject of Canada or Alberta. This is an area we are exploring now. There are quite a number of alternatives as to which way a provincial government can go to provide incentives. The recent royal commission report in Ontario, which I received about ten days ago, is useful.

In the department we are studying alternatives, of which there are many. For example, there could be grants directly to authors, be they teachers or others, for Canadian or Alberta content. There could be a cost-sharing arrangement with school boards. There could be a tri-level arrangement with teachers, school boards and the government. There could be indirect or direct assistance to Alberta or Canadian publishers. This is one route that has been followed in Ontario.

The question is to find the best way to make the dollar useful. We found for example that there are a great number of, not books, but such things as pamphlets and audio-visual materials which are Canadian but which not too many people know about. Perhaps the marketing of the existing materials that may be gathering dust on shelves may not be available, but maybe the marketing and making available to teachers the knowledge that these documents exist could be another avenue. So we're following up all these approaches.

Appropriation 1305 agreed to: \$990,000

Appropriation 1306 Miscellaneous Grants \$107,210
agreed to without debate

Appropriation 1310 Teachers' Pension Fund

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, on this, was there an overall percentage increase in the pensions? I notice there is a figure here of 12.4, but then this provides for the increase in the number who are eligible for it too. But was there an overall increase?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, there is an overall increase and it has been rising the last three years in the number of teachers retiring. In addition a cost-of-living increase, which was effective I believe last January 1, was implemented. It cost some millions of dollars as well, and this brings the teachers' pension fund into line with the basic principles of the public service and the local authorities pension fund.

MR. RUSTE:

What would be, let's say the average increase for one that had been involved in the plan for sometime?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I don't know what the average increase would be, Mr. Chairman, but I could attempt to find that out, as to the dollar increase, if the member wishes.

Appropriation 1310 agreed to: \$9,805,600

Appropriation 1311 Allowances for Aged Teachers

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, this is quite a small vote. I wonder if the minister could explain what it is. Just for one person?

MR. HYNDMAN:

No, Mr. Chairman, this is for two ladies, Mrs. Garne and Ms Smith, I'm told. Mrs. Garne and Ms Smith were not eligible to qualify under The Teachers' Retirement Fund Act. Apparently they just didn't quite fit within that act, so for some years they, and previously other teachers, have been carried. Mrs. Garne receives \$240 per month and Ms Smith \$30 per month.

Appropriation 1311 agreed to: \$3,600

Appropriation 1312 Minister's Committees \$10,000
agreed to without debate

Appropriation 1314 Grants to Private Schools

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know from the minister what his position is and how his department -- where do you see yourself going with private schools? Now I notice here you have given only a \$10 per pupil increase which is about 6.2 per cent increase and it is less than even the 7.5 per cent guidelines. And not only that, in the Advanced Education estimates the private colleges get, if I'm not mistaken, about 60 per cent -- that's a ball park figure anyway -- of what the public colleges get. Now it would seem to me that the private schools -- surely, you know, if we are really interested in maintaining them, or do you intend to phase them out? They certainly should be getting a better relationship than they are getting now as to what the public schools are getting.

It would just seem to me that a ball park percentage would be about 75 per cent, I would really think. I don't believe they should have 100 per cent. I think they want something so they won't kill their own initiative. But nevertheless I would be very interested in the minister's comments as to what philosophy, or where do you see your position as far as private schools are concerned?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, for some years, Mr. Chairman, there was no grant whatever to private schools. They weren't recognized within the public and Catholic systems. Then there was a grant of some \$75, then it went up to \$150, and was frozen at that figure for a number of years.

This figure, I would have to say is, in a way, an interim situation because we are now reviewing it and I expect to be able to discuss with the Association of Private Schools at their meeting in Red Deer in about three weeks the whole question of financing of private schools.

I think there are a couple of things to be borne in mind. Firstly, even though parents may choose to have their children at a private school, there is still, I think, an overriding obligation and responsibility of this Legislature for the quality of education basically received there, realizing that the reason private schools are set up is to provide a degree of choice and diversity which perhaps parents feel is not available in the public and Catholic systems. However, I would think that one might say, for example, private schools which decide to follow their own path but have certificated teachers of high quality, and that also have and follow the basic provincial curriculum, would seem to me to have a stronger voice in asking for provincial support than those which, for example, don't use people of any teaching background at all or who wish to go up and teach courses that are entirely foreign to the basic curriculum.

It seems to me that in the latter case, it is hard to make an argument for provincial support of any substantial amount. So I found in looking at the situation over the last three years, there has really been no defined specific policy as to where private schools fit in our province. There are about 5,000 youngsters in private schools and the number is slowly going up. We certainly would contemplate nothing to put them out of existence. They argue quite properly there is no legislation, even giving them the right to exist at this moment. They exist by Order-in-Council and we wouldn't plan to change that. We are considering perhaps an amendment in The School Act, which might guarantee the right for them to exist, which would be a step in that direction.

MR. GRUENWALD:

One thing, Mr. Chairman, to the minister. When you are doing a review as to where you think private schools should stand in the province? You mentioned

that you feel you have a responsibility to see that the students attending those schools do have a pretty high level of education.

I'd be interested, and I am sure everyone would be, if there is any way you can tell if these students, when they have gone on to higher education, find themselves at a disadvantage? If there were any way at all that you could dig this type of information out when you are making your survey, I think it would be extremely interesting.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I think that might well be a useful test, Mr. Chairman, to find out where the private school students of ten years ago are now, and to find out objectively and from their personal subjective opinion what opportunities and potentialities they feel have been gained by private schooling.

There is one other concern with the private school system and that is the question of who is responsible in a sense that there is not an elected board. The board is an appointed board and I have already had one inquiry of a parent who was unhappy with the quality of education that her son was getting in a private school. Of course, she couldn't go to an elected board chairman. She couldn't turn out the existing board because she didn't feel they did a good job. She couldn't re-elect them because there is no electoral process. That, I think, could be gotten around in a number of ways, which has been proven.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Chairman, in this regard people certainly know that they don't have to let their children attend private schools. Along the line Mr. Gruenwald, the hon. Member for Lethbridge, was mentioning, if research is done I'd be very happy to see it also find out what the qualifications of the teachers were at that time and relate that to the achievement of the students.

The hon. minister mentioned tonight that we wanted our students in the hands of sophisticated and sensitive teachers. My own experience, and I think that of many others, has said that the years of schooling are not very much related to the sophistication of the teacher in the true sense.

I am very concerned if some research can be done to establish whether, in fact, a degreed teacher can do a better job in Grade 3 or 4, or whether there are other elements of schooling, or whatever you want to call it, which may serve just as well. Because as has been pointed out tonight, as long as your schedules force boards to pay higher salaries for teachers who have been to school longer and have received certain degrees whether or not they perform better, you're in a way forcing the school boards to pay for a service they might not be getting.

The private school might be a very good way to just compare the results and say whether we are valid in the contention that you require all this training.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make just four comments in connection with private schools. The first one is that where a private school meets the curriculum of the department, where the private school has qualified teachers and where the private school system is inspected by Department of Education superintendents, much higher grants than they are getting now should be provided. There is one other weighted factor I think that has to be considered in fairness to the taxpayer, and that is providing there is not room, or providing the private school does not leave empty seats in the public school system or the separate school system. I think that has to be a factor that is considered, in fairness to the taxpayer, because in many cases the parent himself decides whether or not the child goes to a private school.

There are some private schools, however, where the parent isn't the factor that decides. Where a child is unable to cope with the system in a public or a separate school and goes to a school where there are highly specialized teachers -- I'm thinking about St. Mary's Salesian Junior High School -- there, I think, is a very strong case for almost equal payment as is outgoing to the public and private school system because it is giving that child an education that otherwise he just wouldn't get under the public or the separate school system.

So altogether I think there are four or maybe five factors that have to be considered: (1) I believe, is that they must follow the curriculum; (2) there have to be qualified teachers; (3) satisfactory inspections by school superintendents; (4) not leaving empty seats in the public or the separate

school system; and (5) if there is a special need being met that the child does not get in the public or the private school system.

I know a number of parents who have placed a son in St. Mary's Salesian Junior High School solely because that child just wasn't able to cope with the system in the public or the separate school system. In the Salesian Junior High School where they have individual instruction and supervision by highly qualified teachers, one year sometimes fits them so they can go back into the public or the separate school system and do well. So I really think these are factors that have to be considered, and I'm very pleased that the minister is reviewing this entire matter of private schools.

MR. HYNDMAN:

One of those five points I would have difficulty endorsing, Mr. Chairman, and that is that private schools be allowed only if they are not leaving vacant spaces in the public and separate system, because the space is available in the public and separate systems of this province. In terms of individual student spaces these are in the tens of thousands. If that were to apply, not only would there be no more new private schools at all, but we could absorb the existing private school population of Alberta perhaps five or ten times over in schools where there are now spaces. But the points are essentially well taken.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Chairman, I have to comment on that. I think any time the private schools can cause empty classrooms in the public schools, the message should be coming across and should mean something to someone. That's all I have to say about that.

MR. HINMAN:

In that regard, Mr. Chairman, I've been wondering for a long time why we don't invite the private schools to use some of the spare space we have. You'd have a double comparison and some competition which might be all advantageous.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I think I've raised that whole question of the use of some of these under-utilized schools. For example, the hon. Horst Schmid was able to work out an arrangement whereby the Mission Park School in the County of Sturgeon will be used for a cultural and youth office centre. Indeed, I think as a government -- and local governments too can look around and maybe use schools where there is always adequate and ample parking during this period. They could be leased out by the school division for extra moneys which they could acquire. Because many, many buildings are available and many are under-utilized.

MR. COOKSON:

Just a comment or two, Mr. Chairman, on private schools. I have two in my constituency and I'm quite interested in the private school structure. I think I've pointed out on other occasions to the minister the importance -- and it's being suggested here tonight -- of establishing legislation, or being prepared for application for private schools so they have some types of regulations or rules which they can go by, and not a hit-and-miss type of direction as far as grants, so they can properly lay out their plan of procedure.

I think most private school advocates are satisfied. Naturally, they'd like to see the grants equivalent to the public school system. The minister has aptly pointed out the very important position of public schools and separate schools as we know them in the province. I think the private school people are prepared to accept grants that are less than those for which other schools qualify because of their uniqueness and their freedom in certain areas to direct their children in certain directions. I think it would be nice though if we could tie the grant in some way to the public school grant so there is no misunderstanding, so it doesn't have to be something that's reviewed on a yearly or two-year basis, so they know where they are going and can plan in advance.

The other thing I wanted to raise with the minister was in the allocation for pension fund for teachers, 1310, whether there was any provision for assistance to teachers in private schools under that grant?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I'm not sure about that, Mr. Chairman; I will ascertain that information and provide it.

MR. BENOIT:

I was just thinking that any time a public or separate school had more room than they had pupils for and they felt private schools should go that way they might be able to encourage the private schools to go that way on a voluntary basis providing they took into account the desires of some of the private school people which would be helpful to the public school too.

But aside from that I have two, or three questions, Mr. Chairman. I will ask two, then the next one afterwards. There are, according to the report, four part-time private schools functioning. I would like to know what the nature of a part-time private school is. That's on page 28, I believe, of the annual report, Mr. Minister.

The other question has to do with the Hutterite private schools. Do they get the grant, the per pupil grant in the Hutterite private schools?

Right at the top of page 28.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I don't know the exact format. If the gentleman is talking about private correspondence schools, there were four private correspondence schools. This is referred to at the top of page 28 of the annual report.

MR. BENOIT:

I'm sorry, Mr. Minister, it's on the bottom of page 27. Four lines up, "In addition, four private schools operated on a part-time basis."

MR. HYNDMAN:

These are part-time private schools, Mr. Chairman, relating to language instruction; three of them offer instruction in German and one in Ukrainian. I believe the stimulus here came from parents who felt that outside the regular school system, and I believe the children involved here go to the regular school system as well, they should have some degree of enrichment in German and Ukrainian. That is the reason for them.

On the subject of private schools on Hutterite colonies, I believe the financing there is the same as in respect to all other Albertans insofar as Hutterites hold the same status as other Albertans under the legal statutes of the Province of Alberta.

MR. BENOIT:

I didn't know whether they accepted it or requested it or whether it was left free that way.

MR. HYNDMAN:

The vast majority are public schools and I believe that is what the Hutterian Brethren generally prefer.

MR. BENOIT:

While we are on the subject, and I don't know any other place I can raise this question, Mr. Minister, in view of the consideration that is now being given to the education on Hutterite colonies, what is the department's intention with regard to investigating and doing something about any deficiencies of the standards of education on Hutterian colonies?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Without accepting the conclusions proposed, Mr. Chairman, firstly we are assessing the approaches that have been used in Saskatchewan and Manitoba, where there are and have been quite a number of Hutterian Brethren, in regard to the educational approaches they have used there.

We are also very seriously considering calling together a group of educators in the province who have had experience with teaching and administering in respect to the former colonies where Hutterites live. In other words, we wonder whether a teacher who has had experience teaching in a public school in a Hutterite colony, a superintendent who has had a number of Hutterite colonies within his or her division, whether or not their opinions might be useful in the sense that the solutions are many and varied throughout the

province. Generally speaking, I think in previous years, there was a tendency to have the less qualified teachers employed by a school division with Hutterite colonies. That is now increasing and more and more qualified teachers are teaching in those locations. However, there still are problems with regard to library facilities, audio-visual materials and that kind of thing. We are looking into that as well.

Appropriation 1314 agreed to: \$735,600

Appropriation 1315 School Buildings

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister can advise the committee what the policy of the School Buildings Branch is with respect to the placement of schools. I'm thinking of schools in the inner-city core which are deteriorating, and though they may very well be fully utilized and still usable in a sense, they are way out of date in terms of present modern educational facilities. I'm wondering what the program is in respect to that because, again harkening back to Dr. Hohol's report of several years back, he suggested that the problem of dealing with inner-city schools was really one much larger than the city and that it would involve some assistance by senior levels of government. Obviously, one would be the replacement of some of these schools.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Going back a few years, Mr. Chairman, there was, I believe, something in the neighbourhood of \$2 million designated specifically for inner-city schools and their upgrading. This upgrading involved the improvement of lighting and all the elements necessary for good teaching. Certainly that is an area where school boards are continuing to put priority in terms of their building requests. And we, for example, are putting quite a substantial degree of money into the Ritchie School which is a very, very old school in the south side.

I think we have to bear in mind as well the problem of the dropping population in the inner-city areas and whether or not, by reason of the fact that in many cases school districts are now getting rid of their attendance boundaries, it might be useful to move students back and forth within the city. Maybe students from a higher socio-economic suburb should move down to an inner-city school for a month and thereby learn some new dimensions to their education; and similarly students perhaps from the Boyle Street area could move out to another school in a suburban area so they could experience the kind of education going on there.

There is no question that people in the inner-city school areas will drive out to new suburbs and look at what is a very fine school and then feel that indeed their school should be upgraded. I think the basic argument here is that in the inner-city cores, the children need perhaps even more of an extra boost than they do in the new suburban areas, where we can generally say that the dimensions of education and parental guidance given are maybe greater than in inner-city areas. I think we can't simply let these schools deteriorate, and they may need over the long run even more assistance than those new ones in suburbia.

MR. BENOIT:

I believe that we are doing the right thing in curtailing all capital expenditures in this regard in light of the declining school population, but I am wondering if the department is giving special thought to giving a change of consideration to those schools in the suburban areas, especially in the new subdivisions close to the two larger cities? There the rural school population is actually increasing, and there is a need for something pretty permanent being done because the population is not going to decline in those areas. We have a lot of older school buildings in those areas and some of them are quite small. Is there going to be a definite change of attitude on the part of the department with regard to that particular area?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well I think, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is referring especially to those areas immediately around the two major cities, or indeed the six major cities, which are, apart from Fort McMurray, almost the only really definable growth areas in terms of student population in the province. So certainly there is no question that there has to be adequate building in this area as the population increases. However, we want to introduce a new element of flexibility to this new building in the sense of perhaps having starter schools

with units which can be plugged in or out with a basic core unit which can, as the student population moves from elementary to junior high to high school, facilitate the addition of new plug-in science laboratories or various classrooms that would reflect the kind of learning patterns there. Then in 10 years, when there are still 15 years of debenture to pay, have some flexibility; and we are not left as we are today with some school buildings 8, 10 or 11 years old in which we have a decade of debenture debt paying \$42 million a year in this budget, which are abandoned or almost abandoned. So it's going to require quite a bit of future hypothesizing

MR. HENDERSON:

Good luck.

Appropriation 1315 agreed to: \$196,690

Appropriation 1317 Personnel Office

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, maybe the minister would outline the staffing qualifications here. I notice there are seven for that amount of money. Could I have the qualifications of those?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, there are seven people here, Mr. Chairman, Departmental Officer II at a salary of \$14,448, a Personnel Administration Officer II at a somewhat lesser salary, a Clerk IV, three Clerk Typists I, and a Clerk Stenographer I.

MR. RUSTE:

Looking at the top one there I understand is \$14,400, which is over half of the total amount. I was just wondering what the others were getting.

MR. HYNDMAN:

The other Personnel Administration Officer II is at \$10,815, the other clerk, clerk typist and clerk stenographic positions are receiving \$8,280, \$5,472, \$5,412, \$4,737 and \$4,812. That's the total.

MR. RUSTE:

Well, I'm missing something in my addition. I understand under 1317 salaries \$27,252 and that's for 7 people. In my addition now it's a way up over that. Am I missing something?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I think it's \$28,000 in 1973-74.

MR. RUSTE:

It doesn't add up.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, the total of those salaries I just listed was \$53,976 and because the personnel office acts also for the Department of Advanced Education there is a debit to them of some \$25,898, because the personnel people act partly for them. So if you subtract one from the other you get \$28,070.

MR. RUSTE:

It doesn't read that way when you look at it here.

Appropriation 1317 agreed to: \$38,000

Appropriation 1319 Educational Services - Handicapped Children

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if perhaps the minister might be able to go into a little more detail on the question I posed in the question period with respect to the visually handicapped children. I gather there was a committee which involved the visually handicapped. Where does that stand at the moment and are

there going to be any programs aimed at providing instruction in Edmonton and Calgary and perhaps in the smaller centres for the visually handicapped child? I understand that most of them now either have to go out to British Columbia or to a school, I believe, at the Lakehead, if my memory serves me right.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, my recollection is that there are 14 children from Alberta in the visually impaired bracket who are going to British Columbia and Ontario. The trend now, especially in the two major centres of Edmonton and Calgary are developing into resource centres for those two cities and the area around them, is to try to get the youngsters who have a visual impairment involved in the school system and merged into it as soon as possible so they will feel comfortable with other children not having those handicaps.

In Edmonton, for example, we are supporting an itinerant teacher concept whereby these youngsters who are visually impaired are in classrooms in normal schools with typical children and the travelling teacher, who is a specialist in Braille and has specialist qualifications with visually impaired children, travels around and spends half a day every week or something in this nature with these youngsters and she knows where they are.

In Calgary, the school boards are moving in this direction as well, mainly in the clinical area at first. But the general approach which the committee recommended when I met with them some time ago was that they feel this concept of having resource centres in Edmonton and Calgary, of providing assistance to children within the regular school system and integrating them into the system as soon as possible, is probably the best approach.

MR. NOTLEY:

What is the course then that a family with a youngster who is visually handicapped would take outside of Edmonton and Calgary? Would they send him to either the Edmonton or the Calgary school systems? Secondly, what level of support is available in the way of funds to make this sort of thing possible?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Generally the approach is to have an arrangement of the sharing of the student -- a fee paid by the school jurisdiction if it is, say, in a remote area where there are only one or two visually impaired children, realizing that the facilities and services available to them in a large centre are very substantial. I think this is generally the case that is happening, although we have been considering itinerant teachers in the rural areas.

There are substantial grants. I believe they are in excess of 200 per cent of the amount for a normal child and upwards available for special teachers because they cost a good deal more -- specialist teachers for the visually impaired. The Edmonton board, for example, has taken advantage of this and has retained one or more specialist teachers in the visually impaired category. No other school board has done that, although these grants are available in substantial amounts. If the boards apply we would be happy to provide any information as to how they can get the money.

MR. RUSTE:

[Inaudible]...grants. I take it that is the vote it comes out of, for these specialist teachers and so on that you mentioned, upon application by a board.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, I think in looking at 1319, there would be some work done in there. But a good deal of the money might come out of the grants under 1303, under the special grants which are available: for example, \$7,500 for special opportunity rooms which is up from \$5,000 two years ago and two increases recently in grants for children in retarded schools.

MR. RUSTE:

Well, then what would be the breakdown of the almost \$1 million in this grant structure under 1319?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, this grant relates first to the two diagnostic assessment centres or projects in a pilot sense which are going on, one in Grande Prairie. Members may have seen advertisements for specialized personnel there, which is an attempt to assess the provision on a regional basis of specialized services for children which were heretofore only available in large rural centres.

In the Red Deer area, as well, a pilot joint operation is proceeding which would involve a number of school boards getting together on the thesis that with very few handicapped students one school division can do very little with the amount of money they have, but by pooling it with other boards more can be done.

That doesn't cover the whole of the moneys involved there and the balance of the moneys will relate to the details of a program which I hope to be able to announce shortly. I think the main thrust of that program as it is developing will probably be assistance in the diagnostic and treatment area for children with learning disabilities.

MR. HINMAN:

Children seem to do a great deal better if the home environment is coordinated with the school environment. Do any of these special teachers visit the homes of these people? Are any grants given to parents where it is needed for special equipment? The other question, are there private institutions too which give service in this field?

MR. HYNDMAN:

On the second question first, there certainly are private institutions -- for example the Evelyn Unger School in Edmonton is well known for its work in learning disabilities, the Winnifred Stewart School and there are a number in other parts of the province and they all do receive grants which are almost the same as those paid to the public school board. Indeed, the assessments for the youngsters as to whether they should go into which kind of special service are made usually by the local school board in conjunction with the private schools.

On the question of -- I've forgotten what it was now.

MR. HINMAN:

Home visit.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Oh yes, home visits. Certainly we're moving in the area, regarding handicapped children, of trying to link together not only the viewpoints, feelings and choices of parents in the sense that they should have a clear understanding and be told what the purpose of a certain treatment is, or in simple language what the problem is that faces their youngster. For example, four years ago no one knew what a learning disability was and there was sometimes a too frequent tendency to bandy about medical or educational terms which were incomprehensible to a normal parent.

We're now trying to emphasize the point of view whereby the special consultant, the educator who works with handicapped children, links in the parent and in addition tries to link in the medical officer and the health unit and the guidance clinic to put together a whole package, so they are all working as a team, and explaining in simple easy terms what the problem is that the child has and what the opportunities are and what the treatment is going to be, so there is no mystery in the mind of the parent.

Appropriation 1319 agreed to: \$1,157,540

Appropriation 1320 Administration -- Educational Services Handicapped
agreed to without debate \$60,650

Appropriation 1321 Field Services

MR. GRUENWALD:

Excuse me, that has to do with the regional offices I presume, Mr. Minister, does it? Well I have always had a little bit of trouble trying to justify these regional offices completely. It seems to me that boards themselves should be providing regulatory consultative and advisory services to themselves. If they do, that's a responsibility, I would submit, at the local

level. I think this was part of the rationale when we wrote the new School Act in 1970, making provisions for all boards to provide themselves with their own superintendent.

So I'm just wondering then if this \$2 million wouldn't be better spent in trying to satisfy and correct the wide disparity that we see between the big boards and the small boards which has been pointed out many many times. If they could be using part of that money to provide superintendents for themselves, I'm of the opinion, at least, that possibly that money would be better spent in that way.

I'm really wondering in my own mind whether the regional offices are not taking away some of the prerogatives, some of the decisions and some of the jobs that the school boards themselves should be doing within their own school districts. I'm just wondering how needed they are because probably the city boards and many of the school boards who already have their own superintendents are using these, not because they called on them originally, but because when the regional offices were set up as I recall -- and sometimes I wonder whether they weren't set up just to give a job to a lot of the government superintendents when school boards were going to hire their own superintendents and give them something to do in there, and they went around shopping for something to do to many of the school districts I'm certain of that. So as far as I'm concerned, I think a great service could be done if some of that money could have been put into use with some of the small boards which do not have superintendents, primarily because they can't afford to use them.

I'd just like the minister to comment as to whether he sees the regional offices continuing and expanding in the future. What are your long-range plans on these?

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Chairman, perhaps before the minister responds, I wonder if I might mention my concerns because they happen to be in exactly the same area.

First of all I think it should be pointed out that there is quite a difference between the problems that are faced by the rural boards, whether or not they have a superintendent, and the large city boards. The problem, I think, arises because really too much emphasis is put upon the superintendent in the rural school board situation. He may, in fact, have an assistant. In many cases that is his complete staff.

Now for example, when the Grade 12 and Grade 9 departmentals were to be removed from the system, it meant that more effort had to be done by the superintendent if he was to design some type of examining system that would, in fact, replace the Grade 9 and Grade 12 departmentals. Now if this work is placed on him alone and his staff, how does he do it? He hasn't got the capacity, so it gets back really to this regional process, this regional office concept. I think, Mr. Chairman, we could further develop the regional offices to provide more work input to the local boards so that they do have access to this capability which, as I say, at the moment seems to be thrown on one man who is the superintendent, who has many other jobs to perform and just hasn't the staff.

MR. HINMAN:

In this regard, I have watched the growth of this particular service over the years. Each time I have concluded that this is the best working example of Parkinson's Law that you can find. If you could set up double that number, they'd all find something to do, and somebody to consult with.

On the other hand, I have a strong feeling that if the whole thing disappeared education would go on just the same. If it were necessary to give the school divisions assistance, grants, for additional help locally, it would be all to the good.

We have transferred people from the building branch down into this branch. I suppose they are going to give consultative services in the building area at a time when we are building less and less.

I am a little bit concerned about the words "to the public". I wonder just how much consulting they do give to the public. I think this is one field where a great deal of money could be saved and the people wouldn't raise one voice of objection.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Perhaps I could begin, Mr. Chairman, by saying there has been general satisfaction indicated by a number of the boards through letters sent regarding the regional offices. I think, however, that we would welcome comments from the boards as to how the regional offices could be more effective. They are not expanding. One could say I suppose, they are contracted by one in the sense that the Athabasca office was closed last year.

The bulk of the moneys involved here in the regional offices are spent not in the six major cities, but in the rural areas. Service is available to superintendents and teachers in those areas.

I think it should be borne in mind that the regional offices are in a very significant way the eyes and ears of the Department of Education, the government and the Legislature. Because when the superintendents became appointed by local boards rather than the government there was really no way left in which the Department of Education could monitor what was going on in the expenditure of a quarter of a billion dollars worth of money.

For example, I think we find jobs that are being done and that will be done over the years ahead by regional offices may be somewhat different than was originally contemplated.

For example, with the new early childhood services program, a program which has to be interpreted and explained, I think, to people and communities, local towns, individuals and boards we have charged the responsibility to the regional offices.

With the Educational Opportunities Fund, charged with upgrading elementary education Grades 1 to 6 in basics such as reading, writing and other projects, here again, they have a monitoring function.

Also for example, if there is a particular problem in the school district where the school trustees and the superintendent act as a team, there is no way that we can find out what the problem is and do any preventive work unless we have someone on the scene from the regional office to assist.

Another area could be in providing advice as to how to squeeze an extra cent out of the educational dollar, which we have done in a number of jurisdictions that have asked people to come in and say, "Well, we are spending this amount of money on that program. How can we save money?" Busing has been one example.

So the thrusts of the regional offices have changed and will be changing over the years ahead in terms of the job which we will be giving to them. They are very much the eyes and ears of the department.

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could cover the point I was raising about the amount of input that superintendents and local boards can get from the regional offices?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, I think it's true that local boards and their superintendents have, they might say, enough work to do without receiving memos and directives from the Department of Education relating to new changes in government policy. Somebody has to assist them in interpreting and applying this policy and assessing how it is to be implemented in the most meaningful way. I think here, with some boards especially, there has been a constant back and forth between the regional office where the boards say, "Now our superintendent and we can't do this. We haven't the expertise and the knowledge. Can you advise us? Can you help us?" We have a number examples of boards which found it very useful. It's certainly in a growing stage in terms of the job they do, but in terms of the number of offices, I wouldn't see any change from the reduction of one made last year.

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Chairman, I, too, am aware that back in 1970 when the former Minister of Education made it mandatory for all school boards to employ their own superintendents, there were a lot of superintendents that were without any jobs, so it's not unusual that these regional offices were set up to give them positions.

However, it was brought to my attention by several school officials from various areas that they had never received any services whatsoever from these regional offices. It was wondered whether sometimes it wouldn't be better if these individuals were spread over the province so they would be closer to the school jurisdiction than they could serve as consultants. I wonder whether, with the cost of the regional offices, it is well worth it?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I would welcome any suggestions from school boards as to the effectiveness and what services they can get or feel they should get or could get from the regional office, because that's one of the only ways we can assess what they should and can be doing.

Appropriation 1321 agreed to: \$2,050,440

Agreed to without debate:

Appropriation 1322 Counselling and Guidance \$45,140

Appropriation 1323 Registrar \$106,570

Appropriation 1324 Board of Reference \$2,000

Appropriation 1325 Special Education Services \$88,870

Appropriation 1326 Examinations Development

MR. TAYLOR:

Will the minister tell us what examinations these refer to?

MR. HYNDMAN:

This is the development of new achievement measuring tests which will replace the departmentals. There certainly will continue to be tests, the purpose being to measure one system against another, one school against another and find out whether the hundreds of millions of dollars are increasing, standing still or decreasing the quality of education.

Appropriation 1326 agreed to: \$361,310

Appropriation 1327 Early Childhood Program - Administration

MR. GRUENWALD:

On that 1327 I just can't but wonder why it would take 15 people to administer that fund, which is \$262,000. That's about 5.6 per cent of the cost of the fund to administer it. Normally school boards are allowed about 3 per cent for the administration of their programs. I'm just wondering what's the rationale behind that difference.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, the purpose is that if the program is to be implemented properly and on a well-thought-out basis to ensure that \$4.6 million is properly spent, I think members will realize that insofar as this is a new program, there is going to be a lot of explanation required; even the writing of proposals by groups and individuals and existing early childhood programs or new ones is going to require some assistance.

In addition, of course, there is nothing in the way of any sort of curriculum guideline as to what sources a teacher in this area might follow. We really don't know whether that 15 will have to be filled or not. If not, we won't fill them. But we feel that with an expenditure of this amount of money, if we're going to do the job, let's do it properly and let's have people who can assist in getting the highest amount of value out of the dollar.

I realize that new programs require extra people, but if you look at the rest of the department, I think you'll find that generally they have been

putting in more programs with fewer people than many other governments across Canada. They are working very hard.

MR. RUSTE:

Getting back to the salaries, and this is a new position here, for \$181,000 -- let's have the top five people and their qualifications there, please.

MR. HYNDMAN:

There is a director of special educational services, \$24,648, one of the directors of the department because it's an important new program; associate director of early childhood education \$21,144; a number of consultants at the \$18,000 level and the balance of clerk typists.

Most of those positions have not been filled and if we can get along without them all being filled we will try to do so.

Appropriation 1327 agreed to: \$262,000

Appropriation 1328 Early Childhood Program

Grants \$4,700,000

MR. GRUENWALD:

Now this is another one of those programs. As far as the principle of giving further assistance to the handicapped, I'm in favour of it. I think that part of it is good. But the problem with these types of programs -- there's this, there's the regional officers, there's the Educational Opportunities Fund. Almost every type of program that is an extra program turns out to be a bonanza for the big school districts.

It just seems to work out that way because -- take this program right here. We talk about the qualifications that are required by the teachers that you want to get into this program. They have to have a specialty, a major in early childhood education. Their assistants have to have specialties. You are not going to find those types of people out in the rural areas, so that one thing alone is going to make it not of a big value to the rural areas.

Another thing that really concerns me in your program here on the operational plans for early childhood services is the way you have set out the pupil-teacher ratio. Again, where are you going to find in the rural areas, fairly small districts, and from how far will they have to bring in these specialized types of students to be able to meet this pupil-teacher ratio? From my own point of view I think this is far too cluttered up with regulations to make the program work well. It really concerns me that the people who are going to get the bucks out of this and be able to use it the most are going to be the big city boards.

It seems that every program we put on seems to have that tendency. The sparsely populated areas don't have the advantage of using them and it gives me quite a concern. I'm very much concerned about setting up this pupil ratio because I can just see that coming up and being expanded. It's going to get into the whole system pretty quick. There are going to be salary negotiations and all these types of things. I think this is a very dangerous precedent and I really question the advisability of holding hard and firm on that. I'm really interested in what your reactions are to that.

Of course on these types of things again, I am really more concerned, and I can see more value and I know you have said it yourself, in the empathy of the teacher toward this type of people -- and I'm thinking of the handicapped people -- than these academic qualifications. I would just like to hear your reactions to some of those things, Mr. Minister.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, we are certainly prepared to be flexible and I think in any new government program where there are large numbers of unknowns, and indeed in this program which is unique in the sense that it covers not only education but health services recreation, there is going to have to be some degree of flexibility. This is why the regulations which are coming in under The Department of Education Act allow initially, at least, a good deal of flexibility. It may be that pupil-teacher ratio, for example, with regard to

handicapped children can't be applied in a certain area and we are certainly prepared to accommodate that kind of thing.

On the qualifications of teachers, I think there is a balance to be maintained here in the sense that it may be that in some areas teachers of lower qualifications would be felt to be adequate. But by the same token I think the government has a responsibility to ensure that when parents send their youngsters to a place away from home, they are in the care and custody and guidance of someone who has a degree of training and can exercise professional responsibility. Of course it is a problem of balancing this all the time.

I think, for example, in an early childhood program, one could say that you take a well-meaning lady whose family has gone away and who says, "I want to teach in an early childhood situation." Teaching isn't that simple. Teaching is as much an art as anything. It requires some degree of professional guidance and I think it is the responsibility of government to ensure when you take a child away to a school system for a good part of his life that there are people there who can exercise professional judgment. It is hard in its objective to say which is right in which situation but we are certainly prepared to be flexible.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Chairman, I agree that there are specialties in their know-how as far as that goes. But the point I make is, let's not get carried away with the academicians because this can easily happen. That's number one.

Number two, if I understood you correctly, the guidelines as set out here won't necessarily be rigidly adhered to. In other words there is some flexibility in this pupil-teacher ratio and these types of things. Did you say that?

MR. HYNDMAN:

That's exactly it. They are guidelines, Mr. Chairman. They are not fixed, inflexible operations.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Another thing. Can private schools as we discussed them earlier, as we know them, qualify under this program?

MR. HYNDMAN:

That is something which just came up in the last few days, Mr. Chairman. I think if there is provision for handicapped and disadvantaged children, really irrespective of where the assistance comes, if we are going to help those children there is a plan available and there are competent people who can man it. It seems to me the help should be given to the children irrespective of what kind of organization, which is an artificial thing after all, is set up.

MR. TAYLOR:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to mention just one point that the hon. minister referred to a couple of minutes ago, and that is about having qualified teachers in this early childhood program. I would suggest that it's more important or very important to have very well-qualified teachers in this program. Otherwise the child gets started on the wrong foot and when he starts his regular school it's most difficult to undo things they have taught in the wrong ways, such as sight reading, phonics, arithmetic and so on. I think it's very important to have good, qualified teachers in this program.

MR. HINMAN:

Along that line, Mr. Chairman, I'm quite concerned about the type of people who qualify to teach under this plan. Our experience in the past has been that, when we first put in guidance counsellors, for instance, many people took these courses and came out as guidance counsellors. Everybody knew right away that they were misplaced people, particularly when they were very young. Now I think the same thing is going to occur here. If we could initiate a program were superintendents and others would select teachers who are going to be professional -- not graduates who may be married next year and may teach a little while -- people who have shown a particular flair for this kind of work. If they could be encouraged to take training and be paid accordingly, this program will probably work out reasonably well.

One of the dangers, of course, of any type of program like this is that people are going to expect marvels. They have to get used to the idea that you can't solve all the problems that they're going to have by starting this program. I hope it will be phased in rather slowly and I hope that it doesn't leave us open to being talked into what you might call just plain kindergartens. That's exactly the kind of pressure which we must expect in this regard, that having once embarked on giving service to pre-school children when our intention is to find out very early those who are going to need some extra treatment, some extra training, and some extra guidance to fit into a normal program, we are not forced then into a broad kindergarten program which may or may not be worth it.

I suppose as our standard of living goes up we can afford even that. But I am very concerned with this teacher-training program and I hope that some effort will be made to select older teachers who have demonstrated their flair, if you want to call it that, their empathy with this type of person and who are going to be career teachers and give them the training so that we will not suffer as we have done when we have introduced new programs and simply got a lot of teachers who took a special course, and came out to do a job, only to demonstrate that the schooling was not a qualification.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, on this particular program I'd like to offer a suggestion to the minister from a meeting I had today with a group of parents. The suggestion is that there might appropriately be a very brief outline that could be distributed to parents to indicate the nature of the program emphasizing the distinction between the program here and kindergartens as most people, I think, are inclined to consider them.

I might also say, in a chiding and perhaps not so chiding way, that I think it must be possible to come up with a set of regulations or at least a questionnaire which is somewhat more concise than this one is, since it apparently has defeated some of the school administrators in trying to deal with it, and is going to result in -- at least in one instance -- the school, the people on the spot, trying to develop a program in their own language, and sending that to an office some place and having someone translate that into responses to this questionnaire. So it leads one to question the value of some of the responses that will come to the particular questions here.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I think the idea of a brief understandable outline might be a good one. It will cost a little extra money and we'll have rearrange our internal priorities.

But on the question of the proposal sheet which the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place has mentioned, it is, some would say, a lengthy document. However, I think it's trying to achieve a balance between the responsibility a government has for ensuring that \$4.5 million of public moneys go out on the basis of a proposal that is valid, sincere and detailed. We are responsible for it and we are responsible to the Legislature for it. I think we therefore have to assess the credibility and the viability of the proposal.

However, I agree that we should reduce to the very minimum the education...[inaudible]...if that's what part of the problem and we'll certainly do it.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, what steps would a school board or school division take to apply for this? The second question is: in a situation where there are more claims on this fund than the money allotted here, would you be prepared to go into a warrant to cover that?

MR. HYNDMAN:

First, details can be secured simply by writing to me and we'll send along the background guideline booklet and the proposal form to apply. In terms of money, there is no question that this is not a universal program in the sense that handicapped and disadvantaged children who need help most are the ones who will get help before other children are going to be considered. Furthermore, if more money is required for handicapped children than is in here, providing a case is made, I think we would look seriously for extra money.

Appropriation 1328 agreed to: \$4,700,000

Appropriation 1329 Educational Opportunity Fund

MR. GRUENWALD:

On this vote I would just like to make the point again that here I find the same problem of the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer. There's just no question about it. I mean it provides \$20 per pupil from Grades 1 to 6. For illustration purposes Edmonton, I presume, could receive maybe \$.75 million on this program which they really don't need very badly. There are some school districts which will probably receive less than \$500. I just don't think we are really doing the job with the educational dollars that we could be doing if we really tried to give more of this money to the boards who really need it, who are operating under less than the provincial average per-pupil assessment on a weighted basis.

When you consider there are about -- I don't know what the figures are but I know you have them, Mr. Minister -- 90 boards I believe which are operating beneath the provincial average on a per-pupil assessment, it just seems to me that the Minister of Education could make a real hero out of himself if he devoted more of his effort to the one thing that I think is a real priority, to try to correct the disparity between the rich boards and those boards with lesser amounts of money.

Every time one of these grants on a percentage basis comes in the big ones are going to get just so much bigger than they are now and they don't need it. A board like Edmonton, and I don't know how many million dollars their budget is, can manipulate those things and provide themselves with types of specialized services without any special assistance. But the small boards find themselves strapped and find themselves in real difficult situation there.

Also on this one here, would private schools qualify for any portion of this?

MR. HYNDMAN:

On the latter, this is a point we are investigating right now. I think the whole question of equity is one which we strive for. We may never attain it, but I would point out again that we have taken four steps since the change of government in the fall of 1971, to ameliorate the problems that caused a differentiation of quality in education in the rural areas. We plan two or three more. More remains to be done, but it will be done.

So I think the rural boards, though, in this program can benefit and there is no question that in the rural areas, especially where there is a remote or sparse situation, some kind of assistance is needed. On the other hand, there may well be some areas of cost which are a little cheaper than the city and I would expect boards to tell me about those as well.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make the point that I recognized earlier this evening that there has been a big correction made in the per-pupil grant. This was a good step. I recognize that you are closing the gap to some extent. You have come a long way in that area. Nevertheless, I want to emphasize that I really and truly believe that we have many, many school boards affecting thousands of children in this province which are really working at a disadvantage financially and I would hope that this again would be one of your top priorities.

I think it is really an important one and one which will make you go down in history as a great Minister of Education.

MR. HYNDMAN:

[Inaudible]... When I explained to the six cities in the province that of the money they pay into the foundation fund they are only getting about 25 cents back and it is going out to equalize it. But that is necessary.

Appropriation 1329 agreed to: \$4,500,000

Appropriation 1331 Correspondence School Branch

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I notice the staff has gone down from 174.5 to 115, and yet salaries have gone up over \$100,000. I just wondered how this is explained.

MR. HYNDMAN:

There is a misprint there, Mr. Chairman, instead of under 1973-74, 115.5 should be 175. So the difference is only one-half.

Appropriation 1331 agreed to: \$1,907,180

Appropriation 1332 Alberta School for the Deaf \$957,560
agreed to without debate

Appropriation 1341 Curriculum

MR. BENOIT:

Yes, probably this is the place where the minister's promise about a comment about this matter of creation, evolution and other similar things would be coming in. Are you going to make that statement tonight, Mr. Minister?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, we haven't put the finishing touches on the full question of providing advice to school boards on controversial questions. I might add the whole question is the area of controversial questions.

But, I think I would say that one of the concerns that has been raised is that it is felt unfair to embarrass or ridicule a student in a classroom if he or she has beliefs other than those which are found in various texts. I think that is sound and should be a guideline. There are other areas of concern and controversy.

Certainly in any classroom in this province we want to ensure that children grow up with minds that are enquiring, that they are exposed to different points of view but that they can draw their own conclusions. I would hope, as I mentioned before, in any event to have these guidelines come down before the end of the spring session. In the meantime I am in correspondence with those who have indicated an interest in this matter.

MR. GRUENWALD:

This is 1341 on curriculum. Have you ever considered giving special grants to school boards who'd develop their own curriculum rather than having it done by the department?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well at the moment, Mr. Chairman, a great deal of curriculum development is being done by school boards in the sense that the provincial government provides guidelines and local school boards can develop and present to the department their own curricula. Indeed curriculum development is now going on, for example, in the social studies course right at the teacher-classroom level and some school boards have different policies than others for example, in the area of family life education. So many boards have, in effect, taken the opportunity to do curriculum development reflecting the wishes of people in their area, which is, I think, providing a degree of diversity of choice that is useful and a good trend.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, will this vote include preparing curriculum for kindergartens?

MR. HYNDMAN:

No, in early childhood services, Mr. Chairman, that's on the previous vote under 1327, Early Childhood Program-Administration. There would be a link-up between the curriculum branch on the situation.

MR. FRENCH:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I notice here it says: "Including curriculum development regarding early childhood programs." And my question is, is there no intention for developing for the kindergarten then?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, I think it must be remembered, Mr. Chairman, that the term kindergarten, which is a word having many meanings to whomever you talk, is one which is included within the broad terms of reference of early childhood services. But the concept is much broader than simply kindergarten which is one form of early childhood services, but certainly an inclusive part of it.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, maybe I could clarify my question. We have a pre-school in my area which we call a kindergarten. It is supported by public funds from our own community. As far as I'm aware there are no government grants available to it. The teacher advises that they seem to have some difficulty as to what they should be teaching in this particular course. A superintendent doesn't visit them, they are on their own and they would appreciate very much some direction, I presume, through curriculum even if they are on their own. I was wondering if there would be some possibility of helping some of these, maybe I could just call them pre-school classes. We just call it kindergarten, for a simple term.

MR. HYNDMAN:

We have been developing materials and have some from some years back available. I think if they wrote to us, we'd be happy to send them ten copies of everything we have which would provide a choice of various curricula available, so that they could implement whatever they feel they would like to have.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Chairman, under Curriculum, I notice it provides for handbooks of regulations, recommendations for textbooks, curriculum guides, and other services. It doesn't say anything about workbooks and I've been reading the ATA magazine recently and just found out how terrible the workbooks are.

But I would point out that one of the fields where the teacher's time is most often wasted is in preparing mimeographed exercises and things of that nature. Now my own experience was that if you have teachers with a lot of resourcefulness and initiative you don't have to worry. But if you have just the common garden variety of teacher many times she will do a great deal better if she has a prescribed textbook and if she has available workbooks to be sure the children get at least a minimum of experience in this particular line.

I have not yet seen any research which has led me to change my mind about the effectiveness of it. I wondered if the Curriculum Branch, particularly as you branch out into these new fields, wouldn't be wise to do some work on workbooks to cover the curriculum because it is my contention that if you engage some of these teachers with real resourcefulness, real initiative, they will work out programs which will be superior by far than what the average teacher can produce. I think we ought to have a look at that again just to be sure we haven't in our efforts to progress, retrograded instead.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, I'd be happy to ...[Inaudible]... Mr. Chairman, I think it's a thoughtful suggestion.

Appropriation 1341 agreed to:

\$557,330

Appropriation 1342 Audio Visual Services

MR. GRUENWALD:

Just a short question here. What type of feedback and demand have you been getting for this type of service? Now as long as I have ever been involved in school board work or education, there has been a tremendous demand for tapes, for visual aids of every description and I see you have a very small increase here. I'm wondering if that reflects what appears to you to be really a demand in that area.

MR. HYNDMAN:

There is an increasing demand, a gradual demand and I expect it will increase. Part of the activities of audio-visual may well be provided in concert with the new education communications corporation. So I think it is a time of sort of sitting back and saying where do we stand now and what link-ups

can we make to more effectively use the audio-visual dollar with the new corporation. That's why the figure is in that amount.

Certainly there is not a decreasing interest and I think there is a gradually increasing interest by teachers and others in using audio-visual aids in the teaching process, although I would very much doubt that the forecast of some that these aids and television will replace teachers will ever come to pass if indeed it ever be desirable.

MR. GRUENWALD:

[Inaudible]... he didn't have that in mind, but I was just going by the general, you know, there seemed to be an increase in demand in this type of thing and I was wondering what feedback you had been getting it, that's all.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well.

Appropriation 1342 agreed to: \$658,480

Appropriation 1343 Educational Television

MR. GRUENWALD:

Just a quick one. To what extent will this appropriation relieve the supporters of CARET and MEETA?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I think it should relieve them almost entirely. The government is picking up the shares that were paid each year by the partners of CARET and MEETA, being the school divisions and the university and NAIT and this sort of thing. But part of the budget of this corporation, \$500,000, is found in the Advanced Education appropriation. I don't recall the number, but part of the corporation's funding is there. The total is about \$1.5 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well.

Appropriation 1343 agreed to: \$1,015,400

Appropriation 1344 Research and Development \$737,640
agreed to without debate

Appropriation 1345 Communications

MR. RUSTE:

On the total I believe the minister has received representation on the program known as Sesame Street. Is there any change or any thought to having something replace this or expand it?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Sesame Street and the decision to broadcast it, Mr. Chairman, is one which is left to the individual stations. Now it is a requirement of that program, which was initially funded by two American corporations in the sum of about \$7 million, it is a requirement of those who hold the copyright in the United States that there be no advertising on these programs.

The Canadian Radio and Television Commission requires, as members know, a degree of Canadian content and therein lies the problem in the sense that private stations who gain no revenue whatever from showing Sesame Street have to make a decision as to what extent they will make a community contribution by continuing to show it during times that could be revenue producing.

So the basic place to which inquiries should be made are the radio station which is carrying the program and which may decide or be deciding not to do so, and the Canadian Radio and Television Commission. The provincial government really has no say as to whether it is broadcast or not, although there would be one alternative and that would be a fairly massive subsidization and payment direct to some broadcast outlet to buy an hour's time once a day for broadcasting. This is one of the alternatives the new corporation will have to

consider in addition to alternatives such as possible expansion of CKUA or television high frequency, very high frequency, et cetera.

Appropriation 1345 agreed to: \$71,370

Total Income Account Department of Education
agreed to: \$286,697,600

MR. GRUENWALD:

Just a few comments before leaving the total budget there. I believe, Mr. Minister, that the total educational budget this year as related to the total provincial budget is a less percentage this year than last year. Now I am presuming that is mostly because of a lesser enrolment. If you disagree with me, you can comment on that. But I think it is about two per cent less.

Another thing I would like you to answer, is the foundation program for this year for all of education as great as it was before? Now I was figuring through here and it looks to me like in total it would be a little bit less. I am not sure, but I believe that that's the case.

And one other comment is that when I talked about the disparity of the school boards, the big ones and the smaller ones, and I pointed out the problems the smaller districts are having. I want to make it really clear that I don't think we are going to solve that problem by closing those schools out. Let's use the money to bring those up and not get rid of them. I want to leave that as my parting remarks.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I agree, especially with the last comment, Mr. Chairman. I think there is much merit in the smaller rural school and that bigness and efficiency in education is not necessarily a quality education system. And on the subject of the foundation plan which was mentioned, I think, I may be wrong, but I believe that it's at the highest figure ever, irrespective of the fact that there has been a decline of students, in terms of total dollars being paid out. But I will check that. If I am wrong, I will certainly advise the hon. gentleman.

MR. GRUENWALD:

I'd like to have that.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I might just quickly comment on the hon. member's comment regarding the spending on education. I believe that if you check that you'll find the only reason that that would be is the fact that in the capital account expenditure in the Department of Advanced Education, the budget given to the universities was largely a strictly complete existing-projects budget so it was substantially reduced.

But if you actually look at the funding for the program of the hon. Minister of Education, it has increased more than the average provincial budget, and the Department of Advanced Education in the area of colleges and technical and vocational schools operating account is increased. The universities increased by nine per cent. But we were very minimum on the capital side for the universities. So really that statement would be a distortion, taken alone, unless you considered the substantial reduction in capital spending for the universities.

MR. GRUENWALD:

I realize it's not just a simple answer. But one other one: to what extent does post-secondary education share in this foundation program? That has to be figured into it, does it not? Or does it?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, the post-secondary institutions of the department don't share in the equalizing formula of the foundation fund. Now what the member may be referring to is the fact that the federal cost-sharing grants for post-secondary education in Alberta because of the Grade 12 situation, assist in part support of Grade 12 in the Province of Alberta, because it is equivalent to Grade 13 in Ontario.

But one last comment in respect of the total amount of money spent; we can't only look at the education budget, because for example, the massive increases in mental health diagnosis and prevention are really a part and an aspect of providing youngsters with a base on which they can get a better education. The new thrusts in the Department of Manpower and Labour, for example, relate to counselling and will mean we will have more graduates, better trained, going into the right spots and having useful lives and futures. So it really blends through many departments.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report progress, and in addition to that, report to the Speaker the following offensive words that were used by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View. I refer to Beauchesne, Citation 138 (2) very briefly: "If offensive words are spoken in Committee, which are taken down, the House only, and not the Committee, can take notice of them."

I also refer hon. members to Beauchesne, Citation 152(1) which deals with civil servants and subsection (4) which deals with personages of high official station; I consider the director of the Emergency Measures Organization to be equivalent to a deputy minister and falls within that category. The specific words to which objection are taken and which are claimed to be offensive are as follows, and I quote from a copy of Hansard:

I never would imagine what they would do. They would probably be well organized to head for the hills in front of everybody else if there was a real attack. That is my opinion of them. There is no power of discipline. They are not under the military.

He then went on and said:

Yes, "shame". But I firmly believe that that is exactly what would have happened. The jeeps would have been in the lead --

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Is the minister suggesting that the Chair is going to make such a report? Because if the minister proposes to raise it on a point of privilege it should be done when the Speaker is in the Chair instead of doing it at this point in time. So I'd suggest if we are going to go through it, that we do it in the right manner, that the committee report and the minister can then stand and raise his point of privilege and the matter can be dealt with at the proper time, as opposed to doing it in committee. But the question is, is it the suggestion that the Chair is going to make a report on this matter?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes. The rules of Beauchesne indicate that Chair shall report to the Speaker.

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

On either one. This is raised with regard to what the Deputy Premier has indicated. Citation 138(2) indicates just that.

MR. HENDERSON:

It's up to the chairman to make the report?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To make the report, that's right.

DR. HORNER:

If the hon. member would like, I'll quote that.

The Committee therefore reports progress and asks leave to sit again; the Chairman reports the words used to the Speaker, who says: "It has been

reported to the House that the honourable member for...has used the following words:..."

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the Deputy Premier has debated the merits of what I've said, I'd like to quote a rule to him, and perhaps he could also take this under advisement, sleep on it and come back a sadder and wiser man tomorrow, as he told me before.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Ludwig --

MR. LUDWIG:

I'd like to quote a rule --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Ludwig --

MR. LUDWIG:

-- that the Deputy Premier really is out of order entirely --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I'm not here to rule on whether the Deputy Premier is out of order. All I have to do is report this to the Speaker, and I'm sure you'll be given an opportunity to speak on that.

MR. LUDWIG:

But, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I am stating that the Deputy Premier is misleading this committee with the points he raised, and I'd like to quote a rule to say why.

But before we do that, since he has already made his statement and got his shot away, I want to reply to it and I am quoting a rule from Beauchesne that says as follows:

If a member should say nothing disrespectfully to the House or the Chair, or personally opprobrious to other members, or in violation of other rules of the House, he may state whatever he thinks fit in debate, however offensive it may be to the feelings, or injurious to the character, of individuals; and he is protected by his privilege from any action for libel, as well as from any other question or molestation.

The Deputy Premier should not be threatening me or molesting me or questioning me. I am protected by privilege of this House and I think the Deputy Premier is out of foot again and all he has been doing is menacing me most of this afternoon and I believe he is out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

On that point I will have to indicate that I will report what the Deputy Premier has raised according to Rule 138 to the Speaker. That debate possibly will be permitted in the House, not in committee.

MR. HENDERSON:

Does the Chair accept the direction of the Deputy Premier in this matter?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

No, the Chair accepts the resolution as placed by the Deputy Premier and I report it --

MR. HENDERSON:

The resolution is then debatable, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Not a resolution to report progress, in my understanding.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, if it is a resolution it is debatable, so let's not say that it is a resolution and is not debatable.

MR. KING:

Speaking to the point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, having been corrected once this evening, I suppose it wouldn't hurt to do it once more and I would draw your attention to annotation 127(1) --

MR. HENDERSON:

What correction this evening are you talking about?

MR. KING:

With respect to the form to be taken under annotation 138 and the making of a motion. The hon. the Deputy Premier has moved that we rise and report progress and he has also moved that attached to the motion to rise and report progress certain words should be added. According to 127(1) that is not a debatable motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

How can you have two motions in one, two separate --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Ludwig, there are no two motions. Mr. Ludwig, there is only one motion. The motion is that the committee rise and report as Mr. King has reviewed it here.

All those agreed that we report, as moved by the Deputy Premier, say aye. Those opposed say no.

[The motion was carried.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain estimates and begs leave to sit again and begs to report progress and asks to report the following resolution presented by the Deputy Premier.

The report I am to give to you, sir, is that the words used by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, quote from Hansard: "I never could imagine what they would do; they would probably be well organized to head for the hills in front of everybody else if there was a real attack."

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any indication in the report as to whom those words concerned?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, these words concerned, of course, the calibre and the quality and the integrity of the members of the civil service of the Province of Alberta who are employed under the office of the Emergency Measures Organization. They reflect upon the integrity and the honesty of those civil servants and I quote to you Section 152 of Beauchesne, subsection 1, and Citation 152, subsection 4, that these are strictly unparliamentary. I would ask that you ask the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View to withdraw those words.

MR. FOSTER:

I think that the motion as read to you was not in fullness the motion passed by the House. There was a final sentence or two that was not read to you by the Deputy Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly I'm not aware of any procedure whereby the House may amend the report of a committee. Possibly the House might wish to go back into committee to amend the report.

DR. HORNER:

Well, on a point of order, your honour. Just the words that I have now read or that the chairman has read are sufficient to ask for a withdrawal. There were additional words in which he reinforced that statement that in fact, the jeeps would be in the lead and that inferred that -- frankly, Mr. Speaker, a very serious offence in my view, he inferred that the members of my organization would not only be cowards but, in fact, would be treacherous.

MR. SPEAKER:

Without wishing to be unduly technical about the matter, but I think we should try to be correct. The report as it was given to the House by the hon. chairman of Committee of the Whole doesn't indicate with respect to which persons those words might have been uttered. And surely that would be relevant as to whether or not they might be unparliamentary. They might have been uttered with regard to the vanguard of the Spanish army.

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, may I have my report back from your desk, please?

Mr. Speaker, as the resolution was presented by the Deputy Premier making reference to tonight's debate, with regard to the Emergency Measures Organization, the reference was made by the Deputy Premier that the hon. member for the constituency of Calgary Mountain View, and I quote from Hansard. This in is reference to the debate on the Emergency Measures Organization of the Province of Alberta.

I never could imagine what they would do. They would probably be well organized to head for the hills in front of everybody else if there was a real attack. So that is my opinion of it. There is no power of discipline. They are not under the military. Yes, he said "shame", but I firmly believe that that is exactly what would happen. The jeeps would have been in the lead.

MR. SPEAKER:

The question is whether this is the report of the committee or what the hon. chairman read the first time was the report of the committee. It seems to me that we have now two different reports. I think order to get the matter sorted out, the House might wish to say that that is the report of the committee or the committee might wish to amend the report. We have two reports. I think we have got to be sure what the report of the committee is, so that we may deal with it properly.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee it was my understanding and recollection, having heard the second report, that that is a fair report of the resolution from the committee.

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I get the impression that we are going to keep fishing around here until we finally come up with a motion that's suitable for the Chair. I think the motion that was made the first time obviously has to be taken as the official report of the committee. This business of taking a report back and changing it and taking it back and forth until they come up with something that sounds convincing, I suggest, is entirely out of order insofar as procedure is concerned, Mr. Speaker. The only report that can be seriously taken is the report made by the Deputy Speaker in the first instance.

MR. STROM:

[Inaudible] .. point of order that I would like to bring to your attention. The chairman in reporting it referred to the debate tonight. I am not aware of any problem that followed tonight; it was an afternoon debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that you now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the matter just raised.

[The motion was carried.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (CONT.)

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of Supply will now come to order.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again and report the following offensive language used by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View while discussing estimate 1440 the Emergency Measures Organization, when he said, and I quote:

I never could imagine what they would do. They would probably be well organized to head for the hills in front of everybody else if there was a real attack. So that is my opinion of it. There is no power of discipline.

And he went on to say, "Yes, he said 'shame'". Those are the exact words I have given to the chairman, that he inferred that is exactly what he meant, that the jeeps would be in the lead.

I suggest that these words are offensive and reflect in an unparliamentary way upon the officials of my department.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, we are back to the same position - the Deputy Premier is debating. The ruling that something raised on privilege under routine proceedings comes up as a non-debatable motion. I suggest that in view of the words the hon. Deputy Premier just said, his motion is subject to debate before this committee. It can't be treated otherwise, because he lumps it in with the motion to report progress which is a debatable motion. There's no way you can have half a motion debatable and half a motion not debatable, unless the question of a motion to rise and report progress is not debatable because I don't know how on earth you can split the two.

I don't see anything here -- maybe the hon. expert in the back row over there, from Edmonton Kingsway I believe it is, can quote the section that says a motion to leave the Chair and rise and report is not a debatable motion. But certainly at any proceedings before this Assembly to my knowledge it has always been debatable. How on earth can you have a motion that is half debatable and half not debatable?

MR. KING:

Speaking to the point of order, Mr. Chairman, we will attempt to take this slowly and carefully. The fact that the motion is in two parts is established by precedent in the House, which precedent is explicitly referred to in annotation 138(2). That is the justification for appending the statement to the end of the motion to rise and report progress. It's based on precedent found in Beauchesne.

Reverting then to 127(1), the statement is made that at the present time no motions are debatable except those which are explicitly stated to be debatable. It says that that is exactly the opposite of what was formerly the case. But today in this House you cannot debate a motion unless it is explicitly stated that it is debatable.

And you will notice, if you take the trouble to look at 127(1), that the motion to rise and report progress is not one of those motions which is listed as being debatable. And on that ground I would say that it is not debatable.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, speaking to the point of order I would like to refer the expert seated opposite to Rule 29 of our own Votes and Proceedings [sic] which takes precedence over Beauchesne. And 29(1)k says:

(1) The following motions are debatable:

(k) And such other motion, made upon routine proceedings, as may be required for the observance of proprieties of the Assembly, the maintenance of authority, the appointment or conduct of its officers, the management of its business, the arrangement of its proceedings, the correctness of its records,

and so on. I suggest that under Rule 29(1)k of our own Votes and Proceedings [sic] which takes precedence over Beauchesne that the motion which has just now been made by the Deputy Premier is a debatable motion. In fact, I suggest to the Chair he was, in fact, debating the motion at the time.

I think it is now in order that the matter be dealt with in committee rather than give this exercise a semblance of a kangaroo court, where the Deputy Premier gets up, makes a statement, casts some personal statements on it of his own liking and then the chairman is supposed to rush out of the Chair and report him to the Speaker. I suggest we had better go through this procedure properly. Under our own rulings the motion is debatable.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, Rule 29 says nothing at all about that and refers particularly to proceedings of the House and not to committee. Again --

MR. HENDERSON:

It does not refer to the House. It just says, "The following motions are debatable" but the minister has misquoted something. It doesn't say that it doesn't refer to committee.

DR. HORNER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, I take it then -- no, I won't say that Mr. Chairman, because that would move him to -- The point is that you have ruled that, in fact, 138(2) of Beauchesne allows a motion to be made without debate and that the offensive words can be cited to the chairman. This I have done and I suggest that the Speaker be asked to rule on it.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, we went through this kangaroo exercise once. The chairman reported and we ended up back in committee. The Chair has made no such ruling. I am pointing out that under our own Votes and Proceedings [sic] which takes precedence over Beauchesne that the relevant authority is not Beauchesne 138, which the Chair has not ruled in this second trip around the merry-go-round of this kangaroo exercise, but 29(1)k is the relevant section in our own Rules and Proceedings which takes precedence over Beauchesne and the motion is clearly a debatable motion. It can't be treated as otherwise.

MR. TAYLOR:

On this point of order I would like to suggest that the motion should be that the committee reports progress and asks leave to sit again and that is where it should end.

The chairman of the committee where offensive words are spoken, when he reports this to Mr. Speaker, simply says, "It has been reported to the House." It is the chairman of the committee who says that, not part of the motion. So the chairman simply reports this to Mr. Speaker. Then Mr. Speaker asks, "Has the hon. member anything to say in explanation?"

In that way there is nothing really to debate. The motion is simply that we rise and report progress, and the chairman, in reporting to Mr. Speaker, simply adds that during the committee some offensive words were spoken. Then it

is entirely up to the Speaker and the House. It is after that the debate takes place, today or tomorrow or when the Speaker so decides.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Obviously if it is going to be done this way, then the Chair is, in effect, ruling, through his interpretation, that the words which were spoken by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View were offensive. Is this the interpretation if we go about it that way?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

No, Mr. Henderson, I am not ruling -- if I may have the --

MR. HENDERSON:

How does the Chair, without the motion, make the statement that there have been words of impropriety? I take it the Chair isn't prepared to pass judgment on the question of impropriety which brings us back to the debate on the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The motion that I have here, if the hon. members of the Assembly, of the Committee of Supply, would listen and give me their attention:

Moved by the Deputy Premier, the committee rise and report progress and that the committee ask for leave to sit again, and that the Chairman report that the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, while discussing Appropriation 1440, the Emergency Measures Organization, this afternoon, used the following words:

I never would imagine what they could do. They would probably be well organized to head for the hills in front of everybody else if there was a real attack. So that is my opinion of it. There is no power of discipline. They are not under the military.

Yes, he said "shame" but I firmly believe that is exactly what would happen. The jeeps would have been in the lead.

This is what the Chair will be reporting to the Speaker. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I move the committee rise and report.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, the Chair agrees with the statement that the words were offensive, then, by virtue of the statement he's going to make? Well, what's he reporting?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, the committee has risen and reported.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No way.

[Mr. Diachuk left the Chair.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, it has been moved by the Deputy Premier that the committee rise and report progress and that the committee have leave to sit again.

Also, the Chairman would like to report on behalf of the Committee of Supply that the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View while discussing Appropriation 1440, the Emergency Measures Organization, this afternoon used the following words:

I never could imagine what they would do. They would probably be well organized to head for the hills in front of everybody else if there was a real attack. So that is my opinion of it. There is no power of discipline. They are not under the military.

Yes he said "shame", but I firmly believe that that is exactly what would happen, the jeeps would have been in the lead.

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to have it clarified as to exactly what the purpose of the statement was that was just read into the record by the Deputy Speaker. Presumably it's being raised under Section 138 of Beauchesne, that in the views of the Chairman the words he quoted were offensive to the Chair. Is this the basis of the words being made? If that was not the basis of the words of the Deputy Speaker to the Chair, what was the basis for the words being read into the record by the Deputy Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. Opposition Leader addressing his question to the hon. Chairman, or is he addressing it to the Speaker?

MR. HENDERSON:

Through the Chair to the Deputy Speaker, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I'm not aware of any procedure which would permit the hon. Leader of the Opposition to deal in this way with a report. Presumably the report has been agreed upon in committee. If there was going to be any question with regard to the report, it would seem that it would have had to be raised in committee.

MR. HENDERSON:

Well, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I asked the question in committee, whether it was the opinion of the Chair that the words referred to in the report were offensive. The Chair would not make that statement, that in the opinion of the Chairman the words were offensive. And yet they are being read into the record under Section 138 of Beauchesne.

I am asking for the clarification of this: exactly what is the basis or the purpose of the statement that was read into the record by the Chairman of Committee of the Whole in his report to the Speaker? I would like to have it clarified exactly. It was not a motion of this Assembly that that report be made and there was no vote on that particular report. We indulged in quite a debate as to whether the motion by the Deputy Premier to report progress and make the statement a debatable motion, and our own rules state that it is a debatable motion. So I'm at a loss to know exactly on what authority the Chairman is making the report to the Speaker. I quite frankly don't know what the procedural answer is to it, but obviously the whole exercise is highly irregular.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, if I could just add one word in connection with Section 138. If the hon. Chairman of the committee had finished his report with the words used in Beauchesne, he should have finished it by saying, "Has the hon. member anything to say in explanation or retraction of these words?" The Chairman says that.

[Interjections]

Well, no, no -- I'm referring to Beauchesne, page 121. The Chairman says that at the end of his report. It's simply very clear here, and he just ought to look at the quotation marks and the question mark.

The member will then give his explanation and withdraw. If the explanation is not satisfactory, the leader of the House may move: "That the words used by the hon. member for ... be taken into consideration at the next sitting of the House."

or deal with it at the present time. That is where the debate takes place.

MR. SPEAKER:

With great respect, it would appear that the hon. Member for Drumheller is misreading the text of 138 (2). As I read the text these words are suggested for use by the Speaker.

With regard to the point of order raised previously by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, it would seem that what the hon. Chairman has read is the report of the committee. I know of no rule whereby the report of the committee may be attacked in any way as being inadequate or incorrect in the House. It is simply a matter of the House deciding whether or not it is going to accept the report or what it is going to do with it.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I simply refer once again to the question that presumably the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole has gone through the exercise of making the report to the Speaker, because in his judgment the words were offensive. But in Committee of the Whole the Chairman would not state that in his view the words were offensive. So how on earth then, do we get to him reading it in the record? Is it to be taken -- I think it is important that as a matter of the record it is to be concluded then, by virtue of the fact that the Chairman has now made the report, that he is of the opinion that the words were offensive. And that's the basis for them being read into the record through the report to the Chair.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition requested in committee that the Chairman make a ruling or make a decision of whether those words were offensive. The motion by the Deputy Minister was to report in that essence and not to make a decision, and I do not believe that it is the position of the Chair to make a decision or ruling on whether the matter is offensive or not. He is in the position to report to the Speaker the proceedings that had taken place and the resolution that was put for reporting to the Speaker.

This is all the Deputy Speaker, in his position as chairman of committee, reported and he reported it on the motion of the hon. Deputy Premier. So it cannot be construed or raised as a point of order that the Chairman should have been required to make any decision as to whether they are offensive words or not. That is a matter for the Speaker to deal with.

MR. HENDERSON:

Speaking to the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would quote again from Section 138 (2) of Beauchesne, which has been referred to as the basis for this exercise: "If offensive words are spoken in Committee, which are taken down, the House only and not the Committee can take notice of them."

Now obviously somebody has to pass judgment in committee on whether the words are offensive. It was not a resolution that was debated that made judgment as to whether the words were offensive. So I want it straight as a matter of record that if it is read into the record by the Chairman of the committee obviously in his judgment the words are offensive. Because this committee did not decide that the words are offensive. The committee did not decide, it must be in the words of the Chairman.

That's the only question I raise as a matter of record. I think it's important to have the matter clarified, since we insist on going through this thing twice or maybe go back to another go round in committee and straighten it out again. I don't know.

MR. KOZIAK:

I think if we read Section 138 (2) of Beauchesne it says: "If offensive words are spoken in Committee, which are taken down, the House only, and not the Committee, can take notice of them."

Now that to my mind is quite clear. All that can be done by the committee is to report those words. Whether or not they are offensive is the decision that is to be made by the House itself under the direction of the Speaker. It's not a decision that is to be made either by the chairman or by the committee as to whether or not those words are offensive. That decision must be made by the House as a whole.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. How on earth can the committee take notice of them when the chairman rises and makes his statements about the words that are uttered in committee? Obviously the chairman is taking note of something. I am at a loss to understand the logic involved in this exercise. Obviously somebody has to pass judgment in committee that the words are offensive, or what's the basis of the chairman putting them into the record? Does he read them into the record, Mr. Speaker, because the Deputy Premier thinks they are offensive? Or does he read them into the record because the Chair thinks they are offensive? In whose judgment are the words offensive? I'm still at a loss to understand the basis for the words being read into the motion by the Deputy Speaker in reporting on the Committee of the Whole.

MR. SPEAKER:

It would seem clear that it's the judgment of the committee that the words be included in its report. Without wishing to be unduly technical about the matter, it would seem that since this is the first time since the beginning of last year that such words have been included in a report, the intention of the committee is that those words be dealt with by the House, along with the rest of the report.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

I speak again to the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I agree with you, but the committee did not, in its judgment, decide that the words were offensive.

DR. HORNER:

We don't have to.

MR. HENDERSON:

We had a motion by the Deputy Premier that the words were offensive, then he debated them and we had a debate on whether the motion was debatable. But the Committee of the Whole did not go on record that the words were offensive.

MR. SPEAKER:

We'll have to bring the matter to a conclusion. Does the hon. member wish to discuss the point of order?

MR. LUDWIG:

I wish to point out that Rule 138 refers to offensive words made by one member with regard to another member. It has nothing to do with any kinds of remarks made by a member in this House about some organization or somebody outside of the House. I wish to quote a rule to support this contention as being quite clear. I'm quoting Rule 150 in Beauchesne. It says:

If a member should say nothing disrespectfully to the House or the Chair, or personally opprobious to other members, or in violation of other rules of the House, he may state whatever he thinks fit in debate, however offensive it may be to the feelings, or injurious to the character, of individuals,

This is outside of the House --

and he is protected by his privilege from any action for libel, as well as from any other question or molestation.

And the hon. members opposite are taking the position that I used offensive words as regards perhaps some hon. member here, but I made a remark about the Emergency Measures Organization, and I'm not withdrawing those remarks. They are in Hansard. But I'm saying that I'm privileged to make those remarks whether anybody likes them or not. And this whole exercise is inane, because 138 does not deal with the remarks I made about EMO or any other association outside of the House. It deals with offensive remarks, unparliamentary remarks or any offense to an hon. member. So this whole exercise, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, is not giving me the privilege that I have under Rule 150, that if I wish to criticize the members of EMO or any organization outside of this House, it is my privilege. And to stress this thing, it says:

he may state whatever he thinks fit in debate, however offensive it may be to the feelings, or injurious to the character, of individuals; and he is protected by his privilege

that's legislative privilege --

from any action for libel, as well as from any other question or molestation.

And I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, that if this exercise continues, I will have a point of privilege to raise. I've exercised my right of my freedom of speech and my rights under Rule 150. And unless the Deputy Premier can show that I was offensive or in any way unparliamentary to an hon. member, then this whole exercise is futile. What are they trying to pull off, as far as I'm concerned?

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, if I may, Rule 150, as the hon. member has accurately quoted, says that: "If a member should say nothing disrespectfully to the House or the Chair..." And it goes on to say "...or in violation of [other] rules of the House..."

In other words, the rule may be said to read: "If a member should say nothing disrespectfully...or in violation of other rules of the House..." then, of course, the comments the hon. member has made can be given effect. But the point that was made by the hon. Deputy Premier in committee and might be made here is that what the hon. member had to say, the words which are reported to you, are indeed in violation of another of the rules of the House, and because of that, lose what might be called the protection of annotation 150. The particular annotation to which we refer you is annotation 152(1), 152(4) and 154(2). The contention is simply that the statements in Beauchesne are that: "References to the Commissioner of Taxation...are unparliamentary." This rule applies to any civil servant

and it goes on,

whose public actions may be unreservedly criticized but whose private conduct is not amenable to Parliament unless it is so obnoxious that it interferes with his public duties...

In other words it is unparliamentary to attack the Commissioner of Taxation. It is also unparliamentary to attack civil servants. One of the arguments in favour of this, of course, is that they are the servants of the Legislature and yet do not have the protection in the Legislature of being able to defend themselves.

Substantiation for 152(1) is found further on in 152(4) which says: "All references to judges ... and to personages of high official station, of the nature of personal attack and censure, have always been considered unparliamentary."

Now to look specifically at the words that were used by the hon. member in committee this afternoon, he hypothesized about what would be the action of civil servants in the event of a disaster or emergency. He hypothesized they would, in effect, get to safety before the people they were responsible for protecting and in that respect I draw your attention to 154(2) which says: "Words may not be used hypothetically, or conditionally, if they are plainly intended to convey a direct imputation." I think the concern of some hon. members is that the words used, while they were hypothetical, were plainly intended to convey a direct imputation that they were directed at the civil

service, or an element of the civil service of Alberta, who are protected from such attack by 152(1) and 152(4) and that 152(1) and 152(4) are an exception to the general protection which is offered to a member of the Legislature in 150. I think that is the substance of my concern at least.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed, agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

I believe it is quite clear that the hon. members opposite are prepared to go to any depth and stretch any technicalities. They have not gotten over the fact that rule 150 gives an hon. member a privilege to criticize anybody he wishes outside of this House, and that is what I did. I am relying on the specific language of rule 150 that I may criticize anything, I may criticize a political party, I may criticize anybody dear and close to the heart of the Deputy Premier. That he might feel annoyed, and indeed he made a number of unparliamentary remarks following that criticism of the EMO.

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. member will complicate the situation if he goes farther afield from the point of order.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting that the hon. members in their debates on the point of order have not in any way overcome rule 150 that gives me a privilege in this House to criticize someone for actions outside of this House, and I believe that if it is unparliamentary to criticize the actions of a civil servant then I believe this House has been unparliamentary time and time again. So that is sort of grasping at a straw in order to substantiate the position taken by the hon. members on the government side.

I am stating, Mr. Speaker, that rule 150 works in my favour. It is clear. I rely on that rule that I have a privilege in the House to criticize someone's actions or intended actions outside of the House. Mr. Speaker, I am asking you to rule on the basis of the meaning of rule 150, which I state is in my favour entirely.

MR. SPEAKER:

There are two points of order before the House. The first one has almost been lost sight of and it is the one raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition with regard to the report. It seems to me that the committee has reported and the House may not look behind that report. It may only deal with it once it has been brought forward into the House and that report requires attention in three respects.

One is with respect to the matter of the report itself, the other is with respect to the leave to sit again and the third is with regard to the words which have been appended to the report. I would say that the matter which is now before the House is whether or not this report is to be accepted. Would all those in favour of the acceptance of the report brought in by the hon. chairman of the committees and the request for leave to sit again, and if necessary I would propose to separate those two items, please say aye.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. SPEAKER:

With regard to the words which have been reported and the point of order which has been raised by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, with respect to those words there is no question that Rule 138 is not expressly intended to cover this kind of situation. It deals with offensive words used as between members within the House or perhaps offensive words used by members in the House with regard to the House. However, it does provide a procedure for dealing with that kind of situation.

Rule 152, however, does not expressly quite provide the same procedure, but it does also provide a procedure for dealing with offensive words which have been -- it does deal with offensive words spoken in committee.

Rule 152 deals with civil servants and with persons of high official station. Now, I question whether it would be a practical exercise for the House

at this point to weigh to a nicety what is a high official station and what may not be. Whether a person of Deputy Minister rank be of high official station and someone of Acting Assistant Deputy Minister rank not be, I would say would be an unprofitable exercise.

Now 150, as I would understand it, deals with the situation generally with regard to persons generally. Rule 152, however, goes to the particular, and I think there are canons of construction which would say that in some appropriate circumstances the particular overrides the general. Consequently, it would seem that since 152 deals specifically with civil servants it should, where civil servants are involved, take precedence over 150. Under the circumstances I conceive it to be my duty to paraphrase the words of 138, to say to the hon. member, "has the hon. member anything to say in explanation or retraction of the words which have been reported by the hon. chairman of committee?"

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have something to say. First of all, those words were taken very conveniently out of context and I wish to read what I said, that the whole exercise that we got into here in the House dealt with the Minister of Agriculture's recommendation that perhaps EMO ought to be reorganized.

I made some complimentary remarks about EMO as regards their civil responsibility, but I took exception to the fact that they have really no worth in any military situation. I believe that is a matter of opinion, and I want to state that when the minister or the deputy minister or the Minister of Agriculture got rather worked up about some remark that I made about him, here is what I said: "I see the Minister of Agriculture smiling."

I would like to suggest that if they are going to reorganize EMO, then for goodness sakes take it out of the Department of Agriculture or any influence he has with regard to reorganizing it, because after he got through reorganizing the Department of Agriculture we have a staff that is almost too much to pay for. We have \$1,500,000 in travelling expenses and that is reorganization. I suppose if you can get everybody travelling around the province he thinks the department is going places.

We want somebody who will reorganize this thing into an efficient operation without embarrassing the taxpayer. I was agreeing with him that maybe we do need to reorganize it. It doesn't have to be as large, but it has to be effective. If it is going to be under the Minister of Agriculture or any minister, then when we do reorganize it let's not build this thing into a brand new bureaucracy with the pretext that the morale of the public will be greater because they will have some kind of emergency task force that can save them from disaster.

We never have. This outfit has never been tested in a real disaster. This organization was started when there was some threat of a military attack. I never could imagine what they would do. They would probably be well organized to head for the hills in front of everybody else if there was a real attack. This is a hypothetical statement. I am saying that they never were under any military attack, none of us were here. So I feel, Mr. Speaker, that under the privilege of the House I had the right to say this. So that is my opinion of it. There is no power of discipline. They are not under the military.

And then there was some heckling and Dr. Horner was cutting in. He said, "Shame." But I firmly believe that is exactly what would have happened, the jeeps would have been in the lead. And this was my opinion of what would happen with an organization like that that has no military discipline whatsoever. It started as a military discipline and I believe it is staffed with a lot of retired officers. But its responsibilities are civil so I levelled this criticism.

And I will say, Mr. Speaker, that I did that after having made some remarks as to the civil worth of this organization. The remarks that I made were taken out of context and where the Deputy Premier's ire was extended was that I took a swipe at him about his reorganizing inabilities.

So that is what I have to say, Mr. Speaker. If the House feels that I have used an unparliamentary statement then it is customary to withdraw or apologise if that is the decision. But I'm submitting, Mr. Speaker, that that was not in its complete context an unparliamentary statement.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, following Beuchesne citation 138(2) the hon. member who just made that statement must withdraw from the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member completed his explanation, or has he gone as far as he wishes to go in the direction of a possible withdrawal?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my position is this: if the House finds that the statement I made was unparliamentary than I will make my decision then, but to date the House has not ruled on whether my remarks were unparliamentary.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, that the words used by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View be taken into consideration at the next sitting of the House.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move 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 11:52 o'clock]