

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Title: **Thursday, April 29, 1976 2:30 p.m.****VS Services Contract**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 44****The Alberta Energy Company  
Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 44, The Alberta Energy Company Amendment Act, 1976. There are some changes in this bill which are a result of a year or two of operation of the Alberta Energy Company and that will allow more efficient operation of that company. In addition, there is an amendment which allows the government to guarantee or make a loan to an affiliate of the Alberta Energy Company in addition to the company itself.

[Leave granted; Bill 44 introduced and read a first time]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

DR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, it gives me very great pleasure to introduce to you, and through you, a very well-known resident of my constituency and the Member of Parliament for the Lethbridge riding, the hon. Ken Hurlburt. He is seated in the members gallery, and I would ask him to rise and receive the recognition of the House.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the hon. Member for Calgary Currie, Mr. Peacock, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the House, 50 Grade 10 students from the Shaughnessy School in his constituency. They are seated in the public gallery, and I'd ask that they rise and receive the welcome of the members.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, 60 Grade 9 students from Parkdale School, which is located in my constituency of Calgary Bow. They are accompanied today by their teachers, Mr. Gordon Wickens, Mr. Fred Kahute, Mr. Bill Eshom, and Mr. Rob Earle. They are seated in the members gallery, and I will ask them now to rise and receive greetings from the Assembly.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health and ask the minister, in light of the closeness of May 1 and the commitment the government has that VS Services would take over certain operations at Alberta School Hospital/Deerhome in Red Deer, if the contract has been signed between the Government of Alberta and VS Services.

MISS HUNLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is it the government's intention that VS Services will take over the operation of the designated areas May 1, whether the contract is signed or not?

MISS HUNLEY: No, Mr. Speaker. It's our intention to have the contract signed prior to May 1. I understand that it's in the final drafting stage at the present time.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. The commitment was given to the public employees that those who had over five years of seniority at Deerhome and ASH would not be losing their jobs as a result of VS Services moving in. Now over 200 employees have received a letter from the government, urging them to become employed by VS Services.

My question to the minister is: if these 200 employees who have been on the staff of the Alberta government at ASH/Deerhome for more than five years do not follow the urging of the government and become employees of VS Services, will they still retain employment with the Alberta government?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. But I have to question the word "urging". While I have not read the letters, I understand that the director of personnel has written to them, and I believe that's a legal requirement. Even though it's more expensive to do it this way, we did give an undertaking that no person will be discharged as a result of the contracting of those various services. We intend to implement the saving through attrition, and I've said that before. Our position on that matter has not changed.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate to the Assembly what capital costs, if any, the Alberta government will be putting into ASH/Deerhome at Red Deer to implement the contract with VS Services?

MISS HUNLEY: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, but I would have to check to be sure. As a result of some other studies, I know some recommendations have been forwarded and as a result of the public health inspector's visit there that some changes should be made. I don't think that relates specifically to it, but I would definitely check and advise the hon. member.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to indicate what mechanism the government will have in place at the two named institutions at Red Deer to monitor the level of care that patients will receive as a result of the change-over from government operation to VS Services?

MISS HUNLEY: A very concerned and dedicated staff who have been there a long time and who, I hope, will continue to remain there for a long time; I have great confidence in the fact that they will see adequate care is given those who reside in that institution.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, can the minister advise the Assembly whether the contract to be signed with VS Services will specify any rental charged to VS for the capital equipment already in place, the various machines already purchased by the Alberta government?

MISS HUNLEY: No, I can't advise that at this moment, Mr. Speaker. When the contract is tabled in the House it will be readily available for anyone to peruse and determine what the terms are.

DR. BUCK: A supplemental question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Is the government considering any change in the terms of the duration of the contract? Is it as originally let out, or has the contract been shortened?

MISS HUNLEY: It was our intention to enter into a two-year contract, but there is always, as in most contracts, an opportunity to cancel. I wouldn't be too familiar with it until I've had the opportunity to peruse the finally completed document.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. Is there an option for renewal for VS foods at the end of the contract?

MR. SPEAKER: Might I suggest to hon. members that possibly questions which are attempting to elicit the contents of a contract not yet signed, and concerning which we have some reasonable hope of having a copy available within a few days, might be postponed until the contract is available, rather than take up the time of the Assembly in the question period with a clause-by-clause questionnaire as to what the contract might contain.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, with all respect, sir, if we're going to try to encourage the government to make any changes, it's best to do it before the contract is signed.

MR. SPEAKER: I agree with the hon. member, but I would think that such attempts would have to be done via debate. As the hon. member knows, the question period is not the occasion for debate, at least not obvious debate.

#### **Taxi Companies**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Solicitor General. The question flows

from the City Cab situation in Edmonton.

The initial question is: when was the Solicitor General or his department first made aware that City Cab had no insurance?

MR. FARRAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a long story, because it's been off and on over a number of months. But the first event was that City Cab filed insurance with Lloyds of London, effective January 1, 1974, through E. A. Whitehead Ltd., the agency. They again filed this on January 1, 1975. The policy was cancelled, effective January 31, 1976. They then filed another insurance certificate policy with the department effective January 31, 1976 — so there was no lapse of coverage — a composite policy with Wellington Fire Insurance Co., and others.

Part of the policy apparently was cancelled, effective March 30. We received notice of this cancellation on April 1. There was some doubt about the period of grace. On April 7 we advised City Cab that, under Section 20 of The Public Service Vehicles Act, they were given 14 days' notice of the cancellation of their insurance. They were advised that, if we didn't receive a new and effective automobile insurance policy within the 14 days, all their livery licence plates would be retrieved, confiscated, if you like.

Three working days were lost in the administrative process, and the registered notification was in error in that it gave them until April 21 to comply. It should have been only to April 16. We attempted to contact the manager of City Cab on April 22. We did contact him on April 23. He advised that he had insurance with Marsh & McLennan Limited, which was handling his renewal policy. When we checked this out, through a long chain of events, it was apparent that he had not got insurance. Finally, the day before yesterday, the action was taken by me under Section 57 of the act.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I'd like to ask the minister if he's aware of any accidents that City Cab was involved in during the last week.

MR. FARRAN: No, I'm not aware of any, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then a supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Has the minister caused any investigation into the circumstances surrounding the over 200 per cent increase in the premiums required to give the normal cab insurance coverage to City Cab?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, the superintendent of insurance has been aware of the situation and, in fact, was contacted by City Cab. As a result of inquiries he made and efforts on behalf of City Cab, he has not indicated to me that there were some unusual circumstances with regard to the premiums being asked.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the Solicitor General. In light of what's happened, is the Solicitor General giving any consideration to either regulations or some other mechanism by which cab drivers would be aware of the parent company's lack of insurance?

I raise the question because in this case we're

advised that a number of cab drivers who have continued to pay their money each week to City Cab assumed that they had insurance during all these carryings-on. That's why I ask the question of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

Is he considering any action that would protect the cab drivers against the parent company not having insurance when the driver believes the company has insurance?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the person or the company taking out the policy is City Cab. In effect, the person who is insured is City Cab. If that is the case, then the requirements of the insurance company in notifying its insured would be City Cab. If that is the case, it is presumably the obligation now of the City Cab Co. to notify its drivers.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Has the minister's office been contacted by cab drivers who have been [making] their weekly insurance payment to City Cab and who now find they haven't had insurance coverage?

MR. HARLE: No, I have not. As far as I'm aware, I have not personally had any contact with a City Cab driver.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Has the government asked the Auto Insurance Board to review the rate increases over the past 12 months as they relate to taxi firms?

MR. HARLE: No, there hasn't been any request from my office to the Alberta Automobile Insurance Board.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In light of the present problems encountered by City Cab, is it the government's intention to ask the Auto Insurance Board to conduct an exhaustive review of insurance rates as they apply to taxi fleets in the province?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I have been considering doing that. However, I have to be aware of the fact that they are already involved in the approval of rates and rate structure. This may already have been done.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for clarification. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly specifically whether that kind of assessment has been done concerning PL and PD rates as they relate to taxi fleets in the province?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, this is what I want to find out.

MR. NOTLEY: I'd like to put a final supplementary question to the Solicitor General. Is the hon. Solicitor General in a position to advise the House whether he has received representation concerning changes which would allow self-insurance by certain taxi companies?

MR. FARRAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't received representations from any taxi company.

### Power Grid

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to question the Minister of Utilities and Telephones. I'm wondering if he can advise us whether any discussions have taken place between his department and the federal government on the proposed cross-Canada grid.

When might a joint Alberta-Saskatchewan power grid become effective, as recommended by the [EUPC] 1975 planning report?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, I am in a position to advise that those discussions are under way. As a matter of fact, my recollection is that those discussions were pursuant to a discussion held at a previous first ministers' conference. It has to do with the possibility of hooking up Alberta and Saskatchewan so there would be an eastward hookup of electric generation and transmission systems, just as there presently is in the westward direction toward British Columbia. My understanding is that there is a technological problem having to do with the synchronization of the alternate current system of transmission, and that those matters are being worked on and discussed in the meetings the hon. member asked about.

MR. STROMBERG: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will federal funding be available for the hookup of this grid system?

DR. WARRACK: Some consideration has been given to that matter, both by the federal government and by the provinces. My understanding is that the state of progress of those talks is not definitive at this time, but that is a possibility.

MR. STROMBERG: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has a price tag been put on what it would cost to hook up this grid?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, I suspect a preliminary price tag has been put on it, though I do not know offhand what it is. It's my recollection that part of the discussion under way would be to nail down that very important aspect more definitively.

### Library Assistance

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address this question to the Minister of Government Services also responsible for Culture. In view of the pending increase in petrochemical activity and the great need for additional technical data in the province of Alberta, particularly in the municipalities, I wonder if the minister could advise whether he's considered any new ways in which additional funds can be granted to implement part of the Downey report on library services.

DR. BUCK: Get grants.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, many ways have been considered. Considering the present restraints on the Government of Alberta, I'm afraid we have not yet come up with a solution to increase the support to libraries in the province.

MR. MUSGREAVE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise if one of the suggested ways of improving the service could be not to adopt the concept of a province-wide control system, but just to give more money to libraries to increase their facilities and their present inventories?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 9, which is presently before the Legislature, would at least accommodate that situation once we could receive additional funds for our budget.

#### **Library Association Meeting**

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the minister. Is it the minister's intention to accept the invitation of the library trustees' association to attend their annual convention in May?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I met with the executive of the Alberta Library Trustees' Association about one month ago. I intend to attend the convention of the Alberta Library Association at Lake Louise this Saturday.

#### **Truck Company**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Deputy Premier, the Minister of Transportation. Could the minister indicate whether he's had any recent meetings or discussions with CP transport officials regarding CP's truck operations in Alberta?

DR. HORNER: No, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member should appreciate there's a difference in the regulatory effect on trucks in Saskatchewan and in Alberta.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. At the meeting yesterday in Medicine Hat, was this matter discussed regarding the effect upon Alberta of CP's trucking operation not being able to come across Saskatchewan to Alberta?

DR. HORNER: It was briefly alluded to, Mr. Speaker, but until such time as the Saskatchewan motor traffic board holds its hearing, I don't think there's anything we can do relative to that matter. It also relates to a more complicated one concerning the federal intervention in Part III of the National Transportation Act.

#### **Land Use Regulations**

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Might I be permitted a short explanation? For the information of the Assembly, the state of Oregon has passed new land laws designed to prevent the sprawling growth of suburbs into farm country. Under that Oregon law, if farmland is sold to a developer it not only loses its lower tax rate, but seller or buyer must pay the difference between the old assessed farm value for the previous 10 years and the tax rate for its new use.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is: in order to save hundreds of acres of good farmland around the city of Edmonton, would the minister be prepared to consider similar strong measures to control speculators and giant developers using up our good farmland?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for St. Albert has, of course, underscored a very important issue which is being considered by the regional planning commissions in and around the metropolitan areas, together with those people concerned with the financial arrangements with respect to municipal expansion and movement of urban centres away from the metropolitan boundaries.

I think I can recall, very casually, that we are doing some work with respect to tax deferrals. It seems to me this is a method of tax deferral wherein the tax is deferred to some future date, given the change in use of that land.

My only general comment with respect to that question, Mr. Speaker, would be that if we continue to use good planning concepts in strategic and high intensity use of lands characterized as below standard in the Canada Land Inventory rating, then perhaps we can avoid some of the questions of high utilization of very valuable agricultural land by urban development.

#### **Hospital Beds**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Has the minister any updated global statistics compiled by the department on the number of hospital beds in the province closed since the beginning of the year?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, no, I don't. Some hospitals are still in the process of making their final decisions as a result of the appeal procedure, and the final budgets have only been determined for approximately two weeks. So the answer is no.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly when this information will be available?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I can give any definite date on it. I have indicated a general impression I have from meeting with many hospital boards throughout Alberta, and in Edmonton and Calgary. As for being able to pin it down to the last bed, Mr. Speaker, I can't give a definitive time on that.

#### **Hospital Staffs**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the minister reviewed the questionnaire prepared by the Alberta Certified Nursing Aide Association, which asserts that at least 20 hospitals have laid off nursing aides and replaced them with untrained ward aides?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, no. I've been out of the capital, in Ottawa, the last three days, and I have not examined the particular questionnaire the hon. member refers to.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. In view of the layoffs which are taking place, has the government commissioned any study

to assess the employment prospects for the 350 to 360 nursing aide graduates expected this year?

DR. HOHOL: No, we haven't, Mr. Speaker, in terms of a formal study. The exchanging and recording of information and the ensuing consequences of the circumstances described by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview are something that we will watch.

I can make one comment. A number of the graduates that we are speaking of are being employed in Alberta; others across this nation; others in work other than nursing, which is regrettable, but that's the circumstance in the short term. Likely in the long term the thing will turn around.

MR. NOTLEY: One final supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Is the minister aware that nursing aides have been asked to voluntarily accept reclassification as ward aides, in order to save money and fit into restricted hospital budgets?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, there are about three points I'd like to make in reply to the hon. member's question. One is that, in regard to employment opportunities generally in the hospital field in Alberta, I think it's important for all of us to understand that, relatively, the opportunities will be better in this province than in any province in Canada. Because, basically, as I've indicated in the House before, although we're trying to bring the annual cost escalation under control, we are providing more flexibility to hospital boards on global budgets than exists in any of the larger provinces in Canada, other than a smaller province in the Maritimes. So that's important for us to emphasize.

The second is that, with respect to the specific representation the hon. member has made, these decisions again are left to individual hospital boards. As they are making them, they must comply with the Board of Industrial Relations and any law surrounding employment of people in hospitals that exists on the statute books of Alberta. As far as I'm concerned, the decisions are then made by the individual administrations and hospital boards.

#### Adoptions

MR. TAYLOR: My question is to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Does the government have a waiting list of parents who want to adopt children?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we do.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary. Are there any Indian and Metis children waiting for adoption?

MISS HUNLEY: I would have to check. I don't know whether we actually have a record of the nationality or racial origin of the children awaiting adoption. But I would be pleased to inquire in the department.

MR. TAYLOR: A further supplementary. Are there any particular categories of boys and girls who are available for adoption at this time?

MISS HUNLEY: I would imagine that, if we go according to the history and development of it, there are older age groups which are eligible for adoption. Most people prefer to adopt a baby, and it's babies that most of them are waiting for. I believe we usually run up a considerable waiting list, and we are continuing to run behind the demand again this year, even though we have had more children referred to us for adoption than we had in the past year.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary. Is it the policy of the government to place Indian and Metis boys and girls only in Indian and Metis homes?

MISS HUNLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I think we try to do the best match we possibly can. As a matter of fact, we have a special study going on through the Voice of Native Women to give us some advice on foster homes for native children. I look forward to receiving that report before too long.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. Are there any applications from single parents?

MISS HUNLEY: I doubt that we would receive them now. At one time single parents were permitted to adopt, but because we have such a long waiting list, we have certain criteria which we use in assessing a family's eligibility and priority to obtain a child.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. I have two questions, and I think they can be answered very easily with one answer: first, the approximate waiting period for adoptive parents; and secondly, is there a limit on the number of adoptive children per family?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, there's a limit to the number of children that can be adopted, or the number of children in a family, which would limit the number of persons who can apply for adoption. What was the other question?

DR. BUCK: The waiting period.

MISS HUNLEY: The waiting period. I'll sit down, Mr. Speaker, and look it up.

#### Hitch-Hiking

DR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General. In view of the recent kidnapping and ultimate unfortunate and very untimely death of a young girl from Lethbridge while she was in the process of picking up a hitch-hiker at Liberty Lake near Spokane, Washington, are there laws and regulations in the province of Alberta concerning hitch-hiking?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, perhaps that is a matter that he might wish to ask his solicitor about.

#### Hearing Aid Program

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. I'd like to know if the minister has launched any investiga-

tions into any irregularities in the government's hearing aid program.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to ask the hon. member to expand on his question. I'm uncertain as to what he's talking about.

MR. NOTLEY: Repeat the question.

AN HON. MEMBER: He didn't hear you, Walt.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, there have been reports that there has been gross overcharging in the senior citizens' hearing aid program, and people who don't really need them have been given hearing aids. I'd like to know if the minister or the Minister of Social Services and Community Health is looking into this problem.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, the matter of providing hearing aids to senior citizens is, of course, one of the extended health benefits which we inaugurated a couple of years ago. We have sent out a questionnaire to find out how the system was working. The number of complaints we received was quite minor. Some related to the fact that we only paid a part of the cost. They weren't complaining about anything else but the fact that we do have a limit on what we pay. Otherwise, there seemed to be a general indication that they were satisfied with the service.

Mr. Speaker, I don't doubt that perhaps some of them are charged rather a high price for it, but I don't have any specifics. If the hon. member has, I'd be pleased to look into it.

#### **Health Care Coverage**

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. I know there seems to be quite a bit of heat generating between the chiropractors and the doctors. Personally, I'm taking a neutral stand on it. [laughter]

Can the minister inform the House why there is a fee limit of \$150 for chiropractors, and yet doctors have unlimited fees?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, certainly I have to go on the advice of the professional people in the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission and the trend that's existed in Canada with respect to medical care coverage of a variety of health professions. Basically, my understanding is that chiropractic is not the only profession that has an annual ceiling based on a single person or a family. The others that are the same as chiropractic are optometry and podiatry.

I am advised this is done because the nature of the practice of these professions tends to be a recurrent performance of the same or similar procedures, which is somewhat different from the way the medical profession is practised, where procedures don't tend to be as repetitive as they are in these three professions. It's one way of having a control of the total amount paid for these services with respect to an individual citizen, or to an individual member of the chiropractic, optometry, or podiatry professions.

#### **Dairy Industry**

MR. FLUKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Deputy Premier. In the absence of the Minister of Agriculture today, I wonder if the Deputy Premier could indicate if any plans have been finalized for the industrial milk market share quota for the new dairy year.

DR. HORNER: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't give any further information than that which the Minister of Agriculture gave us a day or two ago. But I expect that, as he indicated, he'll be ready to make an announcement in the next day or two.

#### **Hitch-Hiking (continued)**

DR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, I thought I might try again. In view of the unfortunate death of this young lady from Lethbridge, are the police doing anything to discontinue the habit of hitch-hiking in Alberta?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I think we should all be concerned about the tragic death in Montana of the Lethbridge girl who was shot by a hitch-hiker. It may be an opportune moment to remind all people in Alberta of the dangers of picking up strangers on the road or accepting a ride from strangers. Of six recent roadside deaths in Alberta, four are known murders, two are unknown; but of these, five were hitch-hikers.

At the present time, no specific legislation is directed at hitch-hiking. B.C. has some legislation in this regard and finds it almost impossible to enforce. The difficulty is that any individual has the right to stand on the shoulder or the side of a road.

Under our Highway Traffic Act, a pedestrian should stay on a sidewalk or a footpath. There are prohibitions against standing in the right of way on a road and signalling a vehicle. There are prohibitions against a vehicle stopping in an unsafe way in a driving lane. But we have nothing that is absolutely, specifically directed at hitch-hikers. Some city by-laws might try to wrestle with this problem. I know they have a by-law in Edmonton prohibiting anyone from standing on a road or a roadway for the purpose of soliciting a ride. The penalty is only \$2, and if they stand on the sidewalk they obviously avoid a conviction.

It's a difficult problem. I would say that in my opinion as a minister of the Crown charged with law enforcement, it would be very difficult to legislate in this area. But I think all citizens should be aware of the extreme dangers of hitch-hiking.

#### **Rapeseed Industry**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Deputy Premier. The question flows from the news reports from the premiers' conference in Medicine Hat.

I'd like to ask the Deputy Premier if the question of freight rates was discussed yesterday with specific regard to the situation that rapeseed plants find themselves in. What recommendations came out of the conference.

DR. HORNER: As briefly as I can, Mr. Speaker, yes indeed, the whole question of freight rates was dealt with yesterday morning by the meeting of the premiers. Particular reference to the rapeseed situation was made in the communique. My honorable friend will recall that started in 1970, and the series of steps that has taken place. The latest is that a federal order in council has now been promulgated and is in effect, according to my information. We have had the assurance of the federal Minister of Transport that all the plants in western Canada will be treated in a similar nature.

The very serious problem, of course, is the anomaly between the raw and finished product freight rates, which again my friend will recall was one of those anomalies the former federal Minister of Transport had said he was going to attack. Part of the nature of the communique, I think, expressed the Premier's dissatisfaction with the kind of thing we were getting from Ottawa, with particular reference to their decision in the rapeseed case.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Deputy Premier, following along on this rapeseed question. The Deputy Premier will recall that early in the session I asked a question about Lever Brothers going ahead with a plant in southern Ontario.

Is the Deputy Premier in a position to indicate if that plant is going ahead and, secondly, if it's receiving federal subsidies?

DR. HORNER: I don't have that at the moment — whether it's receiving a federal subsidy. I'll attempt to get it for you.

My understanding, according to the newspaper reports, is that it indeed may be going ahead. One of the actions relative to the recent OC on rapeseed is that meal will go to Thunder Bay at the Crow rate. We still have that very upsetting arrangement where the Crow rates are being used, in my view illegally, to send feed grain and meal into central Canada.

#### **Freight Rates**

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. Deputy Premier. In view of the failure of the federal government to live up to its commitments at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference, are the four western governments planning any concerted action in order to get some equity in our freight rates in this part of the country?

DR. HORNER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I could say quite accurately that the four western governments not only agreed with the communique issued yesterday evening relative to our dissatisfaction with the federal transport officials, but that they would carry it the next step to the general first ministers' meeting in Ottawa and express to the Prime Minister our disappointment that they have not lived up to those commitments they made at WEOC.

I think other matters that have to be dealt with will be dealt with by the various transportation ministers in western Canada, perhaps having a look at alternate means of moving rapeseed oil and meal.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Deputy Premier. In light of what one might call the "stonewalling" tactics of the railroads, to find a better expression, has any progress been made with respect to the whole question of cost disclosure, which was such an important part of the WEOC conference?

DR. HORNER: I'd have to say, Mr. Speaker, that in certain areas cost disclosure has been made. The difficulty is that railway costing is a very complex matter. We received some information relative to rapeseed costs. As a matter of fact, we got it the day before the OC was promulgated. Indeed, our neighboring province of Saskatchewan agrees with us that the year for which the railways gave us the cost was not a reflective year and that we should have them over a variety of years so we could have a better opportunity to assess what are in fact the minimum compensatory rates. We'll be working on that area.

The other area in which cost disclosure has been useful has been the disclosure to the consultant who is working for the western provinces, R. L. Banks, and his presentation to the Snively commission. We're now finding that in fact over the years the CNR may well have been overpaid when you consider the statutory rates plus the subsidy. If the CPR has any deficit, it is a very minimal one relative to the total amount of money that has been paid to it.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Deputy Premier. In light of the backing off or lack of action by the feds, is the province, in co-operation with the three rapeseed plants in Alberta, involved in developing some kind of contingency plan right now?

DR. BUCK: Strike the loans off.

DR. HORNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Indeed, we'll be meeting next week with the four plants in Alberta. I have had a preliminary discussion with the minister from Saskatchewan where the other two or three major plants are.

If we can get the plants to co-operate in the transportation area, and compete in other areas, it might be a very useful alternative to the "stonewalling" of the railway, which I think is quite accurately put.

#### **Shock Therapy**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Could the minister indicate whether there is any legislation planned this session which would deal with the rights of patients being administered electro-convulsive shock therapy?

MISS HUNLEY: No, there is not, Mr. Speaker.

#### **Adoptions (continued)**

MISS HUNLEY: Perhaps while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I could answer the question which was asked earlier about adoptions.

We have a waiting list of over 400 approved adoption applications. Usually, the waiting period to

receive a new-born infant is approximately 11 months.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary to the hon. minister. I also asked the number of children a family is limited to.

MISS HUNLEY: I believe it's two, but I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker. I'd check to get the exact details and advise the hon. member.

#### **Influenza Vaccinations**

MR. TRYNCHY. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Could the hon. minister indicate to the Assembly what the financial arrangements are for the swine flu mass vaccination program? I understand they were worked out by the provincial and federal governments earlier this week.

MISS HUNLEY: I wouldn't say we worked anything out, Mr. Speaker. We were advised by the federal minister that they would order the vaccine, which of course all members of the Assembly know about. They are attempting to obtain that for us now. Each province would be picking up its own cheque.

MR. TRYNCHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise the House of the anticipated cost of the vaccine program to the Alberta government? Will any cost be borne by the individual who gets a vaccination?

MISS HUNLEY: We haven't actually made a firm decision on the matter of whether or not it will be provided free. My tendency is to recommend to my colleagues that it be provided free. When we ordered the vaccine, the approximate cost was estimated at about \$.75 million. That will vary depending on the ultimate cost of the vaccine when we obtain it.

The federal government is attempting to be sure of a supply, and to get the best bargain they can on behalf of the citizens of Canada by doing bulk purchasing.

MR. TRYNCHY: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister in a position to state who will be given priority in this vaccination program, and when the program will commence?

MISS HUNLEY: We anticipate the program will commence in November, although that isn't firmly established yet.

As I've advised members before, we rely heavily on the national committee which advises the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the federal health department as to what procedures should be followed. They are recommending that a selective immunization take place; that is, for high-risk people, those with chest conditions and lung conditions, those over 65, those over 20 and under 50 years of age. Those are the initial recommendations we've received so far.

We discussed it at our meeting in Ottawa recently, and it is still more or less under review. We'll continue to monitor it until the vaccine is obtained, and until we have a little better information.

#### **Influenza Name**

MR. PURDY: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. I understand there's some concern by hog farmers in parts of Canada about the name, "swine flu". Have you had any representation from the farmers in Alberta to have the name of the flu changed?

MISS HUNLEY: No, not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

#### **ERCB Hearing**

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition recently asked me a question regarding an application before the Energy Resources Conservation Board by a company referred to as PetAlta. He wanted to know when the board might be holding a hearing with regard to this company. Upon checking, the board advises me that they haven't set a firm date yet; however, they feel that tentatively it would be June 15.

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest that any supplementaries arising out of the answer might be saved for another question period. We've run a few minutes over the time limit provided by the standing order.

#### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

##### **head: WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I move that Question 179 stand and retain its place on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

##### **head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I move that the following motions for returns stand and retain their places on the Order Paper: 175, 176, 181, and 182.

[Motion carried]

130. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) statement of calculations used by the Government of Canada to determine tax revenue guarantee payments made to the province of Alberta under the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act, 1972, in amounts of \$507,000 as a final payment in respect of the 1972 taxation year and \$43,400,000 as an interim payment in respect of the 1973 and 1974 taxation years;
- (2) statement of calculations used by the Government of Canada to determine the tax revenue guarantee payment made to the province of Alberta, under the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act, in an amount of \$5,180,000



together with a statement showing how this amount was reported in the public accounts of the province for the year ended March 31, 1974.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in moving Motion for a Return 130, I should advise members of the Assembly that the Provincial Treasurer has indicated to me some problems in answering the question as it is stated. I believe the Provincial Treasurer is going to elaborate on those comments; perhaps we can deal with the motion for a return after that.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, the motion for a return requests calculations that are made by the federal government with respect to interim payments. There are reservations on the part of the federal government in making those calculations public, because they really are estimates and are calculations that are not required to be made under the regulations, and of course become irrelevant once the final calculations and the final payments are made.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then I'd be prepared to withdraw the motion and resubmit it.

[Motion withdrawn]

180. Mr. R. Speaker proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:  
The total amount of all money paid or payable by the Government of Alberta to Mr. John D. Hill, Q.C., for services rendered in connection with the committee of inquiry established pursuant to Order in Council No. 1043/74.

[Motion carried]

#### head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

1. Mr. Appleby proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta give consideration to establishing the basic goals of education in this province and also to setting up educational priorities in relation to these goals.

MR. APPLEBY: I think, Mr. Speaker, at least I should say I hope that the motion is clear. My desire is that we as legislators should discuss the motion carefully and fully, and attempt to identify what we consider the goals of basic education in the province of Alberta. I expect there will be many diverse views here in the Assembly as to just what these goals are. Hopefully, we could reach some consensus on these views. If we do, we identify them. Then I think we should go from there to try to establish a number of priorities we might utilize in relation to developing a means of achieving such goals.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I brought this resolution before the Assembly was that some months ago I came into possession of a copy of a document entitled *Goals of Basic Education: Interim Edition, 1975*. I read this very carefully not only

because I have a great personal interest in this subject [but] because I'm aware, as I'm sure all hon. members are aware, that this topic is coming more and more to the front in the awareness of the public. If we read the columns of the newspapers, if we look at the letters to the editor, we see more and more people becoming involved in making statements and giving opinions regarding education and the goals and objectives of education.

Mr. Speaker, this report was developed over a period of time. It started in 1969 with two committees, one dealing with elementary education and one with secondary education. There were 12 members on each of these committees. Then in 1972 a joint committee was formed to deal with elementary and secondary education. There were seven members on that committee.

Mr. Speaker, all the people who worked on these committees are well known and well esteemed in the educational circles of the province of Alberta. Many are known to me personally. I'm sure they put a great deal of thought and consideration into this report.

However, I want to point out that this report was developed over a period of six years. It involved people who were highly placed in educational positions in the province and probably, I expect, highly financed as well. During that period of six years, they came up, as I say, with this report.

Now the background probably is not that significant. It's what's in the interim edition of the report that counts. Twelve basic goals are established, Mr. Speaker. Each has from two to five subheadings. I don't intend to read all the subheadings, but I would like to read these 12 basic goals because they're relevant to the remarks I have to make afterwards.

The first of these is, learn to be a good citizen; number two, learn about and try to understand the changes that take place in the world; three, develop skills in communication; four, learn how to organize, analyse, and use information in a critical and objective manner; five, learn to respect and get along with others; six, learn about the world of work; seven, develop management skills; eight, develop a desire for learning; nine, learn how to use leisure time; ten, practise and understand the ideas of health and fitness; eleven, appreciate culture and beauty in the world; and twelve, develop basic and special knowledge competencies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after I read that report in detail I had a sort of haunting feeling in the back of my mind that I couldn't quite identify for some time. Then I got to thinking about it and I thought, yes, junior and senior high school handbooks, position papers, various policy statements over the last 10 or 15 years. So I did some research on that in the library of the Department of Education and looked at some of the things that were available over there over the period of years, going back just over a decade or more. They were very interesting, because I found — remember this report came out in 1975, Mr. Speaker — that in 1962 the goals of education were: training for citizenship, familiarity with the tools and methods of learning, intelligent thought and expression, consumer education, social acceptance, ethical values in group living, developing an understanding of the physical environment, vocational competence, personal development, wise use of leisure time, good health practices, occupational preparation, apprecia-

tion of cultural achievements.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members will get the connection between that and what I've just read, and the comparison. Looking at the junior high school handbook in 1962, such things are mentioned as good health, social acceptance, training for citizenship, consumer education, familiarity with the tools and methods of learning, understanding the physical environment, appreciation of family life, vocational competence, wise use of leisure time, ethical values in group living, intelligent thought and expression.

The junior high handbook in 1969, condensed very briefly, dealt with personal development, growth in family living, growth in the qualities of good citizenship, and occupational preparation. Mr. Speaker, there was a statement on elementary education by the Department of Education in 1970. It gave as a major purpose, generalization, to provide opportunities for the development of self-actualized individuals who improve and enjoy the social and physical environment, increase the individual's ability to communicate. I think, as you watch through these various reports, that word "communicate" becomes highly important. The specific purposes for elementary education in 1970: developing a value system by which to live, developing intellectual, emotional, and physical behaviors with which to function morally in the social and physical environment.

A position paper on secondary education came out in 1971. It made suggestions that the education system should promote attitudes, skills, and knowledge essential for effective living in a changing world — knowledge, attitudes, and skills in self-understanding regarding physical and mental health, a philosophy which stresses regard for human worth, for the values conducive to ethical and moral behavior, effectiveness in communicating ideas and feelings, confidence in their own abilities, their sense of responsibility, and their satisfaction and enjoyment of life, and understanding and appreciation of the use of leisure time.

Finally, looking back in this research, Mr. Speaker, in 1972 the goals of basic education, Grades 1 to 12, were listed as: development of communication skills, development of a variety of skills of self-expression, development of critical thinking and what it involves, development of skill in organizing and what it involves, and relationship of competency skills to occupational preparation.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we analyse what appeared between the years 1962 and 1975 and look at all these studies, handbooks, and position papers, we find that in that decade and a half the most clear comparison, the similarity, comes in the one in 1962 and the one in 1975. In other words, we have gone around the full cycle. It was very interesting. So, if this new and perhaps a bit expensive study in 1975 didn't do anything else over the past six years, thankfully, to me at least, it established that perhaps there is hope, Mr. Speaker, that within our school systems today and in the future, the era of permissiveness, the era of complete self-freedom, the era of non-discipline of self or otherwise, the do-your-own-thing attitude that has prevailed in programs and procedures — just perhaps, Mr. Speaker, this interim report is an indication that this era of education may be coming to a close. If it is, I say hallelujah. It's just about time.

DR. BUCK: For once I agree with you, Frank.

MR. APPLEBY: However, what happens if I say something like that? Right away somebody says, oh, old Appleby is just a traditionalist. Right now I can expect to hear that kind of comment from somebody. I don't know who. Maybe not in this Assembly. I hope not anyway. But I am interested to hear what Cookie has to say about it, anyway.

But if by agreeing with these findings, Mr. Speaker, I am branded as a traditionalist, I don't mind. To me it's a vindication of the sort of thoughts and feelings I've had as I've seen education in Alberta in the last 10 to 15 years. I was part of it, and I was exposed to it all. I went through the whole bit. New math.

DR. BUCK: Terrible.

MR. APPLEBY: Remember that? I well remember it, Mr. Speaker. We had a school superintendent who was a real nut on that sort of thing. He came into our school system and whether you were teaching social studies or English, which I was, or phys. ed. or home ec. or science or whatever, you all had to get together and learn this new math. You just had to do it. That was the way it was to be carried out. He gathered 80 or 90 of us together in a room, Mr. Speaker, and he went to work, explaining it all and filling the blackboard with all these hieroglyphics and symbols, which didn't mean much to me. I didn't really know what the result was anyway, when he was through, and down on the bottom corner of the blackboard. But one of the math teachers very timidly said, "Well, Mr. Superintendent, you didn't get the right answer." He desperately went to work and did the whole thing over and over again and still they kept reminding him that he hadn't got the right answer. Finally he said, "Well, it's not the answer that really matters. It's the concept that counts. We're dealing with concepts in education nowadays." That's the sort of thing we went through in those days.

Then of course there was the other thing, team teaching. That was a big deal too. You had a master teacher, who was supposed to be a real hotshot specialist, and then perhaps a couple of lesser lights who were working with the master teacher. The master teacher was telling them what they were supposed to do, or supposed to be telling them what they were supposed to do. Then the master teacher was supposed to be the one who knew what they were supposed to do. But it turned out none of them really knew what they were supposed to be doing. So that went down the drain too.

Another of the things we had in that era, Mr. Speaker, was the "open area", where you took six classes in one great big area and you put them all together and you taught that little group over there, and that group over there, and that group over there. You went into one of those rooms and you put your fingers in your ears because you couldn't hear yourself think. Teachers were having a desperate time, but they said this is what we're supposed to be doing, this is the new way of teaching. That experiment went down the drain. They've got plywood partitions in most of those rooms today.

Anyway, I think if we look at those reports — the

'62 one and the 1975 one — that's good. Because we can consolidate perhaps a little more than they have done in this most recent report. At the top of that list of the goals of basic education we certainly have to put communication. That has to be number one. Included in the list we would have other things. I wouldn't put them on any priority basis particularly: the citizenship and societal responsibilities, I think they have to be in there somewhere; the knowledge and development of career activities and occupational opportunities and skills; work habits and needs — very important; self-discipline, will-power training — those sorts of things; health and personal development; and I probably would also include use of leisure time, because that is becoming more important as we go along.

Now, I'm naming those goals as the most basic ones. I don't know how many people here are going to agree with me, Mr. Speaker. But if we could agree, give or add some — I hope we don't take any away — then where do we go from here? I suggested before that there is a great deal of unrest in the public sector regarding education. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of unrest in the teaching profession as well. We have a tremendous number of frustrated schoolteachers in this province today; people who say, I'm not exactly sure what I'm supposed to be doing. That's the situation we're in.

I'm not too sure how serious it is, but I'd like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is room for improvement in that whole set-up. There is a tendency, and it permeates our whole society today, to isolate our responsibilities. In education we have three groups who are vitally involved. We have the school, the teachers there; we have the parents; and we have the community. As I say, in society today we have a tendency to try to get other people to make decisions for us, to accept the responsibilities we perhaps should be accepting ourselves, to get them to decide the sorts of things that maybe we should be deciding ourselves.

I think a good example of that, Mr. Speaker, is the matter of local autonomy in school jurisdictions. Some years ago the big cry was, we don't want the Department of Education to have so much power. We want more local autonomy in our local jurisdictions.

This was given to the local jurisdictions. I don't think it was wrong. But now, when they get themselves into a bind of some kind, they can't agree, and you get two or more factions working on things, they come to the Department of Education and say, you should make this decision, you should overrule this sort of thing. That's the sort of attitude we have in society: get somebody else to do it, so they can take the rap and they can take the responsibility.

Here we have the challenge of these three groups. We have the schools, we have the parents, and we have the communities. The challenge means that we have to try to marshal all the resources of these three elements. They all can, and should, have an impact on education, Mr. Speaker. So if we can formulate goals which are acceptable to these groups — the majority of them, at least — we can utilize all those resources to develop improvements in our educational system.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, without a doubt communications has to be the number one priority. That involves a great many skills: audio skills; visual skills;

use of words, symbols, and numbers to communicate with others in both the verbal and the written senses. But, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that communication skills should be isolated to the teachers of English or language arts. If we're going to achieve a satisfactory level of communication skills within our school systems, science teachers, social studies teachers, home ec. teachers, industrial arts teachers, option teachers, any teachers at all should be expecting a good, high standard or level of excellence in communication skills.

It should be made known to them by their administrators, superintendents, and so on that they are responsible to see that this level of achievement in communication is attained, and that we cannot depend only on the specialists to attain this. I think that's very important. I have seen many term papers, essays, and things turned in for subject areas outside of English, where the teacher just puts a mark on it; no grammatical errors, no spelling errors, no punctuation, nothing like that is corrected. I think that is sad. I think every teacher in any subject should be responsible for developing that level of achievement in communication.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, this would be as good a time as any to say something about the role of the school superintendent. I think it was very unfortunate that the government, in its wisdom at that time, saw fit to remove the Department of Education school superintendents from the outside jurisdictions and allowed the jurisdictions to support their own superintendents. I think that put the superintendent in a very untenable position. Many I have talked to and many I know of today still feel the same way about it.

They became so heavily involved in administrative details, at the same time being subject to so many local political pressures, that they didn't have sufficient time for working with their teachers and trying to attain the necessary levels of achievement in their school systems. I think it was a well-meaning idea to do this sort of thing, but it was a mistake, and I really would like to see it changed.

Speaking further on communications, Mr. Speaker, to get back to that again for a moment, I think the learning disabilities program we have in effect in Alberta is very good. I think it fulfils a long-felt and very necessary need. It can't be overemphasized. I think, though, that this has to be thought of in connection with the early childhood services program, because it's in the early childhood services program that we can identify learning disabilities that exist in children who are below the school age, anywhere from three to five and a half years of age.

If we can identify a learning disability there and get some work done on it, perhaps by the time they go into the regular school system they will be much better prepared to take part in the regular program. We do have people with these disabilities, Mr. Speaker. Ten per cent of our students who enter school have some sort of learning disability. Four per cent are acute. So I think that is essential.

Going on from there, in the schools we have the special education section. We have the resource rooms. Unfortunately, with decreasing enrolments and budgeting difficulties at the present time, some of the school jurisdictions are finding it necessary to chop these resource rooms from their programs. I

think that is sad.

Rather than see those resource rooms go — I'm not making a plea that we should put more provincial money into education, because I think a lot is going there — I think maybe we should have different priorities and different allocations. Somebody might say to me, well what would you cut out? I'd be quite open about it. The first thing I'd cut out would be the regional offices and all those consultants.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MR. APPLEBY: When I look at a regional office, with those six or seven people sitting there, I think to myself, well there goes a quarter of a million or \$300,000. We could take \$100,000 of that and we could keep all those resource rooms going in the St. Paul county. We could keep them all going in the county of Smoky Lake. We could keep them all going in the county of Athabasca.

AN HON. MEMBER: And Minburn.

MR. APPLEBY: It would be much more effective than having some consultant run around with a yellow paper, such as this one on "The Promotion and Non-Promotion Dilemma". He ends up with the philosophy that nothing can be done about it, and he took an hour of the staff's time to tell them that. That's the sort of thing they're doing. So I'd say that's one place where we could probably make a saving and put it into the resource room program.

Dealing with work habits — that is, dealing with the world of work — Mr. Speaker, deals with self-discipline. I don't believe in teaching by rote: memorizing dates, statistics, and things like that. But I do think we can do some teaching of facts. I think that's very important, and I think the role of the teacher there should be to organize and provide information.

We have an excellent example of that in the field of social studies, because in the development of North America itself — I think it is useful for a student to know how our civilization developed in this country; how at one time, perhaps, there was an isthmus where the Bering Strait is now, and the original natives walked across there to this continent; how the Spanish and the Portuguese came to Latin America, and the French to Louisiana; and how explorers like de Vaca made their way up the Mississippi, and how Coronado looked for the seven cities of silver and brought the horses to North America.

All these things are interesting I think, and learning these is disciplining the mind. You don't have to remember the dates and years they came, but I think those kinds of things are important.

I think we should have some uniformity throughout the whole province in the type of programs being taught from school to school. I think if we had superintendents appointed by provincial education departments, we would have this type of uniformity.

Then, you know, as far as leisure and work habits are concerned, I'm sure that parents will and are quite willing to co-operate, because the home environment is so important. Mr. Speaker, one of the things which has had a tremendous effect on the level of learning in our schools in Alberta is television. In some homes, from the time the kids come

home from school till they go to bed, that television is turned on. The art of reading becomes a lost art. So I think by example, not only of the teachers but of the parents as well, that the enjoyment, the satisfaction, the fulfilment you can get out of reading can be emphasized.

That's another important thing. We can't cope satisfactorily with all the limitations we have in our school systems today. We can't deal with everybody's individual needs as students. It's just impossible.

But I wonder if perhaps we could not extend some apprenticeship programs into our schools, so that some of these students who are 14, 15, or 16 who do not have the motivation and the interest in academic areas could perhaps begin some sort of vocational training which would be meaningful. We do have a sampling of vocational training — industrial arts, home economics, and that sort of thing — but outside our academic programs the only ones we really graduate are those in the commercial programs. Besides the matric. students, those are the only students who come out of the high school ready to enter the world of work.

I wonder if we couldn't try to combine something in the way of apprenticeship programs so that people 18 or 19 years old, coming out of school, would be ready to go to work. Maybe they'd have to serve another year or two of apprenticeship. We do have programs of this sort in some of the bigger schools, in some of the cities, but we could get a modified type of program in some of the smaller schools as well. I think that's important.

In health and personal development, here again we have to use specifically the example of the way of life of others — the way your teachers live, the way your parents live, the way people in your community live. That is why I think it's important to try to marshal all these forces together, those which are working and are interested in education, so that they would have some responsibility in that matter.

Now in the area of health we have become, tragically enough, spectators as far as athletic activities are concerned. I think it's important that we should encourage people to take an interest in those activities where they are not necessarily competing, but where they are taking part in certain athletic activities for their own self-satisfaction — bicycling, skiing, those types of things.

Mr. Speaker, the priorities I mention then are the communication skills — I see I'm running out of time here — work habits, career planning, self-discipline, health and leisure time use, and citizenship.

I mentioned the regional offices. I wonder what else could be done to reduce some of the costs of education so we have more money to put into the places where it could be more useful. Can we consolidate any services we already have? Can we utilize office space any better? Can we cut down on travel? Perhaps on retirement, not replace someone if his position has become redundant in some way? Can we encourage school jurisdictions to do the same thing? I think we can.

I was talking to a school principal not too many days ago. He said, you know, I sent out a check list to my staff of 25 people to see what they needed supplies for next year. When it came in, they wanted \$500 worth of masking tape. And he said, I wonder what we're going to do with \$500 worth of masking

tape? Because it was on the list, each one thought he'd put down 10 or 12, or whatever it was. It ended up that we would have had enough to do us for the next 50 years. Those are the kinds of things we could be looking at.

In the late '60s and early '70s, Mr. Speaker, the emphasis was on documentation, and stress on curriculum on such things as learning to think, a sense of values, living in a changing world. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the normal, capable, efficient teacher will bring all those sorts of things into his general everyday program. I think we have to expect that sort of thing to be introduced in the general everyday program. They don't have to be specifically taught as subject matter on their own, because they should be part of what is being taught every day.

So I think we have a great challenge in front of us in education. I think we need to respect that challenge. We need to marshal all these forces together: the school, the community, and the parents. It's possible, through this, Mr. Speaker, to reach greater heights and achievement in our graduating students. We'd have more and better preparation, and we would be able to reach new heights as far as our education is concerned.

Now I see I have my usual message here. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I could say some other things, but there are many people here who are quite capable of saying some of the things I hope they are going to say. Thank you very much.

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I too want to say a few things on the resolution the hon. Member for Athabasca has brought before us. I do want to compliment him for it, particularly for the fact that sometimes it isn't too easy to see the treetops when you're so deep in the forest. Being an educator, I'm sure there are times he wonders what his colleagues are doing. I just would worry about his future in the profession, whether his membership would be valid very long there. Maybe they won't read this speech, Mr. Speaker, and maybe his membership in the profession will remain. I sincerely hope so, because he is an educator who is, I know, regarded highly in his community.

I wish to make a few comments, not as an educator but as a citizen of Alberta and a parent who has some children still in school and some who have graduated. I have to say, as I've said earlier in this Assembly, that I have been pleased with our education system in this province, but, at the same time, I agree that we should possibly make the full cycle and come back to the good basic goals of education.

In this pamphlet titled *Goals of Basic Education: Interim Edition 1975* — one of these years we'll get a final edition, instead of an interim edition. Nevertheless, the stabilizing influences on page 4 are something I have always felt are good points. But why did we give them up in our society?

The basic function of family, church, school, community and nation will persist but the relationships and structures of each may undergo change.

Well, unfortunately, I believe there wasn't a change, Mr. Speaker, we just threw out some of these good parts of raising and educating our families in this

province. I would hope that we come back and provide an opportunity for the sharing of the education of our people in our schools, in our families, and in our church.

The presentation by our colleague, the mover of this resolution, covered several areas I'd like to address myself to. One is that more and more people are making statements and expressing their opinions about basic education. I hope he meant this, and I believe he did, Mr. Speaker. And I hope the members and the readers of *Hansard* would take this in context, that this means the parents of the children in this province still want a sane education instead of leaving it totally to educators. He elaborated on what an educator did even to a group of educators. That is what parents are afraid is happening to many of their children.

Earlier in our session, when the hon. Leader of the Opposition presented a resolution, I was a bit critical on some of the areas of what is taking place in the particular school my children are attending and in which my wife is involved as a volunteer. Mr. Speaker, I have to say I was pleased, because it got some reaction. They must have read one of my speeches for the first time in the ATA office, because I heard about it. There were excerpts about my address. I'm glad they're starting to read it.

Really, all I'm asking is, let's return to the basic goals: the reading, writing, and arithmetic. When we have time and when we do a good job in those first basic needs, let's get on to some of the others. You can't really believe you can do an effective job as an educator, teach a child to learn to be a good citizen, when that educator is forever complaining about his profession, about his fellow teachers, and maybe about his principal, the leader in that school. This is really what is happening, Mr. Speaker.

As the mover of this resolution pointed out his concern about some of the people in the educational system, I hope some of these people in the profession take note of their attitude and either — you know the old cliché, if it's too hot in the kitchen, get out of it. If they're finding the profession of education too difficult, I suggest they find another profession or occupation, maybe even make more money, and not complain about the lack of money. I believe money is part of life, but also the attitude of teaching has to be there. Because if the right attitude isn't there, they're not going to do a good, effective job of educating the class before them.

The honorable gentleman from Athabasca covered the areas of permissiveness, non-discipline, and children doing their own thing. I agree. They do their own thing to such an extent that when they get home after school, the parent can't stop them from continuing to do their own thing. I think of several years back when we moved into a system and threw out some of the old guides we had in education and brought in, in Grade 1, *Think and Do*. I believe the intent was to be able to help the child to develop his mind, to do things for himself.

Ladies and gentlemen and members of this Assembly, that's exactly what some of this generation are doing now. They're doing what they want to and what they think is right, without any responsibility or responsiveness to their society, to their homes, to their community. But I do say, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad they are in a definite minority. The majority of the

citizens of this province who have come from this system have benefited by it. The intent was right. It was set up by educators. But I'm afraid the permissiveness was there, and unfortunately some harm has come about.

The hon. member indicated he hopes he is not accused of being a traditionalist. There is a lot of good in being a traditionalist. Let's not apologize for it. I honestly agree that, to a great extent, we all should look back at what good there has been in the past, in history, and return to some of the traditional good methods of educating, of leading students, giving them guidance. Because that is what takes place in practically every household until the child goes to the early childhood education program, or to Grade 1 if they don't choose that avenue. Then the concern of many parents begins.

In the 12 goals printed in this booklet — I'm not going to cover them. But I do want to say that many of them are motherhood statements; you can't really disagree with them. I only hope that somehow the dedication of the people who enter the profession of education — that it is a concern of these people who enter education, take leadership and want to be educated in this province. It's not only if the theory is good that you're going to be an effective teacher. Every so often the educator must re-examine his own success. Just as a salesman examines his or her success by the amount of money he brings in, just like the lawyer who examines his bank account at the end of the year or his income tax forms to see how successful he was, so should some of the educators look at success and really be concerned. They are the ones who have to be accountable for some of the failures we have, some of the downfalls in our system, some of the questionable attitudes we have as a result of our system.

I do urge that the resolution as set up by the hon. member be adopted, because I think the government must give some guidance in this educational system, as the voice of the people has been heard. In all fairness, we may no doubt be criticized again and again by people in the educational system who say, we know what is good for your child. I don't accept this. I think we must return to the basic goals of education and then provide opportunities for additional options for expanding what the child or the parents may want.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOPOLNISKY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few comments on the resolution of the hon. Member for Athabasca. My remarks are in three parts: first, the present goals of basic education in Alberta for Grades 1 to 12; secondly, the suggested goals for education in recent years; and finally, the rationale for basic goals of education which, I believe, is quite significant.

Mr. Speaker, the present goals of basic education for Grades 1 to 12 in Alberta must provide opportunities for students to meet the needs of the individual and of society. Individual needs are drives which arise from inside the person and impel the individual toward goals. Societal needs arise from outside the person and have their origin in custom, tradition, and successful past experiences. The latter give society its cohesiveness and purpose, being present and future oriented, but prescribing acceptable behaviors

and actions.

In a world characterized by rapid change yet counterbalanced by stabilizing influences, education must provide opportunities for students to meet individual and societal needs.

As variety among individuals in society is broad, the Alberta goals of education are not listed in order of importance. Such priorities might more appropriately be made by the system or the school levels, and complementary goals may be added at any time. This statement of goals is neither complete nor final. They are designed to provide guidance for students, teachers, parents, and members of the public.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Athabasca has very adequately made reference to the first part of my remarks; that is, the present goals of education. I certainly agree with his comments. Therefore, in the interests of time, I shall proceed to the second part of my remarks.

If the setting of broad aims of education is the responsibility of society, how would society establish these broad aims? How would teachers perceive and apprehend them? Dr. E.D. Hudson, who is the Alberta authority on the historical development of aims of education, said there have always been many aims, but aims have always been relatively broad, encompassing such matters as intellectual development, physical health, good character, social development, and good citizenship. Some of the aims have disappeared; for example, mental disciplines. Some aims, such as creativity, have been added. Some aims, such as religious development, have had a change in emphasis from period to period. Some aims, such as social development, have been reinterpreted.

He lists the aims that, in 1969, were given major emphasis in Alberta: intellectual development, including the three R's; body of knowledge; general disciplines; reasoning power; and transfer of training. On the other hand, about four years ago Dr. Walter Worth identified the general goals of education as: personal autonomy, social competence, ethical discretion, creative capacity, career proficiency, and intellectual power. Use and extend that which is good from the past. There is evidence that the Alberta teachers in general endorse Worth's formulation.

Mr. Speaker, considerable criticism has been levelled at the goals of contemporary education systems. These critics consider that current educational goals are often irrelevant and ineffective in servicing the demands of this rapidly changing society. It is stated that our schools are [going] backward towards a dying system, rather than forward towards the emerging new society. Their vast energies are applied to cranking out industrial men, people for survival in a system that perhaps will be dead before they are.

It is suggested that if the school is to survive as a relevant organization in the future, some of the educational goals must be changed or modified to adapt to the new requests society makes on the school. Today, because of the knowledge explosion and the technological revolution, the questions, where are we going and where should we be going, are frequently asked when discussing the varied aspects of contemporary society.

There was a study to examine the comparative

perception of parents, teachers, and students concerning both the actual educational goals — that is, goals currently providing direction for the schools' educational program and activities — and secondly, the preferred educational goals — that is, goals that provide direction for education. As to the importance of actual educational goals, there was high agreement amongst parents, teachers, and students concerning the four goals they perceived as currently receiving most emphasis in the development of school programs. These are: rationality, communication, vocational preparation, and preservation of the environment. On the other hand, the actual educational goals that were presented as being least important included: life-long committal to education, consumer awareness, effective use of leisure time, and family responsibilities.

As to the importance of the preferred educational goals, the findings disclosed that parents, teachers, and students also displayed a high level of agreement concerning the highest priorities to be associated with preferred educational goals. All three groups accorded highest preference to rationality, communication, and preservation of the environment.

The rationale behind these objectives of education, Mr. Speaker, should perhaps be to help students understand the nature of the society in which they live by seeing the nature of its parts, while comprehending something of its pattern as a whole; to help students acquire those skills by which they can operate effectively within society; to help students understand themselves as fellows, as completely as their individual capacities permit; to help students acquire the information and skills they will need in order to live and prosper in a pluralistic world; to help students become committed to improving quality of life they share in society, to contribute eventually to improvement of life for all men everywhere, and to preserve ideals which represent the highest manifestations of the human spirit.

There are general objectives and specific objectives. The general objectives are: thinking, knowledge, attitudes, feelings, values, and academic and social skills. Some of the more specific objectives are: developing concepts; inferring and generalizing; applying generalizations to predict what may occur in new situations, key concepts; main ideas chosen on their validity, significance, relevance, and relationship; understanding and identifying different life styles; open-mindedness; ability to expect and evaluate change; and responsiveness to democracy and human values.

More than any other generation of students, young people today have the freedom to determine their personal relationship to the social and physical environment, to be responsible in the use of their personal freedom. In the making of choices and judgments, students should deal not only with what is, but also with what ought to be.

The concern with what ought to be gives rise to values orientation. Values orientation is premised on the conviction that students exercise freedom according to the values they hold. Values and related feelings, attitudes, are the prime determiners of actions. Man's relationship to his social and physical environment can be improved, but only when people's behavior is guided by values that are clear, consistent, and defensible in terms of life goals of

each individual as a member of society.

Goals and objectives should be such that they would allow students to clarify their personal values and understand the values of others. Human values should be the major focus of attention.

Some very difficult decisions face today's young people. Affluence and reduction of external restraints have placed in the hands of each individual the opportunity and the responsibility of choosing how he will live, and what he will live for. Some would argue that the diminishing influence of the once cohesive community, church and family, is counterbalanced by restraints imposed by big business and mass media. But these are less direct, thus enabling individuals to do their own thing.

Goals and objectives usually are expressed in the very broadest of terms. This allows for flexibility; the practising of responsible decision-making by planning together and the learning experiences which are significant and of course relevant to their own lives. This should not imply a definite de-emphasis on covering knowledge of history, geography, sciences or major concepts and generalizations that are easily remembered, enduring and transferable to various life situations, in every opportunity for developing many of these skills.

Mr. Speaker, school should no longer be viewed as purely intellectual experience. It must become a forum in which students merge reason with feelings.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, those oft-used terms, "hadn't planned to become involved in the debate". I unfortunately missed some of the comments made by the Member for Athabasca. I got the last portion of his comments, and I enjoyed very much what he had to say. I commend him for putting the motion on the Order Paper and having it discussed here today.

There are just three or four points I'd like to make quite quickly, hopefully before 4:30. The first one is that I'd like to commend the member for having the matter on the Order Paper, because I think it's an appropriate and rather timely discussion to have here in the Assembly, especially in light of the action the Minister of Education has taken with regard to the development of the curriculum committee he's going to be announcing, hopefully before very long.

I'd like to say to the hon. members that the comments I'm going to make aren't very philosophically based, I suppose. But it seems to me that when we're looking at this question of the goals of basic education, it's very easy to blame the educational system for all the other problems that society has. It's very easy to blame the education system, as one member did here this afternoon, because the youngster goes to school and, as that member said, he does his thing and comes home and does his thing at home too. Pretty candidly, I can't see it as very reasonable to lay the blame on the education system because Johnny comes home and is allowed to do his thing at home. Mr. Speaker, I guess what I'm really trying to say to the members is that it's a very easy way out for society, especially for the family unit we have today, to blame on the educational system some of the shortcomings that all or many of us as parents have. I don't want anyone to misinterpret those comments and say that I for one don't think the education system has some problems. It certainly has. Perhaps it got rid of one of its biggest problems

a few years ago, here in Alberta. I'd have to say this: too many people, be they business people or be they parents, find it very easy to blame the curriculum and the things that are supposedly taught in school for the problems we have with young people today.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, one has to remember that young people today are growing up in a society that is changing more rapidly than young people have ever had to cope with before. That in itself is going to make it more difficult for the goals of education to be as current and as much on the ball as some people would like them to be. The family is having the same kinds of problems. So is society having the same kinds of problems. Certainly some people wouldn't be prepared to take the point of view that the permissiveness in society today is the fault of education. It's the result of a new kind of society we're living in today. It makes the job of the education system a great deal more difficult. It makes the job of being parents much more difficult. It makes the job of just being participating citizens in Alberta in 1976 a heck of lot more difficult than it was in 1966, '56, and '46, and so on.

So I guess the point I'd like to leave with the members today is to say, yes, it's appropriate that we look at the question of goals of education. Some would consider me rather old-fashioned when I say that I think we need more emphasis on the basics. When I think of basics, I think of the ability to read and to communicate. We should be looking at the kind of world these young people are going into. The world young people are going into today, as I've already said, is not that easy to cope with.

Perhaps we should be looking at the success of our education system, at least one of the criteria for the success of our education system being how successful young people are in being able to graduate from our school system to go out into society and to be able to cope with that society. If they can cope with that society reasonably well, that isn't just a credit to the education system, but a credit to the families of this province and to Alberta's society. If they can't cope, if they don't cope, if they don't have some of the standards some members would like them to have, that isn't just a reflection on our education system. It isn't just a reflection on the families in this province either.

Just one last comment before I adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker. Members must also recognize that when we look at these basic goals of education, these goals are designed for over 400,000 young people in this province, in a school system as large as Calgary Public and as small as some of the rural jurisdictions in this province. Four hundred thousand individuals are involved in that system too. You can't come up with one very restricted curriculum and have it meet the needs of 400,000 individuals. That's what we've got in our education system today: individuals, hopefully. We want individuals to come out of that system too, hopefully individuals who can cope with a tremendously fast-moving and a very rapidly changing society. It's changing so fast that I must adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

head: **PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS  
OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT ORDERS**  
(Second Reading)

**Bill 209  
The Smoke Detector Act**

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you need any smoke?

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 209, The Smoke Detector Act.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks this afternoon will deal with the need for standardization of legislation pertaining to smoke and heat detectors, that is standardization throughout the province, and to provide the legislative vehicle to require rental sleeping accommodation already constructed to be covered under this act. That is, the act is not retroactive in the way of penalty but it will require present construction to be so provided for.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, 92 persons in this province lost their lives in fires; in addition there were 253 injuries and many, many millions of dollars' worth of damage: a tragic waste of human resources and human care. I can tell you from personal experience it is possibly one of the most horrible deaths that any human can experience.

AN HON. MEMBER: Personal?

MR. LITTLE: Having attended a good number of fire deaths. When I compare the 92 fire deaths with the 527 automobile deaths in the province last year, they may not seem of much consequence. However, the important feature of the fire death is that there is so much potential for many, many more. As I say, we had 92 fire deaths in one year. In one high-rise fire, we could lose many more than 92.

We've been comparatively lucky in this province with the numbers of persons lost in fire. The largest number I ever remember in the city of Calgary was the old Cameron block: seven perished in that. I was involved in the identification of the bodies, which is a pretty grim effort and a great tragedy for the relatives. Possibly our worst disaster in the country was the *Noronic* disaster in the Toronto harbor a number of years ago, when almost 200 persons perished in one fire.

There are two points I wish to make before we leave that, Mr. Speaker. One is, in the fire death, particularly with the high-rise type of construction we have today, there is the potential for many, many more deaths. The second point I wish to make is that in many cases they're easily preventable.

Eighty-nine per cent of all fire deaths are residential; that is, occur in homes or rental property. Of these, approximately half are estimated to be preventable, providing there is early warning. I would like to read from the 1962 National Research Council report. In 1962, the National Research Council published the results of a study examining the value of heat and smoke detectors in detached houses. They estimated that smoke detectors would have saved 41 per cent of all of the lives lost.

So I think this is the second very significant point. I'm quite sure that if somebody was able to come up with a quick method of saving all the automobile



accident deaths, we would quickly grasp the solution.

Something I would like to impress before we go any further is that smoke detectors do not prevent fires. We don't want to get into this misconception. They don't prevent fires. It's a matter of early warning. Practically all fires in sleeping accommodation take place in the hours of darkness while the occupants are asleep, and the solution is early warning. However, as I say, they do not prevent it. Quoting from that same report of a few moments ago:

It must always be remembered that smoke detectors do not prevent fires. It would be a serious mistake to develop a false sense of security and allow [normal] fire prevention [actions] to be neglected.

That occurs time and time again. I have a great deal of documentation indicating that the early warning was the crucial situation. However, in cases where lives were saved, there had also been preparation for escape from the area.

We've heard other criticisms of the smoke detectors, particularly in newspaper articles and editorials. They are not perfect. I don't think anybody has suggested they are perfect as yet. There have been suggestions that we wait until the research is complete. What are we talking about — 15, 20 years down the road? We have this report right here, that 41 per cent of all residential deaths in one year in this country could have been prevented not with something down the road, but with the fire or smoke or heat detector we have right now. I freely admit they're not perfect. I freely admit that somewhere down the line we may have very sophisticated equipment, not only to detect the fire but to notify the fire authorities. But I humbly suggest that in the meantime we would do well to make use of the equipment that is available.

The false sense of security: all I have to say about that is, so what. If you do wake up in the middle of the night with the signal buzzing and it is a malfunction in the machine, that it was actuated not by smoke or heat, I don't think there's that much harm done.

But I don't wish to get into any type of debate on detector standards, because the act, as I will cover in a few moments, provides for ministerial authority in that area.

Nor do I wish to get into a debate on what portfolio of the government should control the regulations and the act pertaining to smoke and heat detectors. I've had a great deal of correspondence since the first reading of the bill. I've had presentations that it should be under the guidance of the Minister of Housing and Public Works. I've had presentations that it should be under the guidance of the Minister of Labour. Well, I don't think that is of great concern.

But just for a moment, Mr. Speaker, would you permit me to go through the bill itself. In the first section, the definition section:

"Bedroom" means a separate room in any building in which any person or persons customarily or occasionally sleep, but does not include a room in any building which is occupied solely by the family of the owner thereof or any person who is permitted by the owner to sleep in such building without payment of rent or like charge.

We're saying, in effect, that it only applies to rental property.

I would like to go on to the final subsection of Section 1, where "smoke detector" itself is defined:

"Smoke detector" means any device capable of detecting and giving an alarm in the joint and separate events of the occurrence of smoke and the occurrence of excessive heat in such a way as to give warning of the onset of the fire, and which is approved by the minister pursuant to regulations issued hereunder.

So as I suggested a moment ago, the quality and the standards of the equipment shall be determined by the minister.

The act, should it be passed, will go into effect July 1, 1977. It is at this point we discuss the possible — what is interpreted to be — retroactivity of the act. It states that all rental sleeping accommodation at that time shall be so equipped. But there is no retroactive penalty. I think a distinction is there that we should make.

The doubts about standards: I dealt with that a moment ago. Section 4:

The minister shall issue regulations providing for the approval of devices submitted to be approved as smoke detectors.

A recent editorial in one of the newspapers suggested that if we pass this act it will provide a bonanza for the manufacturers and dealers who handle these items. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that has to be our concern. Our concern in dealing with this act is to save lives, to save property, and to prevent fire injuries. If it becomes a side issue that certain people make a great deal of money out of the sale of these, I don't think that's our concern.

We have had other criticisms that the time frame is much too short; that is, for the act to go into effect by July 1, 1977, rental properties couldn't be equipped in such a short period of time. Once again, I have no quarrel with that. There is no problem that the minister could recommend an amendment or a delay in the time. There is one feature of the delay that rather appeals to me. If the minister could encourage Alberta industry and enterprise to manufacture these articles, I would suggest that the alleged bonanza would not be distasteful to Albertans.

To recap, Mr. Speaker, the sole purpose of the bill is first of all to provide these safeguards for our citizens, to provide for standardization of legislation — we've had criticism of the fragmentation of the various laws and by-laws passed by city councils and municipal councils of various types — and to provide that all rental properties then in existence be required to install these types of devices. This seems to be a great weakness in legislation I have seen up until the present time: we're not able to backtrack. We have this experience in the apartment I stay in in the city. It is not provided with smoke detectors or heat detectors, and the building standards regulations do not require you to backtrack. Mr. Speaker, I believe the summing-up will provide the proper information for the debate.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a few things about Bill 209. I'm aware of the background and experience of the hon. Member for Calgary McCall. In consideration of this legislation, no doubt he has looked at his experience. He had me a little concerned when he said that he knows from his own experience what a fire death is like. I thought, it's

pretty good for someone like him to still get part of that crop of hair back even though he might have experienced a fire death.

But there is a need for some legislation. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons there's a need for legislation is that I, like many Albertans, am in a real quandary as to what should be bought. I believe if legislation were brought in we would screen out some of the undesirable detectors or alarms and approve certain ones. Then we would be assured we were buying the right type of mechanism to do the right type of work. If you have legislation, you must have regulations to regulate which mechanism is suitable.

The number of fire deaths in the province, 92, is worth remembering and considering. Over and above the waste of human resource, there is also the tragedy that many a family has had to suffer. Some of the families suffer for a long time the loss of members of their family in a fire.

I also want to say that the financial loss is definitely to be considered. From the experience I've had in the insurance business, I know that in many cases we would be looking at levelling off some of the costs of insurance premiums if we brought about some method of cutting back the number of fires in this province. Sometimes people wonder why certain places are labelled firetraps and other places are considered good risks. That is part of the reason. Over and above the fact that there is a construction question, there is also the lack of a suitable alarm system and warning devices.

I don't have the concern raised by the editorial the honorable gentleman from Calgary McCall had. I agree with him [about] the concern one editorial had that this would be a bonanza for manufacturers and dealers. Possibly the editor, whoever he was — and I didn't read that article — should have considered the bonanza that 92 deaths gave to the undertakers in this province and to the construction people who had to rebuild all these places. This is a bonanza to other people. But I wouldn't worry about the loss of revenue to undertakers or to construction people because they don't have an opportunity to rebuild burned-out hulks of buildings. I would really question the depth of the editor — whoever the writer of that editorial was — concerned that this would be a bonanza to the manufacturing industry. I'm glad the honorable mover indicated this could be a plus, bring in a new industry and even provide some occupation.

The note that was sent to me is interesting. I assure the honorable gentleman from Drayton Valley that it is just my day to speak, Mr. Speaker, and not to ask questions. That's why I chose to speak on the earlier resolution and the bill before us.

I can appreciate that there isn't too much hope for Bill 209 to be passed as long as it's not approved as a government bill. But I will attempt to help the hon. Member for Calgary McCall. Even though when I gave notice I was going to speak on it I told him I was going to speak against the bill, I support Bill 209, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in the debate on Bill 209. I'm going to use a different approach to it than did the honorable mover of the bill. I'm going to go into some of the related equipment that may be needed in homes and

what some of the various tests proved for these.

Since 1967, the National Fire Protection Association has required fire detection equipment to warn against fire in the home. The Fire Equipment Manufacturers Association endorses this general requirement. The question to be decided by each specifying authority or home-owner is: how many detectors of what type should be used to obtain adequate and cost-effective protection? Because of the indefinite number of variables involved, and because of difference in judgment as to what constitutes adequate protection, this question may not be answered precisely.

However, general guidelines have been established by the Fire Equipment Manufacturers Association. They recommend: number one, that one smoke detector be installed to guard each separate sleeping area. They specify that a sleeping area comprises a hallway and all bedrooms opening into the hallway. In the bill, the hon. member states it should be in the room. I would differ with him on that. If we're going to have it just in the room, we should probably have it in the hallways leading into the rooms instead.

Number two: that both smoke detectors and self-contained mechanically powered heat detectors be used in every household fire warning system, and that neither type be used alone. We can look at two different types: the ionization or mechanical type, or the photo-electric type. Number three: that each authority or home-owner seek the fullest protection by specifying the maximum number of detectors practical. The number of detectors specified should depend upon how many detectors are economically justified compared to the life-safety risks involved when detectors are omitted from certain rooms or areas.

Number four: where legislation or codes requiring the installation of fire warning detectors in homes are such that the installation of just one detector is allowed, the detector shall be tagged with a conspicuous warning that a substantial risk to life safety exists with the use of just one detector. Additional detectors are recommended in any living room, kitchen, furnace room, and basement. The tag is to be removed only by the occupant of the home. This covers all types of homes, apartments, and mobile homes.

To help the authority or the home-owner decide what level of protection to choose and where to install detectors, the Fire Equipment Manufacturers Association has prepared tables. The tables are intended only as general guidance for typical or normal conditions, and special circumstances may require special consideration.

One table lists the major rooms and the various types that may be found in dwellings. The percentage figure next to each room indicates the approximate relative degree of danger or risk associated with not installing a detector in that room. These risk figures are based upon the assumption that there will always be a smoke detector guarding the sleeping area. The risk figures take into account that smoke detectors guarding the sleeping area will contribute varying degrees of protection from fires originating in the various rooms. Without the smoke detector, the risk figure would be greater in some cases.

One, these figures assume a smoke detector is guarding each bedroom.

Two, for any unguarded room or area that is on a level below the bedrooms, one should be installed at the top of the stairway leading to the bedroom, or the dwelling configuration is such that the smoke or heat originating in the unguarded room will travel freely up the stairwell to the detector at the top.

Three, the furnace includes any major heat-converting equipment such as a furnace, heater, air-conditioning plant, et cetera.

It is impossible to specify various levels of protection depending on the desires of the authorities having jurisdiction. The levels of protection are obtained by varying the types and quantities of the detection equipment selected. It may be argued that a singly installed detector, may it be heat or smoke, offers a degree of safe protection. The installation of additional detectors will result in a higher degree of protection. However, the base level of protection must be established, based on the [types] of fires to be expected within a living unit and reflects also the kinds of fires that historically resulted in the maximum loss of life.

It can be stated with a degree of certainty that all hostile fires in living units generate smoke to a greater or lesser degree. The same statement can be made with respect to heat build-up from fires. But the results of full-scale experiments conducted over the years, using typical fires in living units, indicate that detectable quantities of smoke precede detectable heat levels in nearly all cases. In addition, it is the slowly developing, smouldering fire that is nearly always responsible for the liberation of toxic gas such as carbon monoxide. Under these conditions, a high level of carbon monoxide may be produced without any significant increase in room temperature. Again, the results of experiments indicate that detectable quantities of smoke precede the development of lethal atmospheres in nearly all cases.

The National Fire Protection Association of America has set various levels of protection that an occupant may want to protect his premises. The highest level of protection is the standard in Level 1, as I indicated in the graph. That requires the placement of a smoke detector in the vicinity of each living area. This detector serves to alert the occupants of the sleeping area to the presence of smoke on the escape route from the bedrooms before an untenable position can exist in either the escape route or the bedrooms from fires or other parts of the residence. For those residences having more than one sleeping area, that's sleeping areas located in more than one floor and separated by common usage rooms, such as kitchens, smoke detectors should be required in the vicinity of the sleeping area.

A closed door can effectively delay the movement of smoke to the smoke detector, allowing a fire in a large room to develop great intensity before it breaks out. We hear many times that people say that you should sleep with the bedroom door closed. This association points out that you shouldn't. You should leave it open.

The basement is one area that can be large, remote from the smoke detector, and equipped with some type of closure at the top of the stairs. The basement also accounts for a significant number of fires. For this reason, a smoke detector should be installed at the head of the stairs from the basement.

The National Fire Protection Association states that

the lowest level of protection recognized requires the same basic smoke detector installation as the greatest protection, but no additional heat or smoke detectors are required beyond the basic smoke detectors. In other words, the lowest level requires a smoke detector in the vicinity of each sleeping room, and at the head of each stairway leading to an occupied area. If there is one sleeping area and no basement, then the minimum would be one smoke detector. By the nature of this requirement, it is anticipated that the provision of only one smoke detector would only apply to most mobile homes, efficiency apartments, apartments with clustered bedrooms, and small single-family homes without basements. In all probability, any living unit larger than the above would require two or more basic types of smoke detectors.

There is obviously great interest in the life-saving potential of automatic fire detection systems and equipment. However, there is a growing controversy over the respective merits of the principle of ionization detection of invisible particles of combustion versus the photo-electric detection of visible smoke or visible particles of combustion.

This is evidenced by two strongly conflicting statements representing both sides. Some manufacturers of ionization detectors contend that the ionization principle is superior because it detects a fire in an incipient stage before smoke, heat, or flame. On the other hand, some manufacturers of photo-electric detectors claim this is not true; that in fact ionization detectors do not operate until an open flame is present, or a temperature is high enough to create glowing embers or to support open flame. Because of this, these manufacturers contend that photo-electric detection is superior in a slow, smouldering fire.

It is interesting that in table-top demonstrations ionization detection may appear to support the claims of the ionization manufacturers. But in full-scale, close to real life conditions, the photo-electric manufacturers' claims are generally supported if realistic fire-starting methods — and that's by using no artificial means to compress time — are employed.

The goals of these smouldering fire tests were to show how each method of detection reacts to smouldering fires under real-world conditions. The crucial factor in holding these demonstrations was to specify codes, standards, and regulations which have been written to accept only ionization detection, excluding photo-electric detection. While these codes, standards, and detections may have been well intended, too often they have simply been based on inaccurate or insufficient information. Full disclosure of the facts would surely support the goal [that] such codes, regulations, or standards would allow the use of either method of detection.

A number of tests were conducted using various fire sources such as ordinary mattresses, typical trash consisting of rags, paper, and cardboard, and common extension cords or pipe such as PVC. After the tests were carried out, the general conclusions were that the overall purpose of these tests was not to demonstrate brand superiority but to demonstrate the respective merits of photo-electric detection versus ionization detection in similar conditions. The singularly most important aim was to prove that any codes, laws, standards, or regulations written to permit ionization detection and to exclude photo-

electric are not based on a total knowledge of the facts. There can be little doubt that these demonstrations clearly showed the superiority of photo-electric in slower, smouldering fires.

Concurrent to these tests, the November 1974 issue of *The Fire Journal*, published by the National Fire Protection Association, published an article by Mr. Richard Bright of the National Bureau of Standards. One paragraph in his article reads:

In general, it can be stated that if a fire is a slow, smoldering fire without flame, a good photo-electric detector will be superior to a good ion chamber in terms of detection time. Conversely, if flaming is present in the area, a good ion chamber will be faster than a good photo-electric detector in terms of detection time.

The conclusion of these demonstrations and this paragraph show the fallacy in the claim of ionization manufacturers that these detectors will detect a fire before smoke, heat, or flame.

Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out the two different methods at the outset of my remarks, because there is quite a controversy at the present time. As a member of a volunteer fire brigade and having attended a large number of fires in the past 15 years, being involved in various fire deaths and the investigation of those with the fire commissioner's office, and knowing very well that a large majority of fires always have a significant amount of smoke before actual heat intensity, the reason I bring this out to the Assembly is that all hon. members should probably be looking at some type of protection in their own residences. From the information I have studied in the past couple of weeks, I can draw the conclusion that both basic detection systems are good. That's why about two weeks ago I installed a photo-electric and an ion detection system in my own home, for the protection of myself and my family.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on this bill, I would like to make a few brief points. Being a resident of an apartment in the city of Edmonton, which had a disastrous fire, fortunately when I was in the city of Calgary, it certainly made me feel ill at ease when I walked down the street and saw that darkened balcony. I appreciate that there was a loss of life. Whether it was a direct result of the fire or because of stress on an individual because of a heart condition is another concern.

Before our government is stampeded into making smoke detectors mandatory, I think we should take a more cautious view as to whether these devices would perform satisfactorily.

According to the Underwriters' Laboratories of Canada, some of these devices are considerably less effective than others and none — none, Mr. Speaker — is as good as most people believe. The Consumers' Association of Canada went to great lengths in analysing several brands of detectors for sale for use in households, not under laboratory conditions, Mr. Speaker, but under actual fire conditions. For example, they set a fire in upholstery on the main floor of a home, and they judged the detectors' effectiveness by the amount of warning they would have given to people sleeping in second-storey bedrooms. Summing up its findings, the Consumers' Association of Canada said smoke detectors can save

lives; however, they are not as sensitive as generally implied and believed by the general populace. In one test, Mr. Speaker, a fire in a chesterfield smouldered for 25 minutes before the sensitive detector gave a warning.

Now, my mother lives in a senior citizens' home in Calgary, and they have smoke detectors there. There has been the odd case of little old ladies smoking in the back room . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, shame.

MR. MUSGREAVE: . . . causing . . . Yes, I was going to say smoking something.

AN HON. MEMBER: Pot?

MR. MUSGREAVE: There has unfortunately been the odd case of fire starting, and the detectors have not worked.

In this particular instance, Mr. Speaker, the detectors were installed in recommended locations, like at the head of the basement and second-storey stairs, and in the upstairs bedrooms. That kind of protection, Mr. Speaker, would run more than the \$10 or \$15, or even the \$60 that you see advertised. In this instance, they would cost more than \$200.

The Consumers' Association found that the main floor of the house was full of smoke before the first detector sounded an alarm. Nevertheless, the more sensitive types did give early enough warning to make a safe exit through the main floor — possibly, possibly.

Now if you live, as I do, in a split-level house, you've got the choice of jumping out the window and breaking a leg or your neck, or taking the chance of being asphyxiated by trying to find the front door.

The slower responding types, Mr. Speaker, gave time for escape. But in the judgment of the Consumers' Association, it would have been advisable to make that escape through a bedroom window on the second floor. Now if you're an athletic type, like some Members of the Legislative Assembly, I suppose that would be all right. But there are others of us who would find it a little extreme.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

In other words, a family who bought the wrong detector and then chose the wrong escape route could be in serious trouble. They have, in effect, a false protection built into their home. If a serious problem arose they would suffer the consequences.

Mr. Speaker, walking down Jasper Avenue recently I saw several stores with smoke detectors for sale in their windows. How do we know how effective, or how safe they are unless they pass very rigid standards? The Consumers' Association tested lower rated brands. One of these not only bore the underwriters' approved label, but also had been nationally advertised. Yet it was one of these detectors which, when the serious fire occurred, wasn't that effective that soon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Consumers' Association testing is not that conclusive. But as far as they know, they were the first in North America to actually conduct these tests under real-life conditions. It was done by an independent organization.

Some people suggest that the testing facilities of the Underwriters' Laboratories of Canada are inadequate. Perhaps they should try to improve their testing methods by bringing them up to a level one would more likely experience in a true-life situation.

There has been advertising for smoke detectors that would alert the family before smoke or toxic gases accumulate. That in itself, to an uninformed person, would sound like an excellent device, because a lot of people think that you can't smell these smokes or gases, and you can't see them. They would tend to buy this kind of device thinking it was that much more protective. But the Consumers' Association of Canada said that under the conditions they conducted the tests, these particular devices were inadequate. Once again, it creates a false sense of safety in the minds of the buying public.

Now, much of the current pressure in our province for mandatory smoke detectors in all new buildings comes from fire officials, particularly in the cities of Calgary and Edmonton. We'll probably have a public outcry — I hope not hysterical — but we certainly will have a strong public lobby demanding that these devices become mandatory, because they've been lulled into a false sense of security, not by false advertising but by advertising that really doesn't stand up under testing.

Before we make it mandatory, I think I would suggest that the testing of these devices and the quality of how they operate, whether they'll perform as the advertiser claims, should certainly be the responsibility of the province. I think it would be most undesirable to get ourselves locked into a situation — we already have enough difficulty with municipal laws regarding building and things of this nature conflicting with one another.

We do have a great concern to try to codify these laws so the protection devices in all cities, villages, and hamlets would be of a high standard and would be — if you bought it in Calgary or in Vauxhall, you would know it was going to perform quite adequately, that it would be a safe device, and for a reasonable price.

Mr. Speaker, I think we would be ill-advised to support this bill without first taking a broad look at the total picture, particularly to consider the problems involved with building and costs. The other side of the coin right now, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that unless we made it mandatory for existing buildings this would cause a bit of a hazard for people who are renting. For example, I would perhaps be a little unhappy if the building down the street had smoke detectors while the building I live in when I'm in Edmonton didn't. If we insist that all landlords install smoke detectors, we're looking at a considerable capital investment.

Smoke detectors are one step. Then why not fire sprinklers? We could go on, and on, and on, Mr. Speaker. I'm not suggesting that we don't take a positive attitude toward these safety devices, but I do think we should treat this subject with the greatest caution. I would suggest that before we support this bill and engage in its adoption, we should be more concerned with the possible ramifications throughout the province, both from an economic and safety point of view.

I appreciate that some people have made the point that, you know, this might be an opportunity to

enlarge the industrial base of the province of Alberta. That in itself is a good concept. But I think we have to bear in mind that before we do this, we want to be sure we're permitting the manufacturing of devices that are going to be safe, economical, and the kind of thing in which we would want our community to be involved in developing and selling for our people.

I'm sure we wouldn't want to create a bonanza, as was said earlier, for those who may or may not be unscrupulous dealers, but let's just say they feel they have the best device in the world. Whether it tests adequately is not their concern. I think we'd be providing a disservice to the citizens of Alberta if we moved in this regard without closer examination of the total situation. If we [did not] examine the hazards to life and property, and the hazards, in effect, to the pocketbook of the citizens, we would not be acting in the best interests of the citizens. They are, after all, the people who sent us here to legislate on their behalf.

I would like to say further, Mr. Speaker, that because of the doubts about these standards — I'm always concerned about government agencies repeating research that's been done in other communities. I think that if these things are being carried out by the Underwriters' Laboratory and by the National Research Council of Canada and some of our agencies, again we would be performing a disservice to our citizens if we did not take advantage of all the available data on this situation.

I know it's almost like an emotional issue, Mr. Speaker: you can't be against it, because obviously you're not for safety, you're not for saving peoples' lives, you're not for all sorts of positive things. I think we are all for these things, but I think also we don't want to make further inroads into a situation that is obviously in need of some positive exception.

I would like members of the House to consider this matter further before they support this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on the bill. It seems to me that the object of the bill is to save human life, and any bill with that objective certainly deserves very careful consideration.

The first thing that concerns me in connection with the bill is the universality of it, right from the beginning. The second is the effectiveness of the various smoke detectors. Apparently not all smoke detectors work, and some further research appears to be necessary in that regard. However, I imagine research has reached the point where many can now claim effectiveness in detecting smoke when a place gets on fire. But the universality of the bill right from the start worries me a little bit.

I would like to see the bill passed, but I would like to see it modified in committee to some degree where the effectiveness of smoke detectors could be tried, or even if they're tried and true could be applied first to the places that need them the most and then progressively move into the universal field.

Hotels and motels, which come to mind, would certainly have to have smoke detectors in every room. Now if the expenditure of \$50, \$60, \$90, or \$200, whatever it is per room, is going to be made for every room in a hotel, somebody is going to have to pay for that, and that's the hotel guest. So immediately we

see an increase in price.

I'm very concerned about the increase in hotels. I use hotels quite a bit, as all hon. members do. I use a hotel primarily to sleep in, not to entertain friends or to watch television, but to sleep and get in and get out to do the job I have to do and then get home. It seems to me that I'm paying for many services the hotels now have that I don't even want. I don't want a radio, a television, an air conditioner, and half a dozen other things in my room. I don't plan to watch TV or listen to the radio when I go to the room to sleep. Yet I have to pay for those things; I have no choice in the matter.

I would think that we might persuade the hotel industry — perhaps the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism and the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs could give some thought to our hotels having the deluxe rooms with their color TVs, radios, beds that shake and gently rock you to sleep, et cetera, for those who want them, and let them pay for them. But for those who just want a clean, everyday room to sleep in, surely there should be a few of those in our hotels too, so that we don't have to have all the luxury and pay for it whether we want it or not.

It seems to me that the fires I've heard about in hotels started from smokers. I haven't heard of a fire starting in the room of anyone who doesn't smoke. Generally it's someone who smokes when he's in bed and falls asleep. The cigarette, pipe, or cigar lands on the sheets and starts the fire. I think that's the commonest method of fire. True, that might affect the entire hotel. The chances are that with modern hotel construction and doors that are closed on every floor to keep the fire from spreading from floor to floor — an innovation of our Alberta Liquor Control Board which I think is excellent — surely they could have some floors that wouldn't have to have the smoke detectors, at least to start with. Let's put them where they're needed the most first and then go on from there if we want it to be universal.

Outside hotels and motels, it seems to me that many rooming houses, particularly the old type of construction, which are almost fire hazards in many respects, are places that need them quite badly. Perhaps this would be a place where it would increase the cost, that's right. But certainly they need them far more than a modern hotel or motel, if it's going to save human life. The places I would really like to see these tried out — and perhaps they are already in them, according to what one of the hon. members from Calgary mentioned — is the senior citizens' homes, the nursing homes, the auxiliary hospitals, where there are people who can't look after themselves. If there is a fire, they're really in a very difficult position. We've heard of one or two places like that in Quebec going [up in] fire with a loss of human life. I think in places where there are people who are unable to look after themselves physically, or in mental hospitals where people are unable to look after themselves mentally, or in homes for the crippled or for retarded boys and girls, something like this is rather more essential than it is in many hotel or motel rooms.

I would say that I support the principle of the bill and would vote for this bill on second reading. But in Committee of the Whole, if it gets that far, I would like to see some changes made that would take away

the universality and do it by progressive steps, dealing with the places that need it the most first and going on from there.

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for St. Albert adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, by way of House business tonight, we'll be going into Committee of Supply for the purpose of reviewing the estimates of the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, followed by Treasury. With leave of the House, I would move that this House do now resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. [Acting] Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until the Committee of Supply rises and reports.

[The House adjourned at 5:25 p.m.]

[The Committee of Supply met at 8 p.m.]

#### head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS** (Committee of Supply)

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will come to order.

#### **Department of Advanced Education and Manpower**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you have any opening remarks?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make several very brief comments that may assist the members of the House in examining and reviewing the votes. I would like to highlight the new items in the votes this year in contrast to last year's estimates. Secondly, sir, I would like to indicate the large increases or decreases in the estimates, and then proceed to the estimates themselves.

In the new items under Vote 1, Departmental Support Services, I would like to point out that the planning and research secretariat, which is new to the department, has been organized to serve both Advanced Education and Manpower, although it's fair to say that [previously] it had served two major divisions, Manpower and Labour. But Advanced Education does provide a larger component, and there is an increase here.

In Vote 2, Mr. Chairman, Assistance to Higher and Further Educational Institutions, several new projects are now being supported by the department. For

example, we have recently completed an agreement with the University of Waterloo to provide access for students from Alberta to enter that university's optometry program. The approximate cost is \$30,000.

The department has also taken over responsibility for the laboratory and X-ray service previously under Alberta Social Services and Community Health. The approximate cost here is \$162,120. There are other new programs that are reflected in the estimates.

I would like to draw your attention, Mr. Chairman and members of the House, to a few of the large increases and decreases. In Vote 1, for example, under Departmental Support Services, the department is taking over from Government Services the responsibility for the purchase of equipment and furnishings, resulting in an increase of 84.7 per cent or \$44,000. We're doing this, Mr. Chairman and members of the House, because we are co-ordinating the work of 22 institutions and it becomes reasonable and sensible to use the approach of direct purchasing by the department; therefore, the large increase.

In Vote 2, Mr. Chairman, under Assistance to Higher and Further Educational Institutions, the new creation, Lakeland College, has an overall increase of 26 per cent. This is accounted for by a 20 per cent increase in manpower and a 60 per cent increase in supplies and services, mainly advertising, travel, and relocation expenses. The Alberta Vocational Centre at Lac La Biche has an overall increase of 19.5 per cent, accounted for by an increase in wages to operate a number of new programs which were approved in the 1975-76 estimates.

Mr. Chairman, there's a significant decrease in the overseas project, in the order of 27.9 per cent, accounted for by the reduction in the manpower required to assist in the operation of a college in Nigeria.

Public colleges, sir, show a decline of 19.1 per cent. The explanation here is that in combining the operational money with the capital funds, and by reducing the capital expenditures almost entirely, the result is a 19.1 per cent reduction. As a matter of fact, there is a reasonable increase in expenditures for operations. Special purpose grants have a major increase and account for about \$3.5 million, to be used by the universities. They show moderate increases as a whole, due to decreases in capital grants.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the Students Finance Board shows a large increase in grants. This is due to a change in the remission policy of the Students Finance Board, but at the same time has resulted in decreases in funds required for . . .

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The government members aren't interested in what the minister is saying. Maybe they can leave and the rest of us can hear what's going on.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, the Students Finance Board shows a large increase in grants. This is due to a change in the remission policy of the Students Finance Board, but at the same time has resulted in decreases in funds required for guarantees, interest, and fees and commissions.

Spending decreases in the manpower development area are the result of significantly reduced programs in PEP and STEP, particularly STEP: \$2 million for

this summer in contrast to something in the order of \$10 or \$12 million last year.

For the most part, Mr. Chairman, these outline the significant expenditures in the areas of new items, large increases and decreases. In introducing the estimates, I should like to acknowledge the many hours and days of excellent work by the fiscal and finance people of my department.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could get to a bit of the nitty gritty. The minister will recall that a number of members asked questions earlier in the question period with regard to the financial situation of the University of Calgary. I think it's fair to summarize something like this: as a result of the finance situation last year, the amount allocated to the University of Calgary — that in fact they had more students than had been projected.

I'd like to ask the minister to give us an outline of the financial situation of the University of Calgary — but not from the standpoint of how much more money they are getting. I'm sure the minister is familiar — at least I hope he's familiar — with the points made by the University of Calgary people on the finance question. As I say, in a nutshell, it appears to me that as a result of more students last year, then an across-the-board increase being applied on the money they got last year, with little consideration for an increased number of students, the people I spoke to at the University of Calgary find themselves in the situation where they're going to have some pretty serious financial problems this year. Perhaps we could start there, get an explanation from the minister, and then follow the matter up.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, a significant question, and I should like to respond as follows about three points I should raise. One is that the predictions for enrolment at the University of Calgary, and indeed all the institutions, were in a sense, if not trapped, at least whatever they were in September of last year. It was after that date the 11 per cent assignment of finances to government services generally, including the universities and the university under consideration, was applied.

Different universities found themselves in different circumstances. I had to make the value judgment on whether to attempt to assign different proportions of money — for example, 8 per cent to one university, 12 per cent to another, or 9.5 to another — based on some kinds of criteria. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, we looked at this kind of approach very carefully. The fact of the matter became evident to me. It was virtually impossible to assign the kinds of criteria and make the kinds of comparisons between one institution and another to make it possible to assign differential amounts of money when the restraint amount was 11 per cent.

I remind the House that if growth were accounted for, the whole posture with respect to 11 per cent, which the government took seriously, would simply have gone out the window. It wouldn't be there. So the universities would have to make the kinds of accommodations which in their best judgments are necessary to ensure, without any question, that the quality of education isn't hurt, and certain other accommodations would have to be made.

Let me close this section, Mr. Chairman, by saying

that the enrolments were at the university when the 11 per cent was assigned, so the number of people at any university in 1975-76, including the University of Calgary, is not an issue. It may appear to be an issue but it isn't, because they were predicted the previous spring, enrolled in September, and accepted and registered well before. So the enrolment was there.

The predictions of difficulty and unusual circumstances with respect to this university could well be there this coming September. It's a matter of looking at Calgary's case, and should the predictions of that university stand up, without any question, I think as reasonable people we will attempt to respond in a reasonable way.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, following along with the assumption that the projections of the University of Calgary are accurate, that they do end up with the kind of student body they projected, the minister says he will react in a reasonable way. I think perhaps the University of Calgary and members from the Calgary area would feel more comfortable if we had some indication of what he means by react "in a reasonable way".

Is the minister really telling us that if the projections of the University of Calgary live up to its expectations, he is prepared to think in terms — well no, is he prepared to give us a commitment this evening that he'll review the financial situation of the University of Calgary?

MR. NOTLEY: Will there be a special warrant?

DR. HOHOL: I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.

MR. CLARK: Will there be a special warrant?

DR. HOHOL: I have a view on that. Mr. Chairman . . . [interjections] I know it isn't. But while the issue is serious, we don't always have to take ourselves seriously.

But I want to make two points, and I want to make them beyond any misunderstanding, because the questions the hon. Leader of the Opposition asks are exceedingly important. Into the record, I want to say two things to him and the Assembly. First, I cannot make the commitment, will not make the commitment, that should the prediction of population be the kind they're making at the present time, we would respond to it in the traditional way of responding to full-time equivalents, FTE.

It goes back to my explanation that if we were to do this, the whole proposition of the 11 per cent restraint guidelines would simply fall. I'm saying that can't happen. However, if the university also responds reasonably to the circumstance and adjusts certain circumstances — including, for example, the enrolments at the University of Calgary in some faculties, but at the university in any case — or makes certain other reasonable adjustments, and the case still remains which fair-minded people recognize as being fair and reasonable, in those circumstances I and this government would respond in a reasonable and fair way.

It is not the intention of this government or myself or my department to be prejudicial to any institution in our responsibility. But this isn't a one-way street. The University of Calgary has certain adjustments and propositions to make within the institution. I'm confident, and indeed I'm aware of certain steps

they're taking to make that position possible for next September.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, could we follow along. Specifically, what are some of the adjustments that have to be made at the University of Calgary to satisfy the minister?

DR. HOHOL: I'm sure any information I give the hon. leader won't be new, since he occupied the portfolio of Minister of Education. But the question is nevertheless a fair and proper one.

The adjustments they would have to make are at the discretion of the board of governors of the University of Calgary, the president and his staff, and the various constituent groups at the university. The students' council, the faculty council, the whole community have a set of values, a value system. They've got judgments to make, determinations to make. That's where most of the responsibility lies, as identified under The Universities Act or the statute for the universities. That being the case, those determinations have to be made and their value judgments laid down. If there's still an increment of a case that is fair, reasonable, beyond the management of the university, and appearing to be predictive of prejudice to students, in those circumstances I would attempt to speak to my colleagues in government and effect a resolution of the problem.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, if we continue to get answers like that, I can see us taking a long time with these estimates.

I say to the minister once again: what kinds of adjustments is he thinking of? Surely to goodness he must have some in his own mind, because just a few minutes ago he said that the University of Calgary must make some adjustments. Do the adjustments mean quotas on students in some faculties? Do the adjustments mean more students before some members of the academic staff? Is there a faculty/student ratio that doesn't meet the department's criteria? Simply to get the answer that it remains a decision of the university — I recognize it does. But on the other hand, the university has to take some steps that will satisfy the minister. I'm sure if the minister rises in his place and says they have to make some adjustments, at this time he has some idea of the kinds of adjustments he's looking at. So what are they?

DR. HOHOL: It would be very easy if I sent the University of Calgary a list of criteria and said to them, you know, you've got a board of governors, et cetera, and a large community, nevertheless we'll set that aside and give you this laundry list. You get it cleaned and pressed and return it to me — then I'll respond. Surely, if their increase is projected to be 16, 15, or 14 per cent, the budget we've assigned to them simply can't handle this. So the hon. Leader of the Opposition is absolutely right. They've got to look at some management of student enrolment.

If you wish us to talk quotas, fine. It's that kind of notion. I prefer to call it management or some kind of controlled-entrance approach. The open door will have to be less open. Some adjustments will have to be made. A pupil/teacher ratio is a subjective thing for the academics to decide. It varies from faculty to



faculty, from discipline to discipline, from department to department. It depends on whether it's medicine, arts, or science. So there's no pat answer for those kinds of things.

Surely the University of Calgary can't look for an increase of 14 to 15 per cent and manage within the budget assigned to it. But if it trims things like enrolment and balances them out — because it's not in every department the student enrolment is bulging, it's in some — and if we get a balanced approach to the whole thing and they perform effectively in areas like those . . . . Certainly that's one, the student enrolment, and some approach to the open door on the basis of quality of students coming in.

If it's proper to assume that the university ought to deal with students who are literate, who beyond any question can read and write at the university level, then it has a certain kind of implication for the kind of student who enters university. So sure, an open door, Mr. Chairman, but an open door to qualified students, to students who are competent to do university work at the university level as we'd expect it to be, and enough students of the kind who can be taught and who can learn in circumstances that are traditionally known to be the atmosphere of a university.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, the minister is getting at least a bit more specific, because now he is talking in terms of quotas in some faculties, or closing the door in some faculties, depending on whose terminology we want to use.

I'd like to go back and ask the minister if I understood him correctly. Did the minister say that if in fact the University of Calgary has a 14, 15, or 16 per cent increase in students — when the minister said that, I got the impression that in fact the university, if it does some of the kind of adjusting he's outlined pretty generally, I must admit — the minister would then be in a position to reconsider the financial allocation of the University of Calgary?

DR. HOHOL: No, Mr. Chairman, there is no circumstance under which the University of Calgary could enrol 14 or 15 per cent. That's exactly the point I was making. They cannot. If they make that adjustment, and in that adjustment Calgarians in particular, Albertans generally, Canadians for the most part, and indeed some foreign students can have entry to the University of Calgary, then I'm prepared to look at the case. But it wouldn't be in the order of 14 or 15 per cent.

MR. CLARK: What order?

DR. HOHOL: It depends on the circumstances. I can't predict what will happen next September. I have Calgary's figures, and we have ours, and we've worked together on them. The university has been very co-operative, very helpful, very positive. But we're looking to September 1976, and the proof of the pudding will be at that time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may pursue this question for a moment or two. As the government considers, along with the universities — and I realize the university boards of governors are going to be making these decisions, but obviously

they are going to be made in close consultation with the department. When you look at the question of — the minister tried to say not closing the door but making it less open, and we're quite sure what the definition of "less open" is . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Quotas.

MR. NOTLEY: I suppose quotas. What in fact are we looking at? Are we looking at a form of pocketbook rationing? In other words, we could restrict the number of students by increasing fees. Now obviously one of the routes the government is entertaining at this stage, with the two-tier structure, is in fact applying a form of pocketbook rationing, if you like, to foreign students. So I would assume that's one route.

Another route would be substantially increasing the entrance requirements in certain faculties where there is a very high level of student enrolment and the enrolment is under considerable pressure. But I think it would be interesting, Mr. Chairman, if perhaps the minister could be a little more specific as to what he sees at this point as the role, if any, of fees in fact making the door, to use his words, "less open".

DR. HOHOL: It's a very, very fair question. Mr. Chairman, I personally, and the government, do not believe that the fee structure as it is at the present and will be next September with the 25 per cent increase, and with some increase if the universities can respond to that circumstance this fall or certainly in 1977, will be of the kind that would restrain entrance.

We now have the lowest fees in Canada, probably — in fact I'm certain — the lowest fees in North America. So in the context of the cost of clothes, books, shelter, transport, a host of things that impinge on the total cost of the student's university education, the fees as they now are, and will be next fall and the fall after, will not be of the order that would reduce the student enrolment. It will have to be more in the area of standards and competence and competition for available places.

As I pointed out, we have a 19.1 figure for costs at the college level. The same [situation] exists at the universities. Three major buildings slated to be built at the University of Alberta have been set aside. That simply means that space is going to be short. In that area the pressure will be on the universities in terms of the door being less open than it used to be.

MR. NOTLEY: To follow that up with a supplementary question. Obviously one of the moves the government is considering at this time is the two-tier system.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, in the rather more relaxed rules of the committee, if the minister might first of all give us a pretty thorough statement of the government's reasoning for a two-tier system of fees. Of course the argument one gets — and the minister has no doubt received it many times over — is that a university, to be a university, must be a window on the world, a cosmopolitan centre, and any effort to restrict students from other parts of the world would seriously jeopardize the true meaning of a university.

On the other hand, the equally valid argument is

that taxpayers in Alberta are paying 85 per cent of the cost of running our universities. One can legitimately raise the question of how far we go in subsidizing students from other countries. But these two points of view are diametrically opposed.

At the present time, as the minister well knows, the foreign students association at the university is making the claim that a two-tier system would discriminate against poorer students from foreign countries. The students from wealthier parents would be sent in any event. I rather doubt the merit of that, because quite frankly not too many plumbers' sons and daughters from Hong Kong, Ghana, or wherever the case may be, come to our universities. By and large it tends to be students from the middle and upper classes. Nevertheless that argument has been presented.

The point I'd like to draw out of the minister is the government's reasoning, and beyond that — now I know the minister's tried to side-step this in the various news interviews outside the House — what distance are we looking at between the tiers? Are we going to say to the student from another country, we want you to pay the total amount of your seat in that university — in other words, the 12, 14, or 15 per cent which the Alberta or Canadian student pays, plus the 85 per cent the taxpayers of Alberta and Canada assume?

MR. CLARK: Try 3:1.

MR. NOTLEY: All right, we'll try 3:1. But what I'm interested in is the government's target in terms of setting the tiers. The minister made it quite clear that he didn't like the idea of token differences. So obviously we're not looking at 10, 20, or 30 per cent, but something substantially greater.

I'd welcome the minister's comments on this matter.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, I feel indebted to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. He certainly put the two sides of the problem in exact context, although I'm not as certain as he is that they are diametrically opposed. I believe it's a matter of balance and of how much. I believe, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that leaving fees alone for six or seven years is a mistake. It's a mistake that both sides of the House share, the then government and the now government. I don't think that's fair or reasonable to the university, the students, or the people of Alberta.

Now, on the matter of foreign students, the universal nature of universities should certainly be protected. No question about that. Foreign students, foreign academics: it's the balance; it's how much. Whether it's the land grant colleges in the United States or the universities of Alberta, there isn't any question about the objective, the aspirations, that put those institutions in place. It was the aspirations of our forefathers here in Alberta to get higher education, which they didn't have, for their children. There's no question about that. There's nothing provincial, nothing parochial, nothing small, nothing wrong with that at all.

But the whole notion of a university does include universality and the entrance capability of people from foreign places. We will assure and protect that.

But I think it's eminently fair when Albertans and Canadians invest the kind of money they do, 85 per cent, in our institutions, and the bulk of the Alberta and Canadian students remain here, later on become members of an occupation. They in turn pay taxes and their parents and grandparents pay taxes, and so on, while the foreign student comes and for the most part goes. And that's the proper contribution that we should make.

I'd make only one more point, Mr. Chairman. It's with respect to the member's comments about the needy. If there is a question with respect to the needy, let's put it in that context. If there are poor students from developing nations, then it goes beyond Alberta. It goes into the whole notion of nationhood and that of Canada. Let's make better and more programs that involve aid to students from underdeveloped nations, who are poor literally in the sense of not having access to income or money.

But I put it to you, sir, that for the most part the foreign students in the universities of Canada are not those kinds of students. I am saying the same thing about foreign students that I say about Canadian students: welcome all. But none of them would be denied a place because they can't afford it. If that were the case, don't forget please, Mr. Chairman and members of the House, we have the best student finance programs in Canada second to none.

MR. NOTLEY: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I agree with much of what the minister said. However, he still didn't quite answer the question of what we are looking at in terms of tiers. I would like him to take another stab at it, if he would.

I also appreciate, Mr. Minister, the comments you made about the whole question of looking at foreign students from the viewpoint of, in fact, part of our foreign aid program. I was talking yesterday to one of the professors at the university on this very subject, because there are real concerns on the part of people, both ways on this issue.

One of the concerns I've had is that, as a country, we really haven't been providing access to our institutions for the young people from these other areas of the world, who are desperately needed back, to come here to be trained, to gain whatever education they can receive at our institutions, universities, or technical schools, for that matter, and then take that information back to their respective countries.

I would simply say to you that I would hope as a minister of advanced education, you might raise this at the appropriate federal level and suggest that Canada as a whole, with the provinces co-operating, move more decisively in this direction than we have in the past. It seems to me that is a route we should take as a country. But it seems to me, with many of these desirable national moves, it never hurts to have a little push from the provinces. I am suggesting that a little push from Alberta on this matter might help a great deal.

Now let me get back to the two-tier thing. Again, I would be interested in a little more in-depth assessment of what the minister is in fact looking at at this stage.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, I implore the members of the House to remember that I have to live effectively with chairmen of boards of governors, presidents of

universities, chancellors of senates, as well as my colleagues in the House.

Once having made the determination that there will be a two-tier system, I think all hon. members will agree that a great deal of discussion and negotiation — informal, behind closed doors, and more and more open as we become able to make determinations — will involve the universities. The statute says the minister "shall approve", which means the institutions shall recommend and I might or might not approve. But the way we work, we have effective relationships, we work together, and by the time the recommendations are made, we're pretty well agreed. I don't want to duck, but what I described is the way it works.

I simply repeat, Mr. Chairman, that no member of this House, no foreign student, while wishing one fee — but if there are going to be two, I don't think we'd be interested in something that looks like an insult, a token. If a foreign student is going to pay a token more, if he thinks that token more is all we think he's worth, he's going to be put down. So I go back to my statement in the question period that the increase will be significant; it won't be token.

I've told the universities to take a look at this. We'll be meeting as early as May 11. Pardon? June. Nothing like having a gallery. Mr. Chairman, on June 11, one of the important issues we'll be discussing is the matter of foreign student fees. Certainly I don't want to prejudice the thinking capability, the research and study capability of the universities, the students, the associations, the constituent groups. And my colleagues and I don't want to have our hands tied. But let me say again, it will not be token. It will be significant.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just one supplementary question. It seems to me the issue now — and we're not going to get any more in terms of what the difference is — if the minister is looking at the new two-tier fee structure for the fall session, and I assume he is, it seems to me there's a pretty compelling argument that decisions should be made fairly quickly by the institutions, in fairness to the foreign students. While I can't expect the minister to give us the difference, I do think it is fair in this House at this time, when we're considering the estimates of the department, that we have some pretty clear indication of when in fact that announcement on the fee structure will be made.

DR. HOHOL: Well, that is the kind of information the Assembly, the students, and others would seek. Certain things about universities pretty well constrain government and the universities to make determinations before certain dates. For example, when a student registers in the spring, it is eminently fair and reasonable that he knows in advance what his fee will be. With things like printing a catalogue — of course you can have an errata sheet sent out and so on — there are some very specific dates and deadlines: registration, application forms, acceptances, rejections, and so on. When a student applies, he should know all the facts he ought to know. Assuredly, one of those is the fee structure. That's a specific date sometime in the spring, but I forget exactly when.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, we've got it pegged down now between — when was the meeting, on June 4 or something like that? Spring is over on June 21, so we've got it down to about two weeks. We're pleased to have found that out.

I'd like to go back to the question of the landed immigrants and say to the minister that from some discussions I've had with people at the University of Calgary and the University of Alberta, the question of landed immigrants and student visas is, I suppose, somewhat confusing, to say the least. But it's been explained to me basically this way: the bulk of foreign students — if we might use that term — are in the category of landed immigrants. I'm told the ratio is something like four or five to one, and that the students who come here on student visas are basically the only ones who go back to the country they've come from, because of the status involved.

So when we're talking in terms of helping the underdeveloped nations in the world, I think we have to be careful to recognize that, as I understand the foreign student problem at the universities, a relatively small portion of the foreign students are in fact on student visas. Those are the students who have to go back, or do go back, to the countries of their origin.

My question to the minister centres around discussions he's had, or hopefully has had, with the federal Minister of Manpower and Immigration. The federal government, at this time, is redoing its whole national immigration policy, and I certainly don't want to get involved in that this evening. But there's this question of landed immigrants. It's been suggested to me — and I simply pass it on to the minister for his comment — as far as the landed immigrant situation is concerned, that whether a student plans to stay here or not, if in fact some of his relatives or someone can guarantee him a job, he can then come as a landed immigrant. The minister shakes his head, so I assume that's agreement.

Then my question to the minister is this: when we're looking at two tiers, or two levels of student tuition, are you looking at landed immigrants and students here on a student visa as one group, and Canadian students as the other group? It seems to me there's the danger, if the government is now committed to this question of a two-tier system, that if we just look at the students who are here on a student visa, we're really talking about one in every four or five foreign students whom I think many people would see as foreign students. I'd like the minister's comments in this area and some indication of whether he is looking at students on student visas as the ones who will pay the increased amount — frankly, a principle I agree with — or is it a matter of students on student visa and landed immigrant status also?

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I was going to say a word or two on the same subject. Possibly the hon. minister can deal with both at the same time.

I'm a little concerned with the definition of foreign student. I have checked with a number of students of Chinese origin at the University of Alberta, NAIT, and SAIT, who are here as landed immigrants. Some have already taken out their citizenship and others are in the process of doing it. But as the hon. minister knows, there is a residence requirement before a person can become a citizen.

I would suggest that those who come here as landed immigrants and are planning to live here and contribute and share in our way of life should be treated as citizens of this province. If we do otherwise, I think we're going to be very unfair. It's somewhat comparable to foreign corporations buying land in the province. Where a landed immigrant buys the land and lives on it and shares in the good times and the hard times, I can find no resentment whatsoever from any farmer or any of our people in regard to that type of settler. They're here as Canadians, or will become Canadians, and will share the good times and the bad times. I think the landed immigrant is on the same basis whether he comes from Hong Kong, India, the United States, or any other country of the world. I hope we would not discriminate against that type of student, because in my view he should be treated as Alberta students are.

The other point I'd like the hon. minister to advise me on: in setting two-tier fees, I wonder if any consideration was given to the number of Alberta students who go to universities elsewhere in the world. I don't know whether we have any who go to India, Hong Kong, or England — maybe we have, but I haven't heard of them — but we certainly have quite a large number of students who go to various states of the United States. I'm wondering what the effect is going to be there.

Are these students going to be required to pay the higher fee down there in reprisal for what we are doing here? Or is a reciprocal arrangement going to be possible for student exchanges? It might be awkward, but would certainly help students who for some reason or other go to the United States for their studies. They go there for a number of reasons, but sometimes because they can't get the exact course they want in the province of Alberta. I think that makes some difference too. I would like to have comments from the hon. minister on those two cases.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, because some, in fact most, determinations have to be made, this discussion is exceedingly helpful to me and will be to the universities and other constituent groups in advanced education.

Two significant points were raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. Member for Drumheller. I respect both points of view. In one case they're different.

On the matter of reciprocity, I would like to put it this way. In the United States of America to the best of my knowledge — and I believe I'm accurate — all states have what they call out-of-state fees. Those fees include anyone outside, for example, the state of Montana, which would include all 10 provinces of Canada. Those fees, sir, are significantly higher than for students from Montana.

This has to be placed in perspective. In proportion, it's true that more Canadians are still going to institutions in the United States of America for many reasons. But the one overwhelming reason is they've got many institutions for selection of programs. Along the front bench are people who have taken postgraduate degrees in American universities. Somewhere around 1968-69 when space became short, as it's becoming here, they said, you know the land grant college, the university, the state university

was really built for American citizens — and again the notion of universality. You'll find foreign students at all American colleges, certainly at the private colleges, where they've had differential fees right from the beginning. That is for the record. The point of reciprocity isn't there because they've doubled and tripled the fees of a decade ago.

Now on the matter of visa and immigrant status students, therein lies a real problem — not so much a problem as a value judgment to make. I find myself in this position, Mr. Chairman, at the present time, but subject to change: I feel we're speaking of a thing unlike other circumstances for landed immigrants which are for all purposes as though they were Canadian. I think there's a difference here, that of getting an education paid for in a very substantial way by Canadians, by Albertans. That the person may stay in Canada is true; that he may become a Canadian is probable but not necessarily so.

In my profession in private life, I worked with people who were foreign in the sense that we mean it positively, who chose to remain that way, and are still that way. That's a choice they can make in this country, because that's the kind of country we have. I find myself in a complex and difficult situation, because I believe that if we're really to deal with the matter of a two-tier approach with respect to foreign and Canadian students — and for the record, let there be no doubt whatever: there will be no three levels of fees for Canadian students, for example, in between.

If we're really going to deal with it, as the Leader of the Opposition very accurately points out, the visa students are very few. They're in the order of about four or five to one, and these are the ones who may need a national kind of assistance.

I hope that the national Council of Ministers of Education — not hope, but I'll make the determination that we examine this whole notion at the federal level. I have spoken to my colleague in Ottawa, the Hon. Minister of Manpower and Immigration, Robert Andras, on these issues. They're complex, and by and large he says, let the provinces declare their positions and they'll agree. But it's a process of negotiation, and when we examine the manpower and development act, we will have the occasion to discuss in more depth the matters of immigration, demography, and certain other things.

I think that at the present time I want to be very open and very frank and solicit the counsel, criticism, and help of the House on the definition of the foreign student for purposes of tuition, not for any other purposes. For all other purposes, they're like Canadians. That's my position at the present time, Mr. Chairman and members of the House.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to prolong the debate, but there are just two points I'd like to add in connection with this matter. I'm very pleased the minister is leaving an open door for consideration of this particular item.

When students come from other parts of the world, certainly from Hong Kong, part of our own Commonwealth — well, whether they come from Hong Kong or not, they bring a considerable amount of capital into the country. Even though they're not paying the total fees, they're certainly contributing to many phases of our economic life in this country. They're certainly bringing in capital that wouldn't be here.

But forgetting the capital for a moment, I find they're bringing a great deal of ability, a great deal of their culture, a great deal of knowledge and their brains into this country. Most of those I know are certainly planning to make a life in Alberta and in Canada. They want to become Canadians. I think we should encourage that. I have never heard any 'disgruntlement' among the people I've spoken to in regard to students who come to share the future with us. If they stay in this country, they will be paying back every cent we pay toward their education, give us the benefit of their ability, their education, et cetera.

That's the point I'm very pleased the minister is going to take another look at, because I personally think it would be very, very unfair to treat these people as foreigners when they have come into this country with the full intention of becoming citizens of Canada.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I think we've hashed that out pretty well. I'd just like to ask the minister, now that we're in a time of restraint, if he can indicate to the House what stage the universities are at as far as, say, possibly going to a three-semester system or going year-round, using the physical plant more than it is used.

Secondly, I remember being involved with the 3 AU. It seemed to be greeted with quite a lot of enthusiasm, and people were shelling out funds quite liberally at the beginning. But as the money started pouring into the provincial coffers, I guess everybody decided we didn't really need the money. So I'd just like to know the status of the fund and what point we're at as far as using the physical plants at our universities more than they now are being used.

DR. HOHOL: Those are excellent questions, Mr. Chairman. The matter of the use of facilities — it's very interesting that the hon. Member for Clover Bar puts the question. I just became aware, probably today at noon, that the University of Calgary is going into 24-hour use of its major facilities, and that's interesting. It's the point I made earlier. It wasn't a matter, you know, of doing a dance. I'm 50 plus and I'm not much good at that.

But the facts are that the university has to adapt to the circumstances in which it finds itself in a period of restraint. The University of Alberta is on a 24-hour instruction, research, tuition, and working program, and I find that's a remarkable response to the circumstances in which they find themselves. That's one example. But again, these are the kinds of things where the deans, the department heads, the academic people, the boards of governors, and indeed the senate have specific roles and responsibilities. There is no doubt in my mind that there will be a fuller and more complete use of university facilities, and indeed of colleges and provincially administered institutions. That's one notable example, but there will be others.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the 3 AU fund?

DR. HOHOL: The three Alberta universities fund, of course, now automatically expands. While the name hasn't changed, it will expand to a four Alberta universities fund in view of the government making the determination that Athabasca University is a full

and complete university.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to recall for the members of the House that the government has moved the 3 AU fund into a larger notion, that of a fund for postsecondary institutions, which would include the capability of people to donate to colleges and to provincially administered institutions. Often that's their wish, because it may have been where they themselves went to school.

Now, what we have done in this period of restraint is set aside the postsecondary education fund for whatever number of years we'll be in that period of restraint. So in my estimates we have no money for the postsecondary education fund. I went to Executive Council and said, in that circumstance let's extend the 3 AU fund until such time as we can allocate funds for the postsecondary education fund. We've extended it for another year. If the restraint continues, and that could well be, I hope my colleagues will agree with me that the 3 AU fund should extend a second year.

Mr. Chairman, let me make one more important point for the information of the House and the hon. member. Apart from funds flowing in, the fact of the matter is that people who feel about universities — or some parts of them, some faculty or some research program — are continuing to donate. So there are significant assignments of funds, in a matching way, by the government to certain universities in the fiscal year 1976-77.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, just one other point. I don't know if the minister has the information available.

It's unfortunate we didn't confer an honorary degree on the late Howard Hughes. It might have helped a little.

How many dollars have come into the 3 AU fund? Do you have that information?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, but amongst the many things between my ears and above my eyebrows, that particular detail is not one of them. I go on record that I shall get that information tomorrow and supply it to the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

DR. PAPROSKI: Back on Alberta student enrolment, I wonder if the minister would enlighten the House just a bit more and amplify his remarks. I'd certainly like to applaud him for his comments, because I think he's been right on beam with his remarks up to this time.

Mr. Chairman, what I'm asking is: assuming the usual or average or expected number of increases in student enrolment in Alberta universities, and they're qualified students and Albertans, would the minister indicate to the House whether he really feels the door would have to be closed or will be closed to qualified students who apply in a variety of faculties or in the universities as a whole? Is it likely that Alberta students who are qualified will be turned away?

Is he satisfied at this time that the dialogue going on between his department and the universities regarding restraints, year-round use of universities, and so forth — that the restraints which have been indicated by the universities will in fact be applied in

other areas so students will not have to be turned away from Alberta?

DR. HOHOL: Well, this is again a very basic, important, and significant question, somewhat in the context of a futuristic notion of what kind of scenario we face when the bodies begin to come through the swinging doors. That's when we'll really know.

But I want to be frank and say to the hon. member and members of the House: it could be that during periods of restraint, some students may have to defer their aspirations to get an education at a particular institution at a particular time. I don't think this is necessarily bad. I don't think it's inherently bad, or inherently good. It's a circumstance a lot of us had to deal with over the years.

I do not believe we will find ourselves in a situation where Albertans, and for the most part Canadians and foreign students, will be unable to get into the institutions. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to underscore the fact that scholarship and evidence of capacity for scholarship will be more important. The notion of the open door at the university level — with all due respect to all those who hold or have held that position and influenced that kind of policy, I want to go on record that I have difficulty with it. The university, the notion of scholarship beyond the usual, research, the accumulation of knowledge and its sharing, its storing, its extension: I have difficulty speaking at the same time of this kind of notion and doors wide open for all to come in.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, as a supplementary, I wonder if the minister would just be clear on that one point regarding restraints in other areas of university management, administration, other areas of their work. Would the minister assure the House, if he can, or at least indicate to the House that in fact he is doing everything via his department with the universities so that all areas of management will be of less importance, will be sacrificed, rather than qualified students being sacrificed for enrolment?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the member; I missed that part of his question. I think I will simply take it as instruction, because the point is extremely well made. I have said to the universities and they've said to me: the last thing that will suffer is quality of education.

When we first came out with 11 per cent, you recall the newspapers and the electronic media reporting the reaction from the institutions — and it wasn't just the universities, colleges, and PAIs, but particularly the universities — that the quality will suffer. Then after a period of time, we agreed that quality could not suffer. It dare not suffer, it must not, cannot, and will not, which means that certain other adjustments may have to be made in management, using facilities 24 hours a day, 6 days a week. It may mean that students have to be more qualified, more literate, more competent, and what's wrong with that? Maybe that's overdue.

So I accept the hon. member's question as a directive, as a proper instruction to me, as the responsible minister to work with the universities, to make sure the circumstances he describes are made as full and complete as possible.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, because this is so important, I just want to add one more point, and I want amplification on that so there is no misunderstanding. I appreciate the comments to this point. I think the members of the House feel a little more comfortable for the Alberta students — as a matter of fact, much more comfortable.

Mr. Minister, I wonder if you'd just clarify about the quantity also. In addition to quality, without equivocation we want to maintain quality at the level we have, but maintain quality and still restrain in other areas that are probably less needed at this time of restraints, so we can not only maintain the quality of education, but also the quantity of enrolment at the level we have, unless the situation reaches that stage of restraint that there is no choice but that the type of enrolment, the qualification, will have to rise because we have no more space.

DR. HOHOL: The matter of qualification, of course, looks after itself in a very natural way. For example, in a quota faculty — and when people speak of quotas as though this were a new invention, and it's very bad, I just have to remind ourselves that the faculty of medicine, the faculty of law, and some other faculties have had quotas for years. We are not inventing anything new. What happens is that students apply, and they rank them in terms of achievements and prediction of success in the program from top to bottom. If there are 400 applicants for the school of medicine, and they have room for 80, they take the top 80, put a line under it and that's it, that's the quota. So if you talk about quantity, I want to be frank again. I think there's a limit to how many students a professor, a faculty, a university can effectively deal with.

In the way of opinion — and the hon. member wasn't really asking for my opinion — I think there is such a thing as going too fast too soon. A lot of it has to do with how we've been funding the universities and the colleges based on, you know, one head or two feet; you count them either way, you get the same number of people, and pay in terms of full-time equivalents. I know, Mr. Chairman, there is some basic relationship between the number of people in an institution and how much it costs. That's one factor, maybe the major one, but not the overwhelming one, not the sole one. In the months and years ahead, I hope we come to terms with a finance program that counts people but also measures quality.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, that's exactly what I wanted to hear, but again it's so vital and so important because this is all we are going to talk about in advanced education. It's of central importance. Then it's clear in my mind that the quality of the student will not be sacrificed. The quantity would only be sacrificed after all other things have been restrained, not before that time. All the other things restrained that could be recognized, that are of lesser importance — we could dialogue for hours and hours. The student and his education, historically and for the future, is central in the university and colleges and postsecondary education, rather than other things that might be of less importance.

MR. PLANCHE: Just one short question, Mr. Chairman. When we were talking about this problem earlier, the minister mentioned that some of the people who fall short in English are going through our high school system and achieving grades there that qualify them for university entrance in Alberta. I'm wondering how he's going to handle that problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: How's that again?

MR. PLANCHE: Some of the people — can I not be heard?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. PLANCHE: I'm sorry. Some of the people coming in from out of the country who fall short in English are upgrading their English by going through the high school system, thereby qualifying themselves for university in Alberta with a matriculation from our public schools. I'm wondering how he's going to handle that problem.

DR. HOHOL: The hon. member makes an extremely significant point, Mr. Chairman. It relates to the point made by the hon. Member for Drumheller. A great number of our foreign students are landed immigrants who come to our country by prior arrangement for work or, in this case, for schooling, that schooling being at private colleges — for example, Alberta College — or in Alberta secondary schools.

Before they come here they have a contractual arrangement already prepared for them. So they come into the school system and become part of the Alberta education system at the secondary school level. When they graduate, they have every right in the world to go to the universities of Canada and Alberta. If this is the point the hon. Member for Drumheller was making, he describes exactly the circumstance as it is today.

Now, some other students come directly from other places and have immaculate English. They've gone to private schools. They've gone to excellent schools. They are some of the best students, and they hit the top of some achievement roles in entrance examinations of whatever kind at the universities. Others have difficulty with English. At some universities, including the University of Alberta, there are arrangements, technological equipment, and professors who teach English.

Frankly — no one is asking for my opinion; maybe he did in part — I have some difficulty with that concept. I think the student who comes to a university should be prepared to do university work. If he has difficulty in some area — and we all do, because we don't perform equally in all subject areas or all disciplines — he can get help of that kind. But I do not believe the resources of a university should be spent as though the university were a college, a high school, a preparatory school, a remedial school or a retraining program.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think we've had some good discussion tonight on the whole question of the foreign student situation, everything from definition to quotas, and what have you. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I could just turn to the other side of this

really two-pronged issue. We're looking at the large number of foreign students, and it's pretty obvious that the government is going to move toward some kind of two-tier system, with all that that implies. Fair enough.

The question I'd like to put to the minister is: where do things stand now with respect to foreign instructors and professors at our universities and colleges in the province? We have had the Moir report. The matter hasn't been raised during the question period. But again, the question period really isn't the time to get any sort of in-depth assessment of where the government stands. It seems to me the proper place to elicit from the government whatever philosophy it has on this matter is in the estimates.

I have no particular difficulty with foreign instructors in the physical sciences. I don't think that really represents a problem. It doesn't make any difference to me whether a physical science instructor comes from Timbuktu or Fairview, or whether it's Alberta, Saskatchewan, Newfoundland, Ghana, Germany, the United States, or what have you.

But when you get to your social science course, it seems to me a legitimate criticism has been raised, especially by many of the graduate students in social sciences. When you look at some of the graduate courses in sociology, for example, you find that because we have the buddy system developing in our departments — and let's face facts, buddy systems develop — you begin to see courses changing, and you find more effort is put into discussing the problems of the blacks and the ghettos of Detroit than the problems of the natives in Slave Lake or Wabasca, or what have you.

I think that's not an unfair criticism. It's been made many, many times. I think that was certainly the feeling of at least several of the members of the Moir commission. So, Mr. Chairman, I would invite the minister to respond on this. I realize it's a touchy question, especially when one has to deal with general faculties councils and what have you. Nevertheless, it is an issue of some significance and importance.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, all of a sudden I have a yearning for the question period. But it isn't. The description of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, with respect to the criticism in the areas he defined, is one which I don't accept. I didn't create it, but I agree with it. In the areas of the social sciences, sociology, social psychology, urban studies, and so on, I think it's true. It could well be that way in Canadian history and Canadian literature. At some of our institutions we do not have the capability to provide postgraduate or graduate — I think in most cases we have excellent programs at undergraduate levels. If someone chooses to do a dissertation or doctoral study on the American Negro, great. If you can also take it on the Canadian native — but that isn't the case.

The foreign academic has to be put in prospect. It has to be put in the balance of how many, doing what, and under what circumstances. Again I can be no less than honest. I honestly believe, given the fact that the definition and whole notion of a university without a doubt implies universality and foreign academics as well as foreign students, in specific areas and nearly all areas, if the balance is proper,

the positions in our institutions should go to qualified Canadians.

It's not a matter of an eye for an eye or a tooth for a tooth. But it's a matter of record that notable scholars at the level of doctors of philosophy in their disciplines cannot get a job with our neighbor to the south, the United States of America. They could 10 years ago. They can't today. So it's not a matter of, okay, we can't get jobs there so you can't get jobs here. That's not the point. I simply mention it because that's the way it is.

But I believe, as does the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, that Canadian things, unique to Canada — maybe we've been just a bit bashful. Maybe we felt we were too young. Maybe we felt it was more mature to study other countries and other places, and not enough about ourselves. We've got a great and glorious nation, and we know less about it than a host of other nations.

One of the problems — I should rephrase it, because foreign academics are not problems — but one of the problems is the assignment in Canada of people in the social sciences who teach the social sciences of other lands. If that's the unit, if that's the subject matter before us, then indeed. But if you have a doctoral program, in my mind one of the possibilities beyond any question has to be a full program of Canadian studies, whether it's history, whether it's literature, whether it's sociology.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with the minister's comments. My question though would be to follow up and ask whether the government proposes any specific steps at this time in conjunction with the three universities in particular, but also to a lesser extent the colleges which have a number of programs, to see what changes and adjustments can be made within the system by the institutions themselves. I know this really doesn't affect the principle of the matter. I think that principle is well stated by the minister: that we have a big, glorious country, we should be proud of our own varied backgrounds and the contributions made by many people and the challenges and the problems within the country, and that universities in particular should be apprized of that challenge and excited by it.

The concept of a fully, almost exhaustive Canadian studies program in our university system is in my judgment very important, and I applaud that direction. However, it seems to me the minister is going to face a rather more direct push on that course because of the constraint policy right across the country. There is a tightening of the general education system in the country because of restraints all over Canada. You are going to have a lot of able graduates, doctoral students and what have you, looking for jobs. Four or five years ago they could find jobs. Now they can't. In the Department of Political Science a number of the sessional lecturers find their contracts are not going to be renewed next year.

What I'm saying to the minister is that you're going to find a great deal more pressure for concrete action by graduate students in particular than would have been the case three, four, or five years ago, even when the Moir commission was sitting. Added to the intellectual assessment of the problem and the nationalist direction of the issue is now the bread-and-butter question that a number of people are not

going to find jobs they might have been able to obtain four or five years back.

DR. HOHOL: I'll respond in two ways. First, the description is accurate. I would like to make one point. The Moir report was commissioned and brought down in the days of very generous funding of advanced education and indeed basic education, as I well recall. So the impact of the Moir report was just not there. It was an interesting report, a good report, but it didn't really matter. It found out certain things, brought things to light, but it didn't matter because the jobs were there. The money flowed to the institutions and to the public schools much more freely than now, so there wasn't a problem. Now the whole thing has changed.

I would like to suggest this to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview and the members of the House: given the resources we have and the circumstances which the hon. member accurately describes, inevitably there will have to be a shift of emphasis in what we do, in what we teach and who does the teaching. I think that's inescapable. We will still have part of the problem the hon. member describes, but I think it will be a matter of degree rather than kind. Listening to Albertans generally, and those of us who have the proud and humble opportunity to represent them and speak for them in the House as we are tonight, the institutions, the universities and the colleges, will be more and more sensitive to the aspirations and the attitudes of Albertans, and more and more will make the kinds of adjustments they have to make because they're autonomous institutions. But they're not insensitive institutions. There is a good deal of evidence that they're prepared and able to make the adjustments given some time.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go back to the University of Calgary situation for just a moment and read perhaps three paragraphs to the minister:

The university a year ago received per-student grants to support a projected enrolment of 9,980 in 1975-76.

But when the bodies were in and counted, there were 899 more than expected . . .

So really there was an enrolment of 10,879 compared to the 9,900 and some odd projected.

It's my understanding that the government eventually, if I could use the words, "coughed up" the additional \$600,000 to the University of Calgary. If you put it on a per-student basis, that would have taken care of something like approximately 10,100 students. I think herein lies the problem, because the actual enrolment was about 10,800. So there was a shortfall of about 700 students who were in the University of Calgary last year but, at least on a per-pupil basis, they didn't receive funding for. With the 11 per cent across the board this year, that situation is compounded somewhat, because it isn't just the shortfall of several hundred students, it's also the inflation effect of that shortfall.

My question then to the minister is: on what basis has he established the grant to the University of Calgary this year?

DR. HOHOL: It was just what somebody else [termed] — and in using his phrase I agree with him in no other way — the application of rough justice. I think



that came from leadership in Ottawa with the guidelines that came down from there. We simply said that the universities will have to cut the cloth and perform. I remind the House that while the comments of the hon. Leader of the Opposition are accurate, the university is in business and performing, and not a student was turned away in the fiscal year 1975-76.

The accommodations were made. We added \$600,000; it wasn't sufficient, and there was still the shortfall. But I never was convinced, I'm not now, and am never going to be, that there's an exact correspondence between number of people and amount of money. It depends on the faculty; on the research component; on the clinical component, if that were the case; the library requirements of certain students in contrast to others; a host of factors. Certainly inflation and other factors will compound it.

It's true that more bodies cost more money. But what is also true is that some other universities have the problem of old faculties doing long-term research, doing a great deal of graduate and post-graduate studies in contrast to Calgary's or Lethbridge's undergraduate component, for the most part. These are extremely expensive.

The point I'm making is not to make the case for a university and they get another one, but to put in perspective the very real difficulty of getting some equations that place dissimilar kinds of universities into a formula, and to respond to it in a particular way with respect to finances.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just one comment and one other question. The comment would be that at least from the standpoint of the University of Calgary, when in fact there were 700 or 800 students for whom it last year really received little or no extra funding on a per-student basis, and having to add that into its situation for this year, I think to call that "rough justice" is not a very conservative term, if I might put it like that. I think to say it's rough justice is just being very, very tough on the University of Calgary.

The question I'd like to ask the minister is this: what research work does he see at the University of Calgary and the University of Lethbridge, recognizing that the U of A is involved in, as the minister rightly points out, in a great deal of postgraduate work? What kinds of postgraduate aspirations does the government have as far as the University of Calgary and the University of Lethbridge are concerned?

DR. HOHOL: Let me step back for a moment, Mr. Chairman, and assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition and members of the House that in using the term "rough justice", I wasn't casual at all about the University of Calgary. They've got a real challenge. Let us remind ourselves that an hour and a half or so ago I said that if the evidence falls on the side of Calgary's greater and urgent need, we will be responsible and reasonable.

MR. CLARK: The problem was we couldn't find out what you'd consider evidence.

DR. HOHOL: Oh, a host of things. Calgary will have to make the case, hon. leader.

With respect to research, I think there is a mythology abroad. You know how rumors begin, mostly with people who are interested in the benefits of a rumor. It's simply not a fact that the University of Alberta is going to be the research university, and the other universities will do some research but will mostly do other things. I do not hold that view. I think universities respond, as do other institutions, in terms of what people come to their doors and what kinds of services they ask for. Universities grow in that way. As the University of Calgary and the University of Lethbridge develop their disciplines and declare their basic capabilities, their long-term aspirations, that is how research will develop and grow. There will be no intention and no steps taken to inhibit the research capability of any university, or artificially inflate the capability of some other university.

I would like to remind my colleagues on both sides that the federal government has cut back severely in the last few years in the area of research. They did it in a very neat way — if I can put it that way — by simply leaving it at the same level as it had been. We all know what's happened to the value of money in the last three years. We had a slight hint that things may change next year, and certainly the year after: that the federal government will increase its research funding to what it used to be and beyond. But the future will tell.

No, there is no planned or systems approach to entrap certain people and inhibit them in the area of research, and through the same approach to make some other university flourish.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the minister questions in three other areas quite quickly. First of all, what's the future of — well, we know what happened to the adult education act. I think various institutions had a number of concerns as far as the adult education act was concerned. While it has not been my practice to agree with the minister on that many occasions, I think he chose the wise course in that area. There were, however, some good proposals in various sections of the adult education act. Now the question becomes: where do we go from here as far as that legislation is concerned?

DR. HOHOL: While I wouldn't want to paint myself entirely into a corner, I think I'm quite prepared to be pretty positive and say the major pieces of legislation, The Colleges Act and The Universities Act, will come before the Assembly about a year from now, in the spring session of 1977. Other significant but less comprehensive kinds of legislation like The Students Finance Act, likely the act that deals with Athabasca University — because it's quite different from the other universities, [as is] the Banff Centre — statutes like these could well come before the Assembly in the fall sitting of this session.

I should point out that the submissions preceding the draft act are excellent documents. The recommendations are as varied as the institutions and associations they represent. It is probably a positive thing that no one voice speaks for universities, or a university, though I think it would be in the interest of universities across this nation to have some common objectives, and some which are disparate and different and peculiar to a particular province and,

within the province, peculiar to a particular university.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, we've had the opportunity to hear the Minister of Education explain what happened to the extended practicum, and members had the chance to hear the ATA's point of view, if they've wanted to. I'd be interested in hearing the view of the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower as to what happened.

DR. HOHOL: Oh boy, Mr. Chairman, these fellows are in great form tonight, I'm telling you. That's when you feel like putting up your hand and saying, Mr. Chairman, I want to leave the room.

I'll be very honest with the members. The fact of the matter is that the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower really has little, if any, responsibility or accountability for the extended practicum. There is a contract between basic education, under the Alberta education act, and the universities of Alberta to train teachers. One of the conditions is practice teaching. The notion of the extended practicum was initiated by this government and accepted, over a period of time, by the universities. Then, other events and other things that I will not enumerate because they're well known, but between the ATA, school boards, and the universities . . .

But I simply want to make this significant point to the hon. Leader of the Opposition and to members of the House, Mr. Chairman: the school boards of Alberta can derive their revenue by statutes only from basic education. Advanced Education and Manpower cannot within the law, through the statutes of my department, transfer funds to basic education — not directly and not through any circuitous route, like through the universities — to pay for teacher time to work in the extended practicum. [This is] in no way to evade or avoid the issue, but to place it in perspective where it belongs.

MR. CLARK: I think the minister walked the tightrope rather gingerly and was very kind to himself and to the Department of Education. From where I sit, it became a matter of after the announcement was made, somebody forgot to make the money available in 1977, whether it's Advanced Education and Manpower or Education. You can walk whatever kind of tightrope you want. That's really the situation as I see it.

One that perhaps the minister would feel a bit more comfortable in commenting on is the evaluation of the faculty of education at the University of Calgary. The minister will recall that we raised that situation during question period, and at that time he was able to say he hadn't read the report. We've been waiting breathlessly over here to hear some comments from the minister on the assessment of the University of Calgary. We would really appreciate it very much if we wouldn't simply say it's a matter of the University of Calgary's situation, because I think a number of Albertans would be interested in knowing how the minister views that evaluation of the faculty of education in Calgary.

DR. HOHOL: Well, I should have left the room twice. Mr. Chairman, I just have to get philosophic for a moment, but not for very long. I know the hon.

Leader of the Opposition isn't looking for philosophies; he's looking for information and an attitude by the minister.

MR. CLARK: Agreed.

DR. HOHOL: But the philosophy is important too.

Two significant jobs of universities include looking at the larger community, society generally, and being a scholarly critic and adviser of the larger community. Another one, and there are many more: the universities must look at themselves continuously, and be mature and scholarly critics of themselves. This is important to say because this is what the University of Calgary is doing.

The president of the university said that the university shall look upon itself and shall make judgments, and make those judgments possible to be read and studied by the university as far as Alberta is concerned. And the different constituents at the university will study the document, will speak on it. We now have editorials in newspapers, people from the faculty writing; the president has written. A great deal is being said. It is healthy, it is good, it's proper. As far as I am concerned, quite apart from the faculty of education at the University of Alberta, there is no faculty that should avoid or turn its back on what is within the definition of its own function. That's to look upon itself in a tough, scholarly, intellectual, hard-nosed way, and place what it finds on record for the people who pay for the institution to read, to study, and to respond.

But certainly, as the determinations of the faculty, the senate, the board of governors, the faculty council, the students, and various groups become clear, I have no hesitation in saying what I think. I think it would be a mistake to say, oh there's nothing wrong, you know, the report is just another reaction to a situation.

On the other hand, to say the faculty of education at the University of Calgary is turning out teachers who can't teach is just as irresponsible. I think there are some excellent teachers coming out of the faculty, and there are some who aren't so good. And I say that for every faculty in the nation and elsewhere, that the University of Calgary has a job to do, to refurbish and make some adjustments, and to deal with some areas like personnel and the whole logistics of education, the space, the equipment, the materials, the notions, the curriculum, the objectives, the meaning of education of children, the psychology of teaching and of learning: all these things, and they're complex.

What institution, Mr. Chairman, doesn't have difficulty today? The home, the school, society generally, the community, the nation, the province — why not the faculty of education at the University of Calgary? Why should it not have some problems? Why does it have to be so violently, almost viciously attacked? I want scholarship from the University of Alberta, Lethbridge, Athabasca, and Calgary, and that includes the faculty of education at the University of Calgary. But I deny that you can generalize, whitewash, make statements and make them stick, that the graduates from that faculty can't teach. I say anyone who says that is irresponsible and does a disservice to the students, to the ratepayers, to the faculty, and to himself.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I think that was one of the minister's better efforts, and might I say with due respect, Mr. Minister, perhaps somewhat overdue. I think it's not unrealistic that from time to time it's essential the Minister of Advanced Education give some indication of the direction he sees these kinds of things happening. I would urge, Mr. Minister, in the future that you might not feel you are compelled to do that just in the estimates, that's as long as the House isn't in session, but I commend you for your statement on that occasion.

Now, to get on to the question of the appointment of the presidents of NAIT and SAIT to the positions of assistant deputy ministers in the Department of Advanced Education. I'd be very interested to know the rationale of the minister in making those appointments. I have nothing against the two individuals involved, but it's the principle of having the presidents of two provincial institutions in the position of assistant deputy ministers, when in fact there were some 20 other provincial institutions, albeit smaller, who also want to feel they're in a position of having some influence on the department itself.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, if I had thought of it I would have volunteered to clear up a very, very serious and significant misunderstanding in Alberta on that particular matter. The presidents of NAIT and SAIT are not deputy ministers of anything or anybody. That emerged in the media, and I don't say that unkindly. The media had cause and reason to believe that what they printed was true; it happens not to be.

The truth is we have to pay these two people to do the jobs they do. The question of equity becomes important. How do you pay them? I felt that a president of an institution the size of NAIT or SAIT should be paid something like a deputy minister. So in terms of classification in the office of the Public Service Commissioner, with which most hon. members are familiar, we give them the pay classification of a deputy minister. What came out was a news item and thereafter an editorial which properly said, that's not a proper thing to do. And I agree. The point is it's not a fact. They are not deputy ministers. How can anyone really imagine the president of a college being a deputy minister? A deputy minister of what? So please accept my thanks for asking the question and giving me the opportunity to explain, because that was the rumor, the report, and it happens to be wrong.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, we're pleased to clear up that misunderstanding. After all, in one department we have the chief deputy, the deputies, and the assistant deputies, nine of them involved, so we didn't want you to try to outdo the department of highways.

The last question I'd like to ask the minister, unless something else occurs, deals with the matter rather close to home in my own constituency — the college at Olds. The minister knows my feelings on the question of a board of governors. We won't prolong that particular discussion this evening because I think, unfortunately, the minister hasn't changed his mind about moving toward a board of governors at Olds.

DR. HOHOL: I'm surprised.

MR. CLARK: I'm surprised. I welcome you surprisingly.

The other point I would like to raise though, Mr. Minister, is this. One of the problems they have at the college at Olds is with the number of groups coming into the college and making use of the services. All the money that comes in, be it for rent or use of the facilities through the food services or continuing education programs, comes back to the provincial treasury and the government rather than to the college itself.

I suppose if the people at the college weren't very dedicated individuals, you'd almost say to them, well, why should we try to make use of the college facilities as much as we can on a year-round basis? Why should we be very active in continuing — why should we try to use the college on a 12-month basis? Because the revenue generated, as I understand the situation, all comes back into the general revenue of the province rather than at least a portion going into the revenue of the college itself.

My question to the minister is: I recognize there may be some problems with The Financial Administration Act, but it seems to me that's one good reason for going to a board of governors, and there are others. Is the minister giving some thought to handling this problem so there's some sort of mechanism where, in the continuing education program for example, money can be ploughed back into continuing education in the area? They're doing an excellent job in that particular part of the province. I think the minister recognizes the problem. Now what's he going to do about it?

DR. HOHOL: I had the opportunity to visit Olds College and happily have to agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I was extremely impressed. It's doing an excellent job. There is that problem. I don't know what motivates people. I guess it's because they're professional and because they're good people. But it's true. The money they generate from continuing education, from night classes, seminars, conferences, from whatever, does go to general revenue.

As the hon. leader knows, because he's sat here and has had this very problem, it's not likely the fiscal transfers act, but the procedures that have to do with the auditor's office, in terms of the counting of money that comes from the public and has to be under the stewardship of and accounted for by the government in the Legislature, to the people. I believe it's that notion.

But in my visit to Olds, I can assure the representative for that constituency that the case was made extremely well that the money for operating costs should remain with those who generate it. I'll be discussing that with the Provincial Treasurer but I believe that's likely not possible. We have the same kind of problem in public education, as the hon. leader knows.

I'm happy to share an attitude which I'm beginning to develop. In a few days I will have been a year in the responsibility which I hold. As I look at the months and years ahead, one of the things is the whole notion of governing institutions in advanced education. I visited every one of them early in my

time in this work. One of the things that perplexes me, and I'm not sure about yet — and again I implore the members from both sides of the House to write to me, to phone me, to give me their views. When I visit a place like Olds — and I was very pleased with what I saw and heard, but when I left I felt as though I hadn't had a complete visit. I had the same experience at Fairview and at Vermilion.

MR. CLARK: Next time you're coming down, I'll arrange to show you around.

DR. HOHOL: I had the feeling my visit wasn't complete, and I'll take up that invitation.

I think, Mr. Chairman, what I missed is what the hon. Leader of the Opposition is talking about. That's the representative attitude and the point of view of the larger community in which the institution happens to be. I'm thinking and feeling more and more that institutions lack that — and who knows? Maybe NAIT and SAIT. They're a whole lot larger than several of our public colleges. Why not boards of governors, or some kind of board notion? It need not be a board of governors. There are other alternatives. There are options, and we should look at them. I'm looking at them. I ask you to do the same thing and give me your counsel.

I'm beginning to have clear in my mind the reasons we had, for example, the three agricultural colleges long ago. We were an agricultural, rural, pastoral kind of province. It was in the government's interest to expend resources to assist a farmer to become a better farmer, so when he breaks something on the farm he doesn't have to go downtown. It wastes time. It's unproductive. He can fix it. I know in my own home town the extension classes from Vermilion to Two Hills were legion, and they were good. It broadened the social notion of the whole community.

But are the colleges doing those things now? Have not their functions changed? Are they not more in the whole field of education? Doesn't that lead one to examine the proposition that there should be a public voice, a public responsibility, a public accountability, and a board of governors? That is the direction my examination of the problem leads me to believe in, but clearly that determination has not been made. I want to be frank and honest that that's the direction I feel we ought to go.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, could I just follow those remarks of the minister by saying I agree with you very much. As far as NAIT and SAIT are concerned, Mr. Minister, if you'd like some extra reading some evening, I refer you to a report done by the former deputy minister of education, Dr. Byrne, on the question of some problems at SAIT in about 1970, I believe. The recommendation there was that NAIT and SAIT should move to a board of governors situation. It seems to me in about 1972-73 that, pretty candidly, that was the government's plan at that particular time.

As far as Olds is concerned, I would like to say I think the minister would find a great deal of support not just in the Olds area, but in a large area of central Alberta. That college doesn't serve just the Olds area; it's involved agriculturally in a very large area. I would urge the minister to seek the views of the alumni of that institution, which represents people

from a tremendous area across southern Alberta and outside the province. Candidly, if the minister wants to come down and have the opportunity to meet with a number of groups in the area, I'd be more than delighted to arrange it. I think a move in that direction, toward a board of governors, would be a very healthy move not only as far as the college is concerned, but also the government.

I'd just conclude my remarks by saying this: one of the problems provincial institutions have is that they don't have any outside group to go to bat for them — if I might use the term — like the colleges or universities have a senate or board of governors. Frankly, it puts the civil servants in institutions — be they Fairview, AVC at Fort McMurray, NAIT, or SAIT — in a difficult situation, I think, to present their case, as opposed to the approaches that boards of governors can use by going directly to the minister, by being able to discuss a thing publicly. So I urge the minister to move in the direction he's outlined.

MR. KIDD: In the bounding enthusiasm of the hon. Leader of the Opposition for what was and still is obviously his first love, and in which he covered all things national, global and almost ethereal, not to mention philosophical, he did get around to the question I was going to ask, a somewhat pragmatic one about Olds College. It's been answered, and thank you very much.

MRS. CHICHAK: After that I should take off on the same kind of road.

I wonder if the hon. minister would expand on where the Council on Admissions and Transfer is with respect to their work since their appointment in 1974. Have they significantly progressed in their work to make some recommendations or to have found problems in admissions, the transfer between institutions, and the agreements that exist? Where are they at, and how are [they] moving in resolving the problems?

DR. HOHOL: In capsule form, Mr. Chairman, I would recall to the members of the House that the Council on Admissions and Transfer — known as CATS, which has some problems — was constituted in September of 1974 and held its first meeting in December of the same year. During their first year they worked on their frame of reference, on the things they had to do to get to know each other, and so on. Since then, following a series of meetings with the institutions in particular colleges and universities, they have put together a document. These are the transfer and admission areas we're talking about, which are the responsibility of the Council on Admissions and Transfer.

The document they finally compiled has been approved by all the institutions. The council now has the first annual report in draft form, and I have a copy. It's being edited and printed. I'm certain I'll be tabling it in the House before this session is over.

The work of the council is to bring the parties together in such a way that the institutions understand each other's positions. One of the interesting and very useful things, and not a new invention by this council — it's been used elsewhere — is a kind of registry of courses at colleges which, when included in the registry, will have automatic transfer to a

particular university; for example, from Red Deer to the University of Calgary, from Mount Royal to the University of Calgary, from Fairview or other colleges in the north to the University of Alberta. The council doesn't do a job on behalf of a student though that's how the work is generated. A student is represented by, say, a college when he can't get what he believes to be a proper and responsible transfer to a university.

One more interesting thing. The council has the capability to negotiate, mediate, and indeed hire a mediator somewhat on the model of The Alberta Labour Act and the Board of Industrial Relations, and hire a mediator if it's necessary to bring the two parties together on an issue that separates them in terms of either admissions or transfers. It has the second capability of calling for arbitration. This hasn't happened yet, but there is a case now between a college and a university that the chairman and the council will attempt to work out. If that isn't possible, the chairman will be assigning — and it's my understanding in a telephone conversation yesterday with the chairman, Dr. Baker, that he will be assigning a mediator to mediate the dispute on a matter of transfer between a college and a university. That will be the first of its kind in Alberta. I think it's a healthy situation.

Just an editorial comment, if I may, Mr. Chairman. The institutions, having grown apart from one another, have developed their own attitudes of achievement, of competence, or levels of scholarship, and sometimes feel they are enshrined in something quite beyond the scope of someone coming from some other institution. For the most part that isn't true. The council's main aspiration will be to try to place these matters in perspective.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to hold up the debate, but I would like to mention just two or three short items.

I wonder if the hon. minister would give me some information on the entrance requirements of the various universities in the province. Are these standard, or are there different requirements in each of the universities? I've had inquiries on this. I thought they were at one time all the same, but apparently there are some differences. I'd like to have the minister deal with that.

Then I'd like to deal for a moment or so with a topic the Minister Without Portfolio for native affairs, the hon. Mr. Bogle, has probably discussed with the hon. minister. That is the Old Sun college or school at Gleichen. I believe this institution does need some help from the provincial government. I know it's not a direct responsibility; it's affiliated with Mount Royal College and was originally financed by the Canadian government. But there's a real need there and I'm always completely delighted with the type of work I see going on at Old Sun college.

I know the Minister Without Portfolio for native affairs has been in the college. I would like to see the hon. Minister of Advanced Education endeavor to visit the college and to see the type of work going on there. I think he'd be impressed with the fact that the Indian people are endeavoring to help themselves. The enthusiasm they have for the various courses going on is almost unbelievable. The native people on the board are working hard endeavoring to make it

a topnotch college. Even the mounted policemen in the Gleichen detachment are taking courses there in Cree, which is going to be a tremendous help in their policing abilities too. So I mention that this school does deserve help. Any help the hon. minister can give will certainly be appreciated by the college and by the people of the Gleichen Reserve and the Gleichen general area.

I don't know whether the department is planning to have any more colleges, but I would like to mention that there is quite an area in the province where there is no college. While there is not a great deal of difficulty getting to Calgary or Red Deer where there are colleges, I would hope that when the time comes to consider the site for another college in the province, the Drumheller-Hanna areas might be considered. Drumheller is the centre of a vast hinterland, and there is the industry and the technology of coal mining. But I think a very useful college could be established in that area with a different type of curriculum that would be attractive to people in many parts of Canada, perhaps even from the United States.

The other entirely different point I'd like to mention is a matter of student assistance. I would like to pay a tribute to the Director of Student Assistance, Mr. Tietzen. Students in my riding have had difficulties in securing student assistance, but there hasn't been one case that I have brought to the attention of Mr. Tietzen that hasn't been worked out to the general satisfaction of the people involved. Now, this is a very difficult field, but Mr. Tietzen appears to have a tremendous understanding of difficulties that young people and parents go through.

I'd like to mention one particular type of case that I think deserves some consideration. In this day of independence, it's not unusual for young people of 17, 18, 19 to leave home, not because they are in conflict with their parents but because they want to be out on their own. Many times when they go out on their own there is a complete understanding that they are on their own for all purposes, and the parents are no longer going to supply any financial assistance. Sometimes the parents are reasonably well-to-do, but the young person who has left home feels that he is now independent and has no right to expect assistance from his father or mother. This makes it difficult at times when they run short of funds at university and want to borrow on their own recognizance rather than on the financial ability of their parents.

I know it's difficult also for the student board when they see, even though the young person is not living there, the father could afford to give some help. But in most cases, Mr. Tietzen is able to get around these and show such understanding that I've really been amazed at some of the results. So I'd like to pay tribute to him.

I do think that some special consideration should be given where it can be shown that a young person and the parents are completely separate entities. They're friends, they're not in conflict, but they're just the same as if the parents had passed out of the picture. The individuals, the young men or women, are living entirely on their own, and sometimes I think are very worthy of assistance, particularly loans they eventually will pay back. I simply mention those. Perhaps the hon. minister has had vast experience with all of

them, but I mention these items because I think they are worthy of attention, particularly the outstanding work Mr. Tietzen is doing.

DR. HOHOL: I appreciate and thank the hon. member for his comments about the chairman of the Students Finance Board. I know he reads *Hansard*, but I'd be delighted to pass those kind comments to him. It is a complex area. The matter of the severance of a youngster for whatever reason — and in most cases they're healthy, as the hon. member describes — is something that is before us all the time. We're looking at it. The Students Finance Act will be up for review, hopefully this fall. Hon. members might want to look at it in advance and criticize certain parts or show options or alternatives.

With respect to the matter of entrance into universities in Alberta, they're different from university to university, from faculty to faculty. There's no standard approach. We can make value judgments about them. I think that more and more in education, from the cradle to postgraduate studies, we will have some firmer and more precise measures of the prediction of capacity on prior evidence and anticipations into the future.

The hon. member is obviously very, very familiar with respect to the college at Old Sun. I am from reading and from being told. The hon. member will be pleased to note that I have made arrangements with the president and chairman of the board at Mount Royal to spend two days at the college this fall. Part of those two days will be spent at Old Sun college. I agree that the province needs to support the college more.

I point out what the hon. member and all hon. members know: we're in a situation where we always are when the federal government comes out with its trumpets and its press people and says, look at what we're doing. They set up a college or they set up something at Lac La Biche that they called NewStart. Within 18 months the trumpets die, the funds begin to dry up, they withdraw from the program, and there we sit with a priority that wasn't ours, a creation that wasn't ours.

What do we do? We either support it and pick up the bill, or we look bad because we're not doing what appears to be something we ought to do. I want to put it into perspective. But having done it, I agree with the hon. member with respect to that college.

I'm much impressed with Mr. Scrimshaw. I'm not embarrassed to say that someone is doing a good job. I think he's doing an excellent job as executive director, and so is the board of directors. I will be looking at the college and doing whatever I can with my colleague the hon. minister responsible for native affairs to assist that college.

Agreed to:

Ref. No. 1.0.1	\$116,510
Ref. No. 1.0.2	\$150,000
Ref. No. 1.0.3	\$4,446,753
Ref. No. 1.0.4	\$425,000
Vote 1 Total Program	\$5,138,263
Ref. No. 2.1	\$10,769,958
Ref. No. 2.2	\$64,961,488
Ref. No. 2.3	\$25,330,000
Ref. No. 2.4	\$1,037,000

Ref. No. 2.5	\$176,397,000
Vote 2 Total Program	\$278,495,446
Ref. No. 3.1	\$920,600
Ref. No. 3.2	\$14,788,000
Ref. No. 3.3	\$1,861,000
Vote 3 Total Program	\$17,569,600

Vote 4

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Chairman, the minister indicated that there would be a cut in the financial assistance to this particular program. I think it's a program that has really been worth while. We did have some problems with it last year.

The question I'd like to ask the minister is: what method are they going to use? Are they going to shorten the date for putting in applications for the students for this program? What method will they be using for letting out the funds to the applicants in this particular fund?

DR. HOHOL: Some time ago we released to all hon. members a summary of how the programs will run. They are fairly technical. We changed what we call the program elements, which simply means the different kinds of programs. As I recall, we have six. Some of them are for the most part in government services, government departments, and municipalities and other institutions.

For the most part, they will be for shorter periods of time. For example, in the summary, most of the \$2 million for STEP would be expended during a period of two months, July and August; in contrast, for example, to last year, April 1 to sometime in August if not September. Secondly, on a first-come-first basis, assuming that the people who apply meet the criteria for the programs, and there are specific criteria, once the amount of money is committed that simply ends the program.

Having said that, I should like to assure you, Mr. Chairman and members of the House, that if conditions are clear that it could be reasonable to provide further assistance, I would make that kind of representation to my colleagues and hope to get support.

But the indicators for Alberta, at the present time and when we sought approval for \$2 million, are that unlike across the nation, where unfortunately there is unemployment as high as 14 per cent, for example in Newfoundland, that will not be the case in Alberta. With programs like Hire a Student in Edmonton, Calgary, Medicine Hat, and all the large cities of the province, private enterprise doing an excellent job of hiring students, and the government's modest but reasonable assistance, we think we will manage. But if not, we will certainly respond.

Agreed to:

Total Program	\$8,691,852
Department Total	\$309,895,161

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to do something unusual as we wait for the reporting. I simply

want very sincerely and seriously to reflect my appreciation of the excellent discussion on matters in Advanced Education and Manpower. It will be extremely useful to me and the members of my staff, and I simply thank you for a most excellent evening.

[Dr. McCrimmon left the Chair]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. MCCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolution, begs to report same, and asks leave to sit again.

Resolved that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1977, amounts not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower: \$5,138,263 for Departmental Support Services; \$278,495,446 for Assistance to Higher and Further Educational Institutions; \$17,569,600 for Financial Assistance to Students; \$8,691,852 for Manpower Development.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning the Assembly will consider the estimates of the Treasury Department.

I move the Assembly do now adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion for adjournment by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

[The House rose at 10:15 p.m.]

