

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Tuesday, November 8, 1977 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **PRESENTING REPORTS BY
STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES**

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to present to the Legislature the first annual report of the Select Standing Committee on The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act.

This committee, Mr. Speaker, has been a most interesting and challenging experience for me and the other committee members. I would like to thank the members for the interest and zeal with which they attacked the problems, and the many, many hours of work they have put in within the past two months. I would also like to thank the ministers who appeared before the committee. They answered all questions put to them and provided whatever documentation the committee requested.

Mr. Speaker, about 30 recommendations were received, of which 12 were approved by the committee. Those approved were from all parties in the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this committee has done a thorough and competent analysis of the task assigned to it, and it has been a privilege to chair. Copies of the report will be provided for all members. The committee has been informed that minority reports will be filed.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

head: **NOTICES OF MOTIONS**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to give oral notice of introduction of three bills scheduled for tomorrow: Bill 97, The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1977; Bill 101, The Temporary Anti-Inflation Measures Amendment Act, 1977; and Bill 104, The Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2).

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 256
An Act to Amend
The Election Finances and
Contributions Disclosure Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 256, An Act to Amend The Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, the principle behind Bill 256 is to apply the same rules to corporations residing out-

side this province as are presently set out for individuals, so that any corporation that is not headquartered in Alberta, or owned by a majority of shareholders in Alberta, would have the same prohibitions against contributions to Alberta campaigns as presently face other Canadians.

[Leave granted; Bill 256 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the annual report for the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs for the year ended March 31, 1977, as required by statute.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the reply to Motion for a Return 165, which is the latest 12 issues of New Buildings, the monthly progress report of all buildings under construction in the province by the provincial government.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, in an effort to resolve a dispute between the Alberta Hog Producers' Marketing Board and packing plants in this province, on August 22 I commissioned Hu Harries and Associates of Edmonton to do a study into the price relationship between hogs in Alberta and in other points in North America. I'd like to file with the Assembly three copies of that report, and indicate as well that copies will be made available this afternoon to all members.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a response to Motion for a Return No. 104 and a reply to Question No. 170.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the reply to Motion for a Return No. 147.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file with the Legislature Library one copy of a minority report dealing with the Select Committee on The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act.

MR. SPEAKER: There's some question in my mind with regard to filings at this stage. The *Standing Orders* and the routine provide for tabling returns and reports. There seems to be an increasing volume of filings coming in at this stage. If we have difficulty dealing with the traffic, it may be necessary to have another look at that part of the *Standing Orders*.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly some 40 students from the Westview Village School, which is located on the outskirts of the city of Edmonton in the Winterburn area. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. John Drebit and Mrs. Linda McDougall. They are seated in both galleries. I would ask them to rise and receive the recognition of the House.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I'd like to introduce 26 grade 6 students from the

Kensington Elementary School in the Edmonton Calder constituency. They're accompanied by their teachers Miss Kersell and Mr. Sattler. They're seated in the public gallery. I'd like to ask that they stand and receive the recognition of the members.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and to the members of this Legislature 32 members from the Cayley Junior High School, which is in the Highwood constituency. Their teachers Norma Dudgeon, Arnold Nugent, and Tom Bown are with them. They are in the members gallery. I would ask that they rise and receive the welcome of this Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Foreign Land Ownership

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the first question to the Associate Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Has the minister been made aware of any cases of foreign corporations acquiring Alberta land by loaning money for land purchase to a Canadian, and then when the Canadian has defaulted on the payments, the land in effect reverts to the foreign mortgage holder?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any of the cases the hon. member mentions, other than those that have made the legal application for an exemption.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, has the minister considered removing the June 7 amendment to the regulations so that foreign acquisition of land by this method would not be possible?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, if on investigation what the hon. member states is a problem, it can certainly be considered in the new regulations that will have to replace the temporary ones, which are finished as of the end of December.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. minister. Will the minister file with the House a copy of the results of his monitoring of rural land sales under these regulations?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, at the present time monitoring is ongoing on the transfer of urban land only. I am sure we could make available those figures on the monitoring at the end of this calendar year, if the results would be of any value to members of this Assembly.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, we will make that judgment. We would like the information.

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. Can the minister file with the House a list of the exemptions that have been granted under these regulations?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker the exemptions that have been granted are by O.C. They're public and available to all members. [interjections]

DR. BUCK: Easy, Horst. Easy, six million dollar man.

Highway — Grande Cache

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, has the Minister of Transportation been made aware of the petition, being circulated in the Grande Cache area, to have the extension of Highway 40 routed through the town rather than 15 miles east of the town?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, we have an outstanding and ongoing commitment to the people of Grande Cache that the first section of pavement will be, and is now under way, from Muskeg to the town of Grande Cache; that's the junction with Highway 40. The other commitment is that that pavement will extend south to Highway 16 as a priority relative to the entire Grande Prairie/Hinton connection.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has the minister given any concern to having a second route out of Grande Cache in case of an emergency procedure where the town would have to be evacuated?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, we haven't given consideration to that kind of emergency, but we do intend to upgrade the airport facilities as well in Grande Cache. I expect that if the emergency is of the nature suggested by the hon. gentleman, a good airport might be more important than a second very expensive road.

DR. BUCK: Not to move 4,000 out.

Mental Health Facilities

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. It's really a follow-up on a question asked yesterday in the House. It's to clarify whether the psychiatric facilities at Lethbridge municipal hospital are in the process of being moved to the care centre at Claresholm, Alberta. I wonder if the minister could clarify the position on that.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, there are no plans to move psychiatric services or programs from general hospitals in Lethbridge to Claresholm.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. With regard to the municipal hospital in Lethbridge and St. Michael's, are there plans at the present time to expand present mental health facilities?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday in response to the question in the manner it was put by the hon. Member for Little Bow, the provision of mental health services for the Lethbridge area, hospital-based and community-based, and the inter-relationship, is receiving joint review and study among my colleague the Minister of Social Services and Health, myself, and our respective officials.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister, to be more specific. The answer to the hon. Member for Lethbridge West indicated that services will be held

at the level at which they presently exist. My question: is the policy direction at this point in time one of expanding the services, or doing nothing?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I've answered that question in my earlier answer in saying that the desire of the Lethbridge hospitals for program expansion is being developed and is being submitted and reviewed jointly by the Department of Social Services and Community Health, and Hospitals and Medical Care to ensure a proper balance and full co-ordination between community-based services and hospital-based services in the interests and needs of mental patients in Lethbridge and that part of southern Alberta.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. When will we expect clarification and action, such as building a wing or an extended facility that's necessary, building admittance centres in both the municipal hospital and St. Michael's Hospital? When will we get those kinds of commitments?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, there's been more action in mental health services in the last five years than there was in the previous 20.

DR. WALKER: A supplementary to the minister. Would the minister explain why there should be an expansion of mental health services, any more than any other hospital services in Lethbridge?

MR. NOTLEY: He's on your side, Gordon.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is indicating a view which I happen to agree with, that these things have to be related to all health programs.

Farm Labor Force

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the minister of manpower and labor. I'm sure he can give a very definite answer to this.

DR. BUCK: If he can understand the question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Could the minister advise whether farm labor from Mexico will be available to farmers of southern Alberta in 1978? There is presently some question about, one, your department's attitude on the matter and also the federal government's attitude.

DR. HOHOL: I presume the [question] was to me, Mr. Speaker. At this time, I couldn't give a definitive statement on it, but will take it under advisement and check. I would have some doubt about that at the present time.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Would the minister have an answer for me, possibly tomorrow, with regard to that question and have more definite information?

DR. HOHOL: No, I don't think so; not because I wouldn't choose to, but this is a federal/provincial kind of matter and would involve other departments of this government, the Department of Federal and

Intergovernmental Affairs, that of Advanced Education and Manpower, and certainly the Department of Employment and Immigration in Ottawa. It's at the initiative of a particular sector — in this case farming — to begin the process to attempt to qualify immigrants to Alberta by contract for a period of time. To my knowledge this has not begun, so I can't respond in that way.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Could the minister bring back a current report of the situation for the Assembly tomorrow?

DR. HOHOL: I can certainly make that necessary contact to give the hon. member information in the House. But in all fairness I should point out to the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that in my portfolio I have some reservations of considerable proportions with respect to the reasonableness of the proposition that we should bring people in by contract for a short period of time and get them out again. I should be on record that way.

Metric Time

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Government Services. First, a very short explanation is necessary. News media are advising the public that on January 3, 1978, Canada — except for Ottawa — will be converting to metric time. There will be a clock in the shape of a triangle with 10 hours on it. There will be 10 seconds to one minute, 10 minutes to one hour, 10 hours to one day. Instead of seconds, minutes, hours, there will be millidays, centidays, decidays, or millimonths. The rest will be converted: one day will be one day, a week will be a decaday, a month will be a hectaday — perhaps it should have been a heck of a day [laughter] — and a year will be a kiloday.

Is Canada going metric-mad, or is this some kind of a joke?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, while metrication may be beneficial to international trade as well as mathematical problems, I think in all seriousness that should this come about, we would probably do a similar thing as the Hon. Marvin Moore has done as far as the metrication of acres is concerned; namely, protest to Ottawa and not do it in Alberta. If we consider that our day would be reduced to 10 hours, I can well imagine the psychological impact; sometimes we haven't got enough time available to do our work even in the 24-hour day.

So, Mr. Speaker, again, I doubt Alberta would accept that kind of metrication problem.

Kananaskis Park

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. How will the development in the Kananaskis Park affect the wildlife officers who patrol the areas nearby? Will there be more wildlife officers?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question from the hon. Member for Highwood. I would say initially we're looking at certainly the possibility of some increase in staffing for that particular area

called Kananaskis Country. The immediate effect will be that those in the area surrounding that will be patrolling that area from the regional office in Calgary. We have a committee within the department looking at that right now, as to what the future may hold.

Alcan Pipeline Negotiations

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to either the hon. Premier or the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. It flows from negotiations on the Alcan pipeline. A word of explanation is necessary. It's my understanding the Americans have proposed that there should be one monitoring agency for the pipeline as it goes through Canada, so that they avoid the problems of jurisdictional disputes, different agencies, and what have you. My question to either of the hon. gentlemen is: what discussions have taken place between the government of Alberta and the government of Canada concerning this question of one uniform regulatory agency?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, there have been preliminary discussions between officials of our department and appropriate officials of our federal government concerning that proposed agency. The federal government has referred to it as a surveillance agency. They have indicated that they intend to bring forward legislation, possibly in December or early in the new year, with respect to some kind of agency or overall authority which might have the duty of monitoring all aspects of the pipeline in Canada. They indicated they were receiving suggestions from the United States, but they have not indicated to us their views or their reaction to that suggestion, if it's been made by the United States.

We have been trying to ascertain whether this proposed agency would purport to cover the Yukon and perhaps British Columbia. We have indicated that with respect to Alberta we would not accept any agency which intruded upon the jurisdiction of the province of Alberta with respect to matters relating to pipeline construction. Therefore it could possibly mean that Alberta would devise its own means of co-ordinating, with such federal agency as there might be, a manner of operation in order to facilitate pipeline construction.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Are any specific studies presently under way with respect to the implications of this surveillance agency, or what have you, with respect to the question of provincial rights? Have specific studies been commissioned by the government to consider the implications, or is the proposal in a sufficiently concrete stage that you're able to do this?

MR. HYNDMAN: The information from the federal government is not yet in a concrete stage. We have been undertaking a considerable amount of review and examination of the concept. Studies will not be undertaken outside the government because, in our view, the expertise does exist in the Department of the Attorney General, the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, and other departments. But we will be watching the matter very closely as it

develops from this point on, and we have made the suggestion to the federal government that we wish to be involved and consulted when their legislation with respect to this purported agency is being developed. We've also indicated that this province has more expertise in the area of pipeline construction than any other in Canada, and that we can perhaps offer them some of that expertise and save them some time and money over the years ahead.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister outline to the Assembly the reasoning for an Alberta approach independent from the surveillance? Now I'm not raising the provincial rights question here, but what kind of mechanism the government of Alberta would foresee to dovetail with the federal surveillance agency on the pipeline as it passes through Alberta. Are you in a position to advise us on where that stands at the moment?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, not knowing anything about the form or structure of the proposed federal entity, we are not able to decide what our approach would be. However, we have had in operation now for a number of weeks the task force of four ministers with respect to co-ordination of all departments regarding the pipeline. There is also an interdepartmental support advisory task force involving nine departments. Those two entities would be the nucleus of such a future entity, be it in a co-ordinating role or working with whatever federal entity appears, in order to ensure that the Alberta public interest and that of all departments are fully protected.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question to the minister. Does the minister expect that a formal agreement will be signed between the federal government and the Alberta government on these matters? And are any discussions occurring now with respect to that?

MR. HYNDMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we think it's likely and useful that down the road, probably early next year, an agreement be finalized with the federal government with regard to the various relationships between federal and provincial jurisdictions vis-a-vis the pipeline. We have been working on that for several weeks, and we may well be submitting the kind of agreement we would like to the federal government, and negotiating thereafter.

Crime Prevention Program

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Solicitor General if the crime prevention program sponsored by his department is a universal program.

MR. FARRAN: Yes, it is; universal through Alberta anyway.

MR. PURDY: A supplementary question for clarification, Mr. Speaker. In other words, if a member of the city police force were asked to go into some town outside the area of the city of Edmonton upon invitation of a sponsoring organization, he would in effect be able to do that?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, it's largely an educational program for the public, and I would think that the question of an invitation to a guest speaker would be one for the host.

Power Requirements

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, in light of the [Electric] Utility Planning Council report that by the year 2006, 72 per cent of Alberta's electrical requirements could be met by nuclear power, has the Minister of Utilities and Telephones or his department any input to planning when Alberta goes nuclear?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, the percentage mentioned by the hon. member is correct. It's an option for the 30-year future into Alberta's electrical energy requirements. This was part of a report developed by the Electric Utility Planning Council to the September 1977 hearing on energy requirements by the Energy Resources Conservation Board. Basically in that 30-year time frame, the base load options are between coal and nuclear. Where the matter would stand as it evolves is yet to be decided.

MR. STROMBERG: Supplementary. Have there been any discussions between people of your department and people at the U of A in evaluating the different systems that can be used for nuclear, such as different reactors?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to obtain assistance from others in briefing me on the facts of this matter and its possibilities for Alberta's future, particularly in the hope that electrical requirements can be met more cheaply in the future than might otherwise be the case without this sort of planning. I have had the opportunity to discuss the matter with the Electric Utility Planning Council and also, because it was raised with me, with people from the University of Alberta engineering faculty and Electrical Engineering Department.

Gun Control Regulations

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Solicitor General. I wonder if the Solicitor General could inform this Assembly if there are any laws as far as storage of rifles or guns is concerned, and if the minister would inform this Assembly if rifles stored in a glass case with a wooden drawer with a key for storing ammunition would be acceptable in the urban centres.

MR. SPEAKER: I trust the hon. member will not be unduly surprised if I refer him to other means to do his legal research. In other words, the hon. member is asking a question of law; he's asking the hon. Solicitor General what's in the law, and that really is not a function of the question period.

DR. BUCK: Joe Clark will look after you, John.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, maybe I could help the hon. member to some degree.

MR. SPEAKER: Quite possibly an appointment could be arranged outside the question period. [laughter]

Rural Gas Program

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones. Could the minister indicate whether any revisions are planned in the target of 80,000 hookups under the rural gas program?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, I regret I missed the middle part of the hon. member's question.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, the target was for 80,000 hookups in the province. The question is: is the minister planning on revising this target of 80,000?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, the short answer is no. There really hasn't been reason to worry about exactly what a refined calculation of that might be. Basically we're undertaking the program as rapidly as we can, and a very substantial amount of progress has been made. In fact, well over 50 per cent of the job is done at this time.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are there any statistics, compiled by the department, that indicate the number of hookups in the province at the present time?

DR. WARRACK: Yes. As of the end of October it was roughly 42,750.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One more supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. A number of applicants, especially in northern Alberta, did get the installations but weren't hooked onto gas. Could the minister indicate if these applicants are hooking on and using gas at the present time, or what the number is?

DR. WARRACK: I don't know the number and I don't really have a way of finding out, other than a survey of the large number of rural gas co-ops across Alberta. But certainly a number signed up initially and for various reasons, including their own circumstances, have not hooked up, at least to date. A number of these people have been hooking up during the intervening months. In addition, Mr. Speaker, people who had not originally signed up are hooking up.

MR. GOGO: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. To the minister's knowledge does any other jurisdiction in Canada have a similar type of rural gas program?

DR. WARRACK: Happily, Mr. Speaker, the answer is no; that's unique in the progressive thrust of Alberta government of our time.

DR. BUCK: Tell that to the guys who can't afford to hook up, Allan.

Eastern Slopes — Snowmobile Use

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Associate Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It's relative to the eastern slopes policy statement. I was wondering if the minister has received representations from the snowmobile association, the regional

planning commissions, or other interested groups suggesting revisions. The thrust of my question will lead to asking whether the minister is prepared to have another hearing relative to that report.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to visit with the snowmobile association. Basically the visit and discussion that was held was not a question of any changes in the eastern slopes but of clarification of misunderstandings that existed, first of all without a copy of the [statement] and, secondly, misunderstandings after reading it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the other part of my question to the minister was whether the minister would indicate if any further public hearings would be held to review the statement made at an earlier date?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, long before the zoning concept of the eastern slopes was announced, the ECA held hearings for a period of some three years. In the eastern slopes policy are incorporated 232 of those recommendations. At the present time we feel there was sufficient public input. However, through the administrative procedures under the eastern slopes policy — in looking at individual areas of the provision of recreational complexes — if it were necessary there could be some public input on a particular spot and a particular use.

MR. R. SPEAKER: That's not the answer, though.

Foreign Land Ownership (continued)

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Associate Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Just to clarify a point, did the minister say the department is monitoring only urban land sales to foreigners?

MR. SCHMIDT: The monitoring going on at the Land Titles Office is the monitoring from agricultural and recreational land as covered under the temporary regulations that exist, to see that those transfers follow and meet the temporary regulations. A straight monitoring, in the concept of monitoring before Bill 40 became law within this province in the safeguarding of agricultural and recreational land, is done on that basis, on the transfer of urban land only from an information point of view.

Oil and Gas Export Policy

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Regarding the 30-year continuing supply of natural gas before export of gas is permitted, does the minister see any need for reducing this period in the foreseeable future?

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary. Is any consideration being given to a similar policy for oil in the province?

MR. GETTY: We've considered it, Mr. Speaker, but the supply so far exceeds the 30-year requirement that in our judgment it's not necessary to state it as a policy.

Syncrude Labor Recruitment

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Energy and ask him whether the province has any plans to monitor the hiring practices of Syncrude with respect to the recruiting of permanent, full-time staff, particularly people with technical skills?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Energy and Natural Resources would not be monitoring the hiring by Syncrude. However, the ministers of Advanced Education and Manpower, and of Labour, the representative of the government on the Syncrude board of directors, and of course our Syncrude equity management would be involved. However, I would have to leave it to them to provide any details as to how they might check on the hiring.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question then either to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, the Minister of Labour, or the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder, who sits on the Syncrude board.

DR. BUCK: And does their advertising.

MR. NOTLEY: What monitoring policies do we have with respect to the recruitment of full-time staff, particularly in the area of technical skills?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, it's exactly the same vehicle and sets of procedures we have had in the construction phase of Syncrude. It will proceed in the same way in the operations. It has been very successful. The record is excellent. We're working in the manner described by my hon. colleague. It's successful. We're looking to real, full capability by Syncrude to use Canadian manpower.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Can the minister advise whether Syncrude officials have made a number of trips to Europe to hire British and Dutch technicians for Syncrude, and are similarly undertaking recruiting trips to Europe in the near future?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, some trips have been made abroad and some to eastern Canada, in some cases with respect to making available sufficient people in the technical areas, some in the trades — for example, in the area of insulation.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Is the minister in a position to confirm to the Assembly that the foreign technicians being recruited are the most highly trained technicians, specifically for the categories of 3B and 3C, which I gather are the most technically oriented positions and also the best-paying jobs?

DR. HOHOL: The classifications are accurate, but I would have to check the information. On balance, I would doubt that the full complement of those categories would be filled by people from outside Canada. Some will be, but a great number will not. We will be

looking at the long- and intermediate-term capability of Syncrude to do the operations phase of this project, with particular reference to manpower.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister with respect to the availability of Canadians. Has the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower made any assessment or do they have an inventory of the people available in this country for the technical jobs involved? Do we have enough qualified people? Have there been any discussions with Syncrude on ratios between Canadian and non-Canadians for these highly technical areas?

DR. HOHOL: Well, the capacity to man the operations phase is a project that Syncrude has to undertake and complete. The capability of a nation to catalogue its numbers with respect to a particular occupation is extremely difficult. We're talking about a competence that moves to where the work is, and the kind of work we're talking about is really international. A great number of our people in management, drafting, engineering, and design are abroad; many are in the nation. So if we did come down with a figure at any one time, it wouldn't last very many days, much less weeks or months. But the capacity to do this kind of work has been increasing steadily.

There's no question in our minds that Syncrude is making every effort to use Canadian content, and the record is there to show it. But in some areas, it would be unwise for us to try to respond for a short period of time by training a particular occupation that would be in oversupply immediately this project was completed. We have to remember that the operations numbers are much smaller in contrast to the building phase of Syncrude.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question to the hon. minister. It really flows out of his last answer. Mr. Minister, I'm talking about permanent people who will be working at Syncrude, not people who will be working on the construction project. Bearing that in mind, have there been any discussions with Syncrude as to targets for Canadian opportunities in these areas of special technical expertise? Has there been any preliminary discussion, or is that just left within the context of as much as you can?

DR. HOHOL: No, not at all, Mr. Speaker. In the context of the last statement by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I did respond in every instance that we were speaking of the permanent force at Syncrude that would operate the plant once the operations begin. So in that context, again the same kind of vehicle for consultation, for discussion, with respect to the manpower phase in the permanent operation of this plant is in place, and is not left to the best they can do and the best we can hope for. But a concerted effort by government, through the vehicle described by my hon. colleague, is in place, working, and very healthy. As I say, we're looking forward to a tremendous program of service and opportunity for Canadian people in the operations phase of Syncrude.

MR. SHABEN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Does the minister have any figures as to the

number of new jobs created in Alberta last year and, if so, the impact of this on the availability of skilled labor within the province?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, these are filed figures, and I have seen them a few days ago. But I would want to be precise, and I would examine the files and report to the House. But the ratio of indirect jobs to direct jobs on a plant like Syncrude is in the order of a maximum of 1:7.

Gun Control Regulations (continued)

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I'll try it again. I direct my question to the Solicitor General, if the general can in fact inform this Assembly if there has been a change in the policy regarding storage of rifles or guns in the province of Alberta, in commercial or residential areas.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy the hon. member has hit the target with his second shot.

I understand it is the intention of the federal government to provide for proclamation of new gun control laws in June next year. They will make it an offence not to have a firearm in secure and safe storage. At the present time the police and any common-sense person would advise the owners of firearms to keep them in a secure place. That could include both locking a gun in a cabinet and the use of a trigger lock. A very good trigger lock was invented by someone at the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology a couple of years ago. The practice of leaving firearms loose and unprotected in the back of a pick-up truck and that sort of thing is not recommended.

As of June next year then, Mr. Speaker, in effect we will be obliged to enforce the federal Criminal Code in regard to storage of weapons.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Drumheller, as chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, has asked me to say to hon. members that there will not be a meeting of the committee tomorrow; that is, Wednesday morning.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move that the following bills not be read a third time now but be referred back to Committee of the Whole for further amendments: Bill 71, The Nursing Assistants Registration Act; Bill 72, The Alberta Insurance Amendment Act, 1977; Bill 85, The Social Development Act, 1977 (No. 2); Bill 96, The Trust Companies Amendment Act, 1977; and Bill 98, The Motor Vehicle Administration Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2).

[Motion carried]

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I move that Motion for a

Return 172 stand and retain its place on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

163. Mr. Notley moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing a copy of the Management Manual or similar document, howsoever styled, which outlines to senior Alberta civil servants guidelines on making information and/or documents available to the public.

[Motion carried]

173. Mr. Mandeville moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing the number and total amount of all loans committed by the Alberta Housing Corporation under the starter home ownership program during the period April 1, 1976, to March 31, 1977, for each of the following regions:

- (1) Calgary
- (2) Edmonton and Slave Lake
- (3) Fort McMurray
- (4) Grande Prairie
- (5) Lethbridge.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, the motion is generally acceptable except that there is a mistake in it. The Alberta Housing Corporation should be replaced by the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation. If I might be permitted, Mr. Speaker, I would make that amendment, and thereby the motion would be acceptable with the Alberta Housing Corporation being replaced by the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation.

[Motion as amended carried]

174. Mr. R. Speaker moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) for the periods
 - (a) April 1, 1976, to March 31, 1977, and
 - (b) April 1, 1977, to September 30, 1977,
 the amount of money received by the government of Alberta from the Western Canada Lottery Foundation, pursuant to the agreement between the Western Canada Lottery Foundation and the government of Alberta;
- (2) a copy of the total agreement between the government of Alberta and the Western Canada Lottery Foundation which outlines their relationship, one to the other, with respect to moneys to be transferred from the Western Canada Lottery Foundation to the government of Alberta;
- (3) the disposition which the government of Alberta has made of all moneys received as outlined in (1), including
 - (a) the name of each person, society, organization, and body corporate which has received such moneys,
 - (b) the amount of money received by each person or organization as outlined in (a),
 - (c) the purposes for which such moneys were distributed by the government of Alberta, and
 - (d) the conditions which were attached to the use of said funds.

[Motion carried]

175. Mr. Mandeville moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing the number and total amount of all loans committed by the Alberta Housing Corporation under the direct lending program during the period April 1, 1976, to March 31, 1977, for each of the following regions:

- (1) Calgary
- (2) Edmonton and Slave Lake
- (3) Fort McMurray
- (4) Grande Prairie
- (5) Lethbridge.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, the same mistake has been made in Motion 175 as in 173, so I would like to move an amendment which changes the Alberta Housing Corporation to the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation.

[Motion as amended carried]

GOVERNMENT DESIGNATED BUSINESS

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**
(Second Reading)

Bill 99
The Statute
Law Correction Act, 1977

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 99, The Statute Law Correction Act, 1977. As I indicated on first reading, this bill which has become, I hope, a tradition in this House, unfortunately, is designed solely and simply to correct incorrect references, typographical errors, and drafting omissions as they occur in several statutes of this Assembly.

[Motion carried; Bill 99 read a second time]

Bill 54
The Petroleum Marketing
Amendment Act, 1977

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move second reading of Bill No. 54, The Petroleum Marketing Amendment Act, 1977.

The main principle or objective of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to place the marketing of condensates or pentanes produced from Crown lands in Alberta under the control of the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission. This would put the pricing and marketing of condensates on the same basis as crude oil in Alberta. More particularly, it would provide some assurance that an adequate supply of condensates would be available as feedstock for a liquid-based petrochemical industry in the province.

Mr. Speaker, I would still prefer to see suppliers and users of condensates enter contracts themselves without the government being involved. Therefore it is the intention of the government to have this bill pass the House, should the House agree, but not trigger the operation of the legislation unless absolutely necessary.

[Motion carried; Bill 54 read a second time]

Bill 68
The Alberta Heritage
Savings Trust Fund Special
Appropriation Act, 1977-78

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 68, The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Special Appropriation Act, 1977-78. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could simply call to the attention of members of the Assembly comments I made on a similar motion yesterday.

DR. BUCK: Premature.

[Motion carried; Bill 68 read a second time]

Bill 69
The Alberta Heritage
Savings Trust Fund Special
Appropriation Act, 1978-79

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 69, The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Special Appropriation Act, 1978-79.

[Motion carried; Bill 69 read a second time]

Bill 95
The Glenbow-Alberta Institute
Amendment Act, 1977

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 95, The Glenbow-Alberta Institute Amendment Act, 1977. The principle of the bill is to assure that government-appointed representation on the board of governors of the Glenbow-Alberta Institute will reflect the increased fiscal responsibility for the institute assumed by the province of Alberta during the past few years. That level of support is approximately 7 per cent of the annual budget of the Glenbow-Alberta Institute.

Mr. Speaker, in moving this bill, I would like to do two things. One would be to comment on the important cultural contribution the Glenbow Institute has made to the city of Calgary and indeed to all of southern Alberta, also to pay tribute to the Harvie family for their contribution to Alberta culture and history throughout the years, through the Devonian Foundation and its predecessor.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to support the bill and bring to the attention of the members the contribution the Harvies have made to Alberta. I guess many of us who know that many of the dollars that came out of the ground in the Redwater area contributed to the Harvie fortunes. I was fortunate enough to be a very good friend of one of the Harvie family — but that's neither here or there.

I think the thing we should remember is that this Glenbow Institute doesn't get as much recognition from the people of Alberta as it should. We sort of seem to take the Glenbow Foundation for granted; we appreciate all the wonderful things it's doing, but never seem to fully appreciate the fact that a family — the Harvies — took charge of this and tried to keep before Albertans some of the things that of course

are part of our history. So I think we as members of the Assembly should certainly do everything we can to bring the focus of the people of Alberta onto the wonderful work the Glenbow Foundation is doing.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say a word in connection with the Glenbow Foundation and pay tribute to the institute, but particularly to the work done by the Devonian Foundation. This foundation has improved the main streets of many, many towns in my constituency and probably throughout Alberta. They certainly do splendid work; they leave a wonderful taste in the mouths of the people after they've been there. I think they are to be highly commended.

[Motion carried; Bill 95 read a second time]

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I move that you now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of the Whole to study certain bills on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Deputy Premier, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**
(Committee of the Whole)

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of the Whole Assembly will now come to order.

Bill 66
The Department of Hospitals
and Medical Care Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

There are some amendments to the bill. Is everybody familiar with the amendments?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Chairman, in the spring sittings of the Legislature, during debate on the estimates of the heritage savings trust fund, and on second reading of Bill 66, there were several matters that I indicated I would report back to the House on. But before I do so, I have as a very pleasant task a major announcement to make to the members of the Assembly.

I am pleased to announce the appointment of a new Deputy Minister of Hospitals for the province of Alberta, Mr. Gary J. Chatfield. The appointment is effective January 1, 1978. Mr. Chatfield comes to Alberta from his current position as Assistant Deputy Minister, Institutional Health Services, Ministry of Health, government of Ontario.

Mr. Chatfield completed his high school education in Winnipeg and received his Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy from the University of Manitoba in 1957. He obtained his diploma in hospital administration from the University of Toronto in 1961.

Mr. Chatfield brings to the deputy minister position an extensive background of experience in the hospital and health care field. Prior to joining the Ministry of

Health, government of Ontario, Mr. Chatfield worked as a consultant for the development and planning of York Central Hospital in Richmond Hill, Ontario, and was appointed its administrator in 1963. From 1969 to 1971 he was president of Medex Nursing Home Limited, which operated a number of private nursing homes in Alberta. He was employed by the government of Ontario in 1972 as co-ordinator of the extended care program, Ontario Hospital Services Commission, and was appointed general manager, direct services division of the Ministry of Health and the Ontario Hospital Services Commission, following merger, with responsibility for psychiatric hospital services, ambulance services, mental retardation facilities, public health laboratory system, clinic services, and children's mental health services.

As Assistant Deputy Minister, Institutional Health Services, since 1976, Mr. Chatfield has been responsible for the direct services division, information systems, the inspection branch including extended health care program, and the institutional division responsible for all public and private hospitals in the province of Ontario, plus responsibilities for The Ontario Cancer Treatment & Research Foundation and the Alcoholism & Drug Addiction Research Foundation.

Mr. Chatfield is a member of the Canadian College of Health Service Executives, holds fellowships with the American colleges of hospital and nursing home administrators, and holds an associate professorship, department of health care administration, Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto.

Mr. Chairman, I believe all members will agree that we are indeed fortunate to employ an individual of Mr. Chatfield's calibre for the portfolio of Alberta Hospitals and Medical Care. He brings to the portfolio an obvious extensive administrative, operational, and financial skill background.

Mr. Chairman, during debate last night on the heritage savings trust fund, and earlier, I indicated that I would be filing further information with the House with respect to evolving policy positions in the portfolio. I would now like to do so. First, I would like to file the Alberta Medical Association seventy-first and seventy-second annual meeting reports, and particularly refer hon. members to the parts of those reports which talk about the relationship of the medical profession with the government of Alberta, which they describe as excellent both with the Social Services and Community Health portfolio, and with Hospitals and Medical Care.

The next items I would like to file for the information of members are with respect to my comments on the high rates of surgery in Alberta, and a comparison of Canadian surgical rates with England and Wales; A Strategy for Utilizing Existing Buildings, that is relevant to what we've been talking about in hospital construction and capital cost control; Health Project Management: An Overview. That constitutes the items I would like to file for the information and reading of hon. members.

Next I would like to make several points before we go into any questions hon. members may have on Bill 66. I think it is obvious to all hon. members that I view sound organization as a key first step in meeting the challenge of sound decision-making and choice of priorities in health care in the future. Bill 66 represents a major change historically in Alberta from the

commission concept to a departmental concept. I would restate that change obviously creates apprehension in terms of staff, of the hospital community, and of the professions involved in the health care community. That is natural. But that will require our collective leadership during a period of reorganization of the portfolio, the utilization of a new deputy minister, in order to communicate the purposes for which this reorganization is being undertaken in terms of providing in the longer term in our province quality services within responsible levels of financial expenditure; in other words, Mr. Chairman, to repeat that in my view it is not responsible of any member of this Assembly to take the natural anxiety and apprehension that citizens or groups may have as a result of change that is needed to thwart or attack the need for desirable change.

Mr. Chairman, one other point I would like to make is that I fully realize that over the past year or two a lot of decisions which hon. members would like to have been made for hospitals, expansions, or program services in their constituencies, have not been made. I have to say that I take full responsibility for stopping certain kinds of decisions and actions. Because in my view the only way we would have a chance to assess and to make choices for the future would require that we stop some of the actions and decisions which had been under way in order that we could assess with more clarity the alternative directions we should go in the future. Mr. Chairman, in my view it was an important decision to stop the very large, if you like, elephant of hospitals and medical care services in the province in order that we could assess and redirect our energies to what might be more appropriate goals and objectives.

Mr. Chairman, during the spring sitting of the Legislature, when I announced the holding pattern on hospital construction, I indicated that I would be providing a progress report to the Assembly on new construction control procedures. Having assigned this to officials in the Hospital Services Commission, soon to be the department of hospitals and medical care, I'd like to acknowledge the outstanding contribution that two young officials in the commission have made; namely, Mr. Kohut and Mr. Stoodley. In a very short period of time they have come up with an analysis and with specific recommendations on improved construction control procedures which I believe to be excellent and outstanding, and that address themselves to the historical dislocations we have found. Because of the importance, topical nature, and discussion this has received, I would like to highlight some of the major recommendations these two officials have made.

First, in his report Mr. Kohut recommends that the new department of hospitals and medical care be founded on a fiscally responsible planning orientation which integrates planning and financial control with consistent decision-making based on master planning rather than simply on a more tightly controlled but continued *ad hoc* expenditure basis. The second recommendation is that the new departmental structure contain a single unit or units devoted to planning, programming, and evaluation. The third recommendation: that the planning unit provide current, competent, and analytic advice on service and cost implications of policy and planning alternatives. Fourth, that a planning, programming, and budgeting system be

accepted in principle. That the following five principles be incorporated into the organization of the new department: definition of clear and limited lines of responsibility, grouping of activities to enhance decision-making, explicit linkage of financial accountability and program responsibility, formal development of a committee structure to facilitate communication, and the establishment of an internal audit function which of course would dovetail with Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, a very major change from our historical system is recommended in this official's report; that is, that functional planning become the responsibility of the new department of hospitals and medical care. Functional plans produced must be consistent with departmental policy and must be developed by seeking substantive input from local boards. Responsibility for functional planning would rest with a specially created unit within the new department, which would produce functional plans using its own resources and hospital and board staff in combination with departmentally hired consultants as required.

Mr. Chairman, that means that no longer would the responsibility for the initial functional plan rest with the hospital board. That would start with the province, in consultation with the hospital board, and then move to the next stage where local boards would retain responsibility for hiring their prime engineering and architectural consultants. It provides us with greater control over the first step in the planning process that gives rise to the construction of health care facilities.

I think another very important recommendation is that a program be formally established to evaluate the effectiveness of the systems and design of every hospital project built under the new policy.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Stoodley's recommendations, which are in the financial area and tie into the program area are, I think, of major interest to members of the Assembly as well. I'm not giving all of them but I'd like to highlight his recommendations as well: the development of a costed departmental master plan setting goals, objectives, and a strategy for implementation; the monitoring and reporting of all financial factors relating to master plan activities. The ability of hospitals to carry on with short-term plans will be restricted until initial long-range plans have been approved. Project proposals will contain preliminary cost figures for capital, staffing, and operating. No functional program will be accepted for review unless accompanied by a new project resource requirement proposal which will contain construction feasibility, space program, capital budget planning study, equipment budget, preliminary site data, staffing budget, and four-year operating budget proposals.

The approval of the functional program and project resource requirement proposal will set firm project end price in current year dollars, as developed construction standards are to be followed. There'll be additional financial control during the construction process, which will be the appointment of on-site building inspectors, formal reporting of progress by the hospitals, the strengthening of financial reporting and control systems during construction, and a formal audit and evaluation program to cover financial integrity, compliance with rules, et cetera. To incorporate all these new procedures, there will be the formation

of a capital project control centre in the new department.

Mr. Chairman, the officials also conclude that decisions and actions on capital facilities in the health care field impact three, five, and six years down the road. So the need for these improved procedures is clearly demonstrated by the number of years and time span involved. Historically the province has not set definitive parameters at the outset of a project. It's our intention to do so to avoid some of the difficulties of the past, and demonstrated more recently by the Calgary General psychiatric wing and, of course, the Southern Alberta Cancer Centre and the Foothills auxiliary services. It's a key change and will move away from rubber-stamping local hospital board requests. It will require a great deal of responsibility locally and by the province.

Mr. Chairman, concurrent with that are three major policy areas, which I've mentioned in the House, that MLAs will be chairing, examining, and reporting to me for a subsequent report to the Legislature: one by the hon. Mr. Gogo, on the economics of health care; one by Mr. Kroeger, who is nearly finalizing his report in the area of nursing home policy; and one by the hon. Dr. Backus, in the area of new approaches to rural health care.

Mr. Chairman, obviously the new deputy minister I announced at the beginning of committee this afternoon will play the key and major role in carrying forward the implementation of Bill 66 and working toward the incorporation and implementation of the new mechanisms and controls that are necessary, and in maximizing the effectiveness of the management which departmental structure is intended to incorporate to ensure we develop the appropriate policy challenges to the future, and that we do so within appropriate balance between the need for quality program and ongoing financial responsibility.

MR. ZANDER: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say just a few words. I certainly don't want to rehash something I've said for over six years. But certainly I think some of them have to be said. I welcome the change, a change that was probably six years in coming. It was a long time before we made up our minds that the changes were necessary.

There are a few questions I asked myself, and that I'll also ask the hon. minister: how long before we go in the direction for long-term health care in our province? Where do we start? When do we start? Are we going back to the basics of 1971, or are we going to start in 1977? The planning that was done six years ago is no longer adequate for the people of this province. It may be that within the next four, five, or six years of planning this century will be four-fifths gone and we'll be no better off than we were before we started. It's only my hope that the new direction will certainly benefit the people of this province. As I stated just this last session, I hope it's a start in a new direction. If it is, perhaps all the suffering that has gone past will not have been in vain.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before we move on, the minister today outlined a couple of things— the most important I thought — because we discussed the principle of doing away with the commission before — was the change in the planning process for

hospital construction where, at the initial stage, the government is going to be setting out the general perimeters, I guess, and getting fairly deeply involved in the planning. I suppose this would presume, Mr. Minister, that plans would be drawn up by the department and discussed with the hospital boards.

I wonder if you could be just a little more specific on how you visualize the first step of this planning process — who is going to do it; whether there will be architectural plans that will be developed for given size hospitals; whether many hospitals in the province will generally fit a category; whether we're going to have a general approach for each category of hospital: how, in fact, this first step is going to operate.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Was the minister going to answer the member's question? Possibly he had other follow-up questions. Maybe they could complete that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you wish to answer one question at a time, or do you wish to have all the questions and then answer them all?

MR. MINIELY: I'd prefer that they finish all the questions.

MR. R. SPEAKER: The minister referred to two studies done by the department, by Mr. Stoodley and Mr. . . .

MR. MINIELY: Kohut.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Kohut. Would the minister make those available to the members of the Legislature.

MR. MINIELY: They're internal documents.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Okay. Mr. Chairman, would the minister indicate whether he has accepted the criteria outlined from those two reports as policy? Will they be placed in a formal statement to be presented not only to members of the Legislature and the general public, but sent in clear, concise language to the hospital boards?

MR. MINIELY: Yes.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I'd like that in the record, if the minister is able to stand up.

MR. MINIELY: Yes.

DR. BACKUS: Mr. Chairman, I was very pleased to hear the minister's statements on the proposed planning process of health care delivery in the province, because I've been very concerned that many members on both sides of the House have been increasing their demands on the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care for action on specific hospitals in their constituencies without really any thought for an overall planning process of health care delivery in the province. Mind you, this isn't surprising because for many years there has been very little in the way of overall planning of health care delivery. This is why I'm so delighted to hear the minister is now undertaking it.

Just for a second, I would like to take a look at the experience in Sweden. There they have developed a hospitals plan. They consider that a 200,000 to 300,000 population justifies a central county hospital with several satellite hospitals. Each of the satellite hospitals services a population of 50,000 to 90,000 persons. These hospitals are able to manage the care of 90 per cent or more of the ill people in the catchment area, the rest being referred to the central county hospital.

In addition, they have developed in the whole country about six regional hospitals, each regional hospital to take care of a 650,000 to 1.4 million population. These figures, translated to Alberta, give us a pretty good indication of how excessive we are in this province as far as having beds is concerned.

One interesting comment I would like to quote is that:

Within the last 30 years specialized departments have been established in some of the district hospitals far away from the central county hospital. The formation of these specialized departments in the smaller hospitals was often due to pressure from both doctors and the local public. It should be noted that the national board of health which has to make the final decision both on hospital buildings and personnel agree to allocate necessary resources for these specialties. Infrequently departments have insufficient patients and have been or are intended to be closed down. As an alternative the county councils have recently been offering an extended ambulatory service.

Now this is the significant part:

Reduction of facilities has never been achieved without creating a heated debate and this rationalization often met with dissatisfaction and disapproval from the population concerned.

So as one can see, we aren't the only people who are having problems. However, the Swedish regionalization has been going on for over 10 years and is considered highly successful.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make these comments because I feel we are entering a new era in health care delivery in this province. There is going to be much debate. Much concern is going to be expressed by hospital boards and local people because they have been going in one direction for years and now they are asked to look at a bigger view. Instead of the individual hospitals competing with each other, I hope we're going to get a co-operation between hospitals that will develop a much more economical as well as efficient service for our people in this province.

I want to congratulate the minister on taking the bull by the horns and taking this step which I'm sure he has realized will cause a certain amount of debate and argument. But he's prepared to take on this problem and perhaps put some order into the chaos that has been developing over the last 30 or 40 years.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, the minister indicated that functional plans now start with the province, not with hospital boards. I wonder if the minister can indicate when the hospital boards will be notified that they shouldn't initiate any plans for extensions, new hospitals, or new facilities, and that any directive of that kind is to come forward from the

province in their overall, large plan of things. When will that be clarified with the hospital associations? Will the minister be making this kind of announcement at — I'm not sure whether or not they've had their annual meeting yet. But will that be the thrust of his remarks to the hospital association?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, I certainly support the bill and the arguments the minister put forward. I'd simply like to make one or two observations dealing with people. I think we in Alberta have, by sheer numbers, been extremely fortunate in having not only the highest standards of care in the country, but the greatest number of beds in our active treatment hospitals. I think it's been pointed out that it's the cost of operation as well as the principle of accountability to elected people which really prompted this bill.

I would simply like to point out — and I'm sure the minister is well aware and perhaps he'll make some comment — that we as Albertans have been very well served by many dedicated people within the Hospital Services Commission and certainly by the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission. The Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission is second to none in Canada. I would like that to be understood by most members. The only one that would come close would perhaps be the province of Saskatchewan, the pioneer in that direction. If it weren't for the administrative problems we had with the premium collection system — there's no question that physicians in Alberta receive prompt payment for their claims by an extremely dedicated and well-functioning health care commission.

I would like the minister, if he would, to make a comment on the dedication of the members both in the Hospital Services Commission and the Health Care Insurance Commission, because there's no question that to make this new concept under Bill 66 work, we're going to require the co-operation of those people. I don't think it should be something that's assumed. I think it's something that we as legislators should be asking of the members who will continue in the functioning of this new concept.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, this topic of course is of high interest to me, as it is to many if not all members of the Assembly. I am only going to speak for a minute or two, to indicate to the House that I'm certainly pleased that the minister has taken cognizance of the total approach for total health — meaning physical, mental, and social well-being — which I attempted to bring about through community health and social service centres in 1971 and thereafter. Just for the record, I would like to recognize that the minister certainly now recognizes the need for co-ordinated community services out of institutions; in other words, to de-institutionalize patients wherever possible. Number two, he recognizes the need for co-operation and co-ordination of auxiliary, active hospital patients, and nursing home patients with community facilities and services and three, that with such a total, co-ordinated approach with flexibility — which the minister has indicated — I am confident we will indeed have optimal care for the physical, mental, and social well-being of our communities in Alberta, at optimal dollar cost.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to add just a couple of comments to the debate. As a member of the Hospital Services Commission, I worked quite closely with the people in management and administration there. I think we should recognize that what is being done doesn't necessarily constitute a condemnation of the former commissions. I think the people involved at that level, having been invited to stay in the new department as it will be constituted, is the answer to the point made by the Member for Lethbridge West. The minister wants these people involved, has invited them to stay. The former chairman, of course, isn't staying in the department as directly as before, but in another area. New duties have been assigned to him. All of which indicates that we are not talking about people.

If the minister feels that departmentalization is the way to go, certainly that is the choice he should make. I think that any organization can stand to be reviewed. I think that any system can stand to be improved. The aim of what is being done now is to improve an operating system with the appointment of the new deputy minister.

I think that the minister is now ready to proceed and we can look forward to some very good things in the near future.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Chairman, the comments started with the hon. Member for Drayton Valley, who indicated he was hoping that some of these would start a new direction. The way I put it was that I think there is lots of evidence to demonstrate that we are at a turning point in hospital and medical care services and in health care generally, and that the challenge for all public leaders will be very simply to carefully manage the public dollars within citizen priorities. We won't be able to go back to the history of the last 20 years, where it's been an open cheque book and then the axe falling. We will have to carefully manage and develop quality in our services, also new responses, showing that the problem in health care is different than it's been historically. In that sense this is starting, and we are at a turning point in a new direction.

With respect to the question of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I would say that the change in the planning process, relative to the new department having responsibility for the functional program, is in response to the fact, as we travelled throughout the province, that more definitive parameters should be given to hospital boards from the beginning; not to design their facility totally, but to give them some parameters so we get away from this historical process. We find that boards and administrators are happy with this change. They don't feel they've had adequate guidance right from the beginning to develop a facility, and then all of a sudden it gets near the final design stage and the government comes crashing down and says, no, this is now far beyond what we can tolerate in cost. Granted, that's the way it has been done for many, many years. But we believe the time has come for the government to give the hospital community in Alberta, and nursing homes, more broad, definitive parameters in terms of what's reasonable, tolerable, and financially responsible as far as what the government will fund.

Of course that will be done right from the outset, in consultation with local boards and local communities

in terms of the need for services in that community. In other words, it won't be done in isolation. It will be done in consultation. But the responsibility for the development of the functional program in consultation with local communities will rest with the new department rather than with the local board.

"Categories" may be the wrong word, but I think the relationship between rural hospitals, larger centres in rural Alberta, and our very sophisticated, specialized facilities in urban Alberta will have to be developed in a very co-ordinated and concurrent way, if we're going to be effective in terms of the movement of patients between the different levels of care available in the province. To that degree it may be we have to categorize hospitals more in the future than we have in the past.

In answer to the question of the hon. Member for Little Bow, with respect to the two studies. For the information of hon. members, because it has been topical both in the spring and fall sittings and because the work had been done and presented to me, I have made a decision that the main recommendations of the two reports of officials will be implemented in the new department. Nevertheless it is an internal departmental organization document, and to that degree I am not prepared to release it publicly. I am prepared to state that I have endorsed the policies to be implemented, as I've indicated in the House today. It will take some time to implement the policies, as the hon. member would understand. So I would ask for his understanding: it will take some time to actually implement these new policies in the new department and during the period of reorganization.

MR. R. SPEAKER: [Inaudible] . . . extended policies.

MR. MINIELY: As soon as we have the mechanisms to deal with future construction proposals, we will communicate these policies to the boards right from the beginning. In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. Member for Little Bow, I will tell the Alberta Hospital Association and the hospital community that these kinds of procedures are coming, so they won't be caught by surprise. But the building in of the mechanisms, as I indicated, will require a control centre, also the strengthening of people. We will need more people to do the job effectively than we have had historically. That's something I'll have to deal with my colleagues on, in terms of budgetary support.

I simply want to compliment the hon. Member for Grande Prairie on his remarks and his perception of the broad view. I think it is difficult, particularly in an emotional area like health care, to defer decisions in the best interest of our province in the longer term and take the broad planning view. That's exactly what we've been attempting to do.

The hon. Member for Little Bow raised a question with respect to the functional plan. I think I have answered that question with respect to his earlier questions.

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West: while I want to make it clear that I firmly believe there should not be an arm's length organizational mechanism, either real or implied, in this largest area of public expenditure — and "implied" is an operative word too — that's no reflection on the outstanding job many people have done. I said in my opening remarks on

second reading of the bill that I believe the structure is not the right structure to meet the challenge now and for the future. But in no way is that critical of people. In fact I want to compliment the people on both commissions. With respect to the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission, in particular, I want to endorse the remarks by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, who sits on that commission. They have done an outstanding job in terms of the relationship with our citizens and the medical profession in billings back and forth.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway: yes, I've talked about belief in an approach to managing health care, concurrently with my colleague the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. It's based on priorities within a total health definition. I think that's going to be exceedingly important in the long term. The co-ordination of services on a total health basis, community and institutional, will be essential.

I would also compliment the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation. He chaired the nursing home policy review committee and has given me an interim report which is excellent. While the report isn't final yet, his contributions, as well as those of the hon. members for Lethbridge West and Grande Prairie, will be very helpful to me over the next number of months as we're trying to move in some of these policy areas.

Mr. Chairman, I think that answers all the questions.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, before we rush away, I would like to make one or two comments that I feel are significant and must be made relative to the concept at this time. I've made my statement with regard to that. A department of government, if administered correctly, can carry on the health care responsibilities of this province. The commission, if administered properly, in communication as it should have been, could have functioned properly with elected and ministerial responsibility. There is no question about that. The decision-making rested with the minister as a responsible person, and in turn with cabinet.

We considered how we would approach Bill 66 in committee. We first considered we would raise a number of questions with regard to various hospital issues across the province; hospital boards that have contacted us, people who have concern. But, Mr. Chairman, we felt at this point in time that we would have to ask the question. We felt the minister would have to go find out the answer from somebody, and we would just be going through a process of little value. We feel that the minister has not been on top of many of the grass-roots issues across this province. I raised the question with regard to Lethbridge yesterday. The minister was not aware of what was being considered, relative to the mental health programs in the Lethbridge municipal and St. Michael's hospitals.

We've had ample discussion with regard to the Cancer Centre in Calgary and the Health Sciences Centre in Edmonton. Answers were not available. The minister was not on top of the problems occurring at the regional or local board level. Mr. Chairman, we said, why ask questions? And at this point we made that decision. We feel there's nothing wrong with the concept of a department even in light

of that. The minister has stood before us today and outlined a plan called functional planning. We all know what that, as a management tool, is supposed to do and what it can do. We know it can facilitate communication and priority planning if used properly.

But the key to any kind of plan, Mr. Chairman, is the man who sits at the top and administers the program or the men who have the capability of giving good advice and direction, of being able to communicate with local hospital boards in determining what their priority needs are and how they relate to provincial priority needs. That is the key to the success of a health care program in this province, Mr. Chairman.

We've had presentations with regard to cost control and the new administration, the new efficiency, reports that we are going to do great things. They all sound just fine. I have gone back in *Hansard*, and I note the minister said in 1975 that he was going to come up with this new grand plan; 1976, exactly the same thing; 1977, here we stand today saying the province is going to establish priorities, cost control, and have this new plan for health delivery across the province. We are at exactly the same stage we were in 1975. The minister is unable to make decisions with regard to needs at the local hospital level.

In the interim we have done some things I just can't accept: one, we in this Assembly, through authorizing budgets, have built an insulation of social workers around the minister which has moved him away from professional people in the health care commission, and they could just as well have been departmental people. Whoever they were, they were servants of the government, servants of the people. We've built an insulation between that kind of advice that could have been to the minister and kept him fully aware.

I thought the prime example of that was when I raised the question the other day with regard to the initiation of work on the Calgary Cancer Centre. The minister knew the work. He must have talked to somebody outside this inner circle of insulation. He received good information and was taking his responsibility. I thought, maybe something is happening.

Well there's that insulation. At the same time the minister focuses on his internal responsibility with these people, and hospital boards across the province do not know the direction this government wants to go in health care. Millions of dollars are being spent and administered by local hospital boards, and they don't know why they are being faulted at this point in time, why they're being criticized, why this cost control is going on. They're trying to do a responsible job.

We freeze 13 hospital boards that were asked in earlier years to do something. They say, why is that happening to us? I guess it's because we have to wait for this grand plan. Well the minister has admitted here that it will take time before the plan is implemented. It will take time. At the same time, we've got people waiting at the doors of hospitals. I understand the mental health facility in Lethbridge is filled to capacity; Claresholm, filled to capacity; others across the province, the very same. Some practical things must be done. The minister should talk with these people and in the interim at least make some decisions. But that communication level has been broken.

So that's the second one: one between he and the

department; the second between he and the local hospital groups. It's one thing to have 400 meetings with them, but another to have some kind of decision-making that keeps the plan moving while this grand plan is in place. I'm not sure it will happen.

Such plans involve people. When you have people, you have difficulties administering things — making it run smoothly and priorities happening. That takes a skill in itself. Well, to this point in time we have no confidence that will be fulfilled under the present minister. We've waited since 1975 to have something positive come out; some good direction and easy decisions at the local level of government. It has not happened, Mr. Chairman, and we're not willing to accept that.

We're not going to vote against the act because of that; the act has some possibilities. We feel that if the Premier, in his assessment of the minister's responsibility, can either shuffle him to another portfolio, or otherwise, and bring in somebody who can administer that department, then the functional plan, the departmental plan, the needs at the local level, the dismissing of these people who are putting insulation around the minister can happen. What we want, as MLAs and representatives in our local districts, can happen in this whole health scheme.

I think it's unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that I have to stand in my place and say those kinds of things. But I'm concerned at this point in time that nothing's going to happen. I'm sure that in 1978 . . . [interjections] There might be some other people; we'll have a spring election prior to that. But in 1978 we're going to hear the same thing. We're waiting for the grand plan to be fulfilled. But at the same time, we have uneasiness at the local hospital board level, authority moving away from the local people, no decisions being made, and nothing but frustration. Mr. Chairman, that is an unfortunate thing.

I'm not criticizing the legislation. That's standard departmental legislation. It's how it's administered, the type of planning that's going into it, the hundreds of thousands of dollars the minister just asked for in additional staff. He's committing not only his colleagues but all of us to hundreds of thousands of dollars of additional staff.

What you have to ask is: what does that do to the red tape between the local government level and the minister? I'm concerned what will happen to that kind of thing. If we build in this whole thing, will we facilitate communication between the local hospital and the minister as such.

Mr. Chairman, those are my concerns, concerns of many people outside this Legislature, and concerns of many groups involved in the health delivery system who want to do a good job but don't know how to communicate with the government through the minister at the present time.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Chairman, I'm amazed the hon. Member for Little Bow would have the nerve to stand in his place and make the remarks and comments he has. I'm simply going to respond once, so that my response is on the record, and stand on the record.

But I want to begin by repeating what I said at the beginning of second reading of Bill 66. I quote what I said, which is accurate and on the record in *Hansard*:

Mr. Speaker, the former government's attempt to answer these questions was through what the

Leader of the Opposition cited this spring as a commission form of government. Upon assuming office the present government had little alternative but to continue to provide service under the existing or recommended structure. The official opposition's so-called commission form of government has been given a trial period and found to be wanting — beginning with initial questions posed by my predecessor the Hon. Neil Crawford.

In the spring session the hon. Member for Drumheller, Mr. Gordon Taylor . . .

This is what matters, in response to the hon. Member for Little Bow. A member of the same government . . . rather succinctly stated the major shortcomings . . .

It [the Hospital Commission] was done with the ulterior purpose in mind of getting the people off the shoulders of the minister . . .

Now is that Social Credit's idea of ministerial responsibility? It isn't my idea of ministerial responsibility — "getting the hospital done at arm's length". The hon. Member for Drumheller then went on to say "the minister has to be responsible". Well, that's what Bill 66 is all about, Mr. Chairman. You bet I take that responsibility.

But I have said in this House that the first step will be organization and accountability. Policy will be next. In my view the hon. Member for Little Bow has a lot of nerve getting up and making the comments he just made.

He talks about one more item I want to deal with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Time.

MR. MINIELY: He talked about items . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Our hour has passed. I'm afraid we have to move to the next item of business on the agenda.

MR. NOTLEY: Can we obtain unanimous consent to finish?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration Bill 66, begs to report progress, and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

1. Moved by Mr. Shaben:

Be it resolved that consideration be given by the government of Alberta to introduce legislation requiring oil companies and/or refiners operating in Alberta to bear

all costs of transporting gasoline and diesel fuel to vendors within the province of Alberta.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, my resolution has been on the Order Paper for some time. A number of people have approached me and there has been a certain amount of misunderstanding as to the intent of this resolution. I'd like to make it clear at the outset that the intention of the motion is not to interfere with the free enterprise system in the marketing of gasoline and diesel fuel within the province of Alberta.

Over the years, Albertans have been faced with and historically have been upset by unfair transportation costs as they relate to movement of goods east and west, and transportation is certainly a factor in gasoline prices across this province. In the realm of overall transportation concerns, all members of the House are familiar with the representations this government made to the Hall commission, asking for a rationalization of transportation costs in the province of Alberta and western Canada generally.

My resolution points to the same difficulty as it relates to gasoline pricing within the province. The wholesale, or dealer posted, tank wagon price, doesn't vary a great deal across western Canada. It doesn't vary any more than it does across the length and breadth of this province, and that's the problem I would like to address myself to.

The citizens of rural and northern Alberta are interested in joining the mainstream of the development and growth of this great province, and our government has addressed itself in many ways to decentralizing this growth, and encouraging development throughout the province. One of the difficulties that rural citizens face is the higher costs of gasoline and fuel away from the major urban centres. In some cases those costs are as high as 20, 25, almost 30 per cent different from Edmonton and Calgary. I realize the subject before us is not simple, and it's complicated by a number of factors including competition, dealer support programs offered by the oil companies, and the transportation component.

The question I've put to the Assembly, though, is to help reduce some of that differential by asking oil companies or refiners to develop one transportation zone for the province. At present, the zones are based on location of refineries, and the transportation component increases as you move further away from these refineries. An interesting case in point is that Calgary is a zone with pricing based on the fact that Calgary had a refinery. It's no longer operating and the great bulk of the fuel moving into Calgary comes out of Edmonton, but the Calgary consumer has the advantage of that zone pricing. In a sense we could say that the citizens of other parts of Alberta are subsidizing the cost of transportation of gasoline and diesel fuel into Calgary markets.

The effect of transportation costs being zoned on the basis of the entire province should move the pricing of gasoline toward uniform wholesale prices, posted tank wagon prices. I'd like to give you an example. In High Level, the posted dealer tank wagon price is over 7 cents higher than in Edmonton. That transportation component forms part of the price at the pump. I'm certainly not going to say that the entire differential in the price at the pumps in High Level is a result of differences in the transportation

component, but it's certainly a contributing factor. By moving in the direction of zoning the entire province, it could have the effect of substantially lowering the price of gasoline at the pumps in High Level, Hinton, High Prairie, and in the non-urban centres and the centres away from these zones.

There's no doubt we would still have the interplay of competition, which has a great bearing on the prices of gasoline and diesel fuel. Many members are aware that within the province most oil companies offer a dealer support program, ostensibly to allow their franchise dealers to meet the competition. The dealers are assured a minimum margin on their gasoline sales in order that they don't go under. That minimum support guaranteed by most oil companies is in the range of 5 cents a gallon for a self-serve station, and for full service stations it's in the neighborhood of 8 cents a gallon. So the effect of gasoline pricing, now mainly in the large urban centres, is to a great extent dictated by the dealer support program available in order that the dealers can respond to competition. This sort of situation rarely occurs in the small rural centres. As a result, you will see a difference in gasoline prices of 20, 25, 27 per cent, as I mentioned earlier. I realize that a great deal of this is a result of competition. But surely the members must wonder where the cost of that support goes. The cost of supporting this dealer support program is in the tens of millions of dollars. Those dollars are absorbed elsewhere by the consumers.

As I mentioned earlier, the situation in gasoline marketing is not simple. It's complicated by a number of factors I've mentioned — the transportation factor, the dealer support program — and I can visualize the difficulty the government would have controlling prices, either rack prices or wholesale prices. It would be very, very difficult. But in many ways the oil companies are doing things throughout Canada to maintain a fairly close level of pricing from one area to another. If one examines the pump prices in, say, Vancouver, Saskatoon, Regina, and Winnipeg, the differences between those prices and the prices consumers in Edmonton and Calgary are paying is minimal. I really have trouble understanding that, in view of the fact that the Alberta sales tax on gasoline is substantially lower. It's 7, 9, 10 cents, the lowest in Canada, yet in many cases the price differential in these urban centres may be a couple of cents. So I have difficulty understanding the pricing, although I do understand the dealer support program, and that cost to the oil companies of assuring the dealers' viability must be absorbed somewhere within the system.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one additional comment — and the effect of this is largely felt in rural Alberta. There are some small oil companies, other than the majors, which have had a beneficial effect on the small rural communities in moving in and pricing their gasoline at the pump lower than the giants in the oil and gas business. This has tended to lower the prices somewhat in rural centres, although all rural communities don't have the advantage of these small companies being located there.

So I would lay this matter before the members of the Assembly and repeat my request that the government consider establishing a single transportation zone for the entire province in order to allow rural communities a more reasonable price for their fuel

and gas, and to allow the policy of the government to decentralize, to move forward.

I look forward, Mr. Speaker, to listening to the contributions of the other members of the Assembly to this debate.

MR. KIDD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments on the motion by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I'm sorry, he's from Lesser Slave Lake.

DR. BUCK: The same political persuasion.

MR. KIDD: Mr. Speaker, it's a little confusing when an hon. member puts a motion on the Order Paper and then speaks about something else. I don't know too much about the rules of this Assembly, but I was tempted to rise on a point of order and ask what motion he was speaking on. Because it certainly isn't the one I read here. The one here says, and I think I can read it pretty clearly:

... consideration be given by the Government
... to introduce legislation requiring oil companies and/or refiners operating in Alberta to bear all cost of transporting gasoline and diesel fuel to vendors within the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is another instance of the attitude of some of our members — I hope not too many — and a lot of the public toward oil companies who say, they're making great profits and so, by golly, all we have to do is let them pay for transporting fuel to anyplace in Alberta and take it out of their profits.

Okay, let's talk about some of the facts. Now, do the hon. members know — maybe it would be good to state exactly what the situation is on a gallon of gasoline. Let's take April 1977, which isn't much different now. At a full service retail outlet in Edmonton, for instance, regular grade gasoline was selling for 78.9 cents. What made up that 78.9 cents? It was made up as follows: dealer's margin, 9 cents; provincial gasoline tax, 10 cents; federal sales and excise tax on gasoline, 14.9 cents. Mr. Speaker, if we're talking about relieving the price of gasoline, let's try to get that 10 cent excise tax that was imposed on everybody in this country on June 24, 1975, by the federal government.

DR. BUCK: And the provincial tax, Fred.

MR. KIDD: And the provincial tax. Let's speak about that in comparison. The provincial tax is by far the lowest of any province in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. BUCK: Well, take it off.

MR. KIDD: To carry on, I said the federal sales and excise tax was 14.9 cents. Provincial and federal royalties, and taxes paid by producers on crude oil, 17.5; the cost of crude oil, excluding royalties and taxes, 12.9 cents; and the oil companies' share to cover operating expenses and return on investment, 14.6 cents. What is that 14.6 cents comprised of? It must cover all costs of refining, inventories, working capital, distribution, sales, administration, credit cards, municipal taxes, corporate income taxes on refining, marketing of oil products, et cetera, plus a reasonable

rate of return on investment.

Let's take a look at the return on investment. Marketing and refining of oil has historically had a low return on investment. In one major oil company with which I am familiar, in only one year from 1966 to 1976 did they have over 6 per cent return on their investment. That is less than most other manufacturing industries.

So really when we talk about a gallon of gasoline, we've got 42.4 cents in taxes. The after-tax profit of the oil company I'm talking about — refining and marketing — approximated 2 cents on each dollar of sales, including direct product taxes. Although I don't really know what the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake suggested, if we go back to his motion, I think he suggested that the companies absorb 7 cents so he can have his gasoline at 7 cents less cost in Lesser Slave Lake. My figures indicate that you just can't stand 7 cents when you only make 2 cents on a dollar of sales.

So let's talk about some facts here. I think this motion is ridiculous; I think I have a great many more facts that will support it being ridiculous; and I think in the future all such motions as this should be left to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Thank you.

MR. PEACOCK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter this debate in an impromptu way, but I couldn't help but respond to the Member for Banff stating that the previous speaker from Lesser Slave Lake was speaking on a motion that he couldn't understand. It seems to me that what the Member for Lesser Slave Lake has suggested is a pretty fundamental, philosophical approach to what we in the province of Alberta have been looking at: that is, the decentralization, or uniformity we should say, of opportunity for all areas of the province to experience their particular skills and show their entrepreneurship in the development of their own areas.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody should be penalized for a location. Because a refinery happens to be located in northern, southern, or central Alberta, I don't think it gives them licence in any way to penalize the products that come from that particular refinery, in the movement and use of those products in the areas they're servicing.

I think there's a lot of precedent, Mr. Speaker, for a universal pricing policy. In the history of Canada rate areas in Montreal, Toronto, the areas around Toronto which are Hamilton, Peterborough, Belleville, have all been given a rate grouping area. In other words, they've defined those as the same rate to allow them equal economic freedoms and opportunities, and to make them competitive in moving from those areas into any point in western Canada. That's called a rate grouping.

I think manufacturers traditionally and historically in Canada and the United States have done the same thing in attempting to give equality to people who, by reason of location, are removed from the source of supply. I refer to tire, battery, accessories people; they have a common price all across Canada. It seems to me how they do this is a corporate responsibility on behalf of the refineries, rather than, as the resolution reads, an act of legislation. But surely the corporate responsibilities of the refiners in Alberta should be looking at a one-price zone rate for Alberta.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. PEACOCK: The reason, as I have suggested, is the precedent in the rail industry, the precedent in the manufacture of such products as tires and batteries, where we have the same price in Toronto as we do in Calgary or Edmonton, and the same price for accessories in Toronto or Montreal as in Calgary or Edmonton.

I think this has been brought about by the corporate responsibility of the manufacturers involved, who have understood that they are working at a disadvantage to apply a transportation charge just because a plant has been located at a spot different from the source of the product being used.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake, and this House, might see fit to draw to the attention of manufacturers involved in the province of Alberta that farm income, as has been mentioned here before, has not increased equal to that of some of our urban industries. If we relate farm income to the increases we've experienced in real estate, the automobile industry, and the hydrocarbon industry, we can rapidly realize that farm income and the farmers themselves, who are the users of these products, are paying the difference in this transportation charge and should be protected. For that reason I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there be a zone for all Alberta for hydrocarbon products.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a word or two on the resolution, too. I think the resolution might be called equalization of freight rates for gasoline and fuel oil, and as such it bears some resemblance to what we have been trying to get in Canada for freight rates across this nation. We don't think it's right that we should be at the apex of the freight rates, pay the highest freight rate out of anywhere in Canada, or that Nova Scotia should be somewhat similar but not quite so badly off. I'm not going to develop that, because I think every hon. member agrees that the Canadian government could, if it wanted to, find ways and means of equalizing those freight rates so the people of Alberta and our industries would not be penalized.

When we travel around Alberta and find the price of gasoline at the pumps different in one place to another, sometimes up to 10 and 12 cents, it leaves a very bad taste in the mouth, and you begin to think you're being gouged. The freight rates have something to do with it, and the market place has something to do with it, too. But until fairly recently, the city of Drumheller probably had the highest priced gasoline at the pump of almost anywhere in the province, which was very difficult to explain and to understand. The market place has looked after some of that but it's still very high — 5, 6, 7, 8 cents higher than 90 miles away in the city of Calgary.

I went into the Crowsnest Pass a year ago, and found I was paying 12 or 15 cents more than I had been paying west and east of that particular service station. I was so disgusted that I put two gallons in and went to the next service station where I saved 7 cents a gallon. That's the market place. What proportion of this is freight is difficult to understand. It

certainly stands to reason that if you haul gasoline 100 miles it's going to cost you more than if you haul it 5, 10, or 15 miles. If you're going to haul it 200 miles from the refinery it's going to cost more than if you only haul it 10 miles.

I think this is the thing many Albertans are now looking at when they travel, and they're travelling more and more by car across our province. As a matter of fact, I think the excellent tourist program now advanced by the Minister of Tourism will see Albertans travelling across this province from length to breadth, from east to west, in a way we've never before envisioned. I think that little enticement and reward will put the frosting on the cake, and many, many people will be travelling across Alberta. It would be nice if there were some equalization of gas as far as the freight rates are concerned, so it would then be the market place without taking into consideration those freight rates.

The question is, who is going to pay it? I think the resolution does leave a little bit of misunderstanding there. It says, the companies or refiners are "to bear all costs of transporting gasoline and diesel fuel to vendors". I suppose that could mean the total cost of transportation or freight would be totalled and an equalized rate set. I see the hon. mover of the resolution nodding his head, so it appears we're on the right track. I don't think that would be too bad. It might be a trifle more for those who are living very close to the refinery, and may meet with some resentment there, but it would be a tremendous boost for those who live a long way from the refinery. I think it would come into the category of helping other Albertans to appreciate the resources we have. I suppose it could also be done by government subsidy, but once a government starts subsidizing one thing, where do you stop? Do you subsidize everything? Equalization of freight could apply to practically everything in the province that moves.

Gasoline is used by almost everybody today. Almost every home has a car, truck, two cars, or a tractor; they're using fuel oil, gasoline, and diesel fuel. It seems to me that equalizing the price across Alberta, even within zones, would be a tremendous boost to travel in the province and make all the people of Alberta, those who live in the far reaches of the province, feel they belong, that they are not being asked to bear an unfair portion of the costs of operating a farm or their vehicles for business or for pleasure.

I think the resolution is worthy of looking into. There may be obstacles and ramifications. But if we can go even part way in getting some equalization of freight rates for gasoline and diesel fuel across the province, in addition to giving a tremendous benefit and boost to our own people — at least all who would receive the benefit, it's conceivable some wouldn't, some may have to pay a little more — but for all who receive the benefit, I think it would be a tremendous example to the Canadian government of what a government can do for the people. We might then be able to make greater advances on freight rates across the Dominion of Canada.

DR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, in responding to this motion by the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake, this government has a policy of decentralization to try to spread industry out to the smaller centres. But this

policy conducted by oil companies has the direct opposite effect. In actual fact at the moment the smaller centres are subsidizing places like Calgary and Edmonton.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. WALKER: The point-to-point pricing by oil companies is done in a zone system. I don't know how many zones there are, probably 12 or 14. This all had to be arranged between companies — Shell, Texaco, Esso, the whole lot. Some way or other they worked out a system where they could zone at least a dozen areas in the province. Yet they can't seem to work out an agreement to have one zone for the whole province. As the hon. Member for Calgary Currie said, this should be one whole zone.

The price of gas in Calgary and Edmonton, as of August this year, was 62.8 cents per tank load or whatever they call it. Now, in Saskatoon at the same time the price was 63.4 cents — an 0.6 cent difference. In other words, presumably it cost 0.6 cents to ship from Edmonton to Saskatoon. But it cost 3.4 cents to ship from Calgary to Fort Macleod, a distance of 100 miles. There's no refinery at Calgary any more, yet the price in Calgary is the same as in Edmonton, 200 miles away. It doesn't cost them anything to ship that little distance. So there are obviously a lot of inequities in the whole set-up.

Even in comparing the smaller towns, for instance, the wholesale cost to both Fort Macleod and Claresholm is approximately 59.5 cents. When you add the federal and provincial tax, the price to the dealer is 79.5 cents. In Fort Macleod it sells for 92 cents a gallon, which is about 13.4 cents profit. Then you go to Claresholm and find that . . .

MR. PLANCHE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There is in fact a refinery operating in Calgary.

AN HON. MEMBER: It's a restaurant.

DR. WALKER: The oil company I talked to today had closed theirs down two years ago.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, Gulf is still operating.

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the hon. member could intervene at a later stage. The refinery may be in order, but the intervention is not.

DR. WALKER: When we look at a lot of these figures, the little towns are marking up about 13 cents profit which isn't excessive. Then you look at Calgary, which buys at 62.8 cents and sells at 79.5 cents. I think that works out around 17 cents profit, yet they are still way, way cheaper. They can buy it cheaper retail than small towns can buy it wholesale.

The oil companies come along and say, if you reduce your price by 8 cents, we'll sell you the gas a bit cheaper. So they invoice them the same price and give them a cutback of 8 or 9 cents under the table, or whatever it is. So you get all these disparities between the small towns. There's no way to compare the cost of gas in one town with another, because there are so many different pricing set-ups whereby the oil companies guarantee a certain profit to a dealer, no matter what he sells it at in the price war,

or in other areas where they are in a marginal situation.

The hon. Member for Banff said the motion wasn't in order. But it is in order, because while we say in the motion to bear the total cost of transportation, that cost could easily be spread over the whole of Alberta for a difference of 1 or 2 cents a gallon. I'm not at all opposed to the oil companies making a profit while they're selling oil, but it shouldn't make the profit from the rural areas subsidize the cities. Perhaps it would be a good idea to remove the provincial sales tax on country-sold gasoline only and just leave it with the cities and put a wee bit of tax on them for a while.

The hon. Member for Drumheller mentioned the distance from the refinery. I think I've tried to make a point that this doesn't hold water at all when we start comparing prices across the province.

The whole thing boils down to some more equitable type of distribution. The two ways it can be done are: either the oil companies sit down and work it out, or, if that doesn't happen, government may have to interfere and say, get with it and do it, because the present system is very, very inequitable in every way. I would like to support this motion by the hon. Member for Slave Lake.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a few moments to participate in this debate, in support of the motion in general principle. I do so because I've had the opportunity during the past year or two to meet with the Medicine Hat group of the Automotive Retailers' Association. I don't pretend to know all the intricacies of the pricing system employed by the multinational oil companies and their relationship with their individual dealers.

I am impressed by the arguments put forward to me by the local businessmen who operate the little corner gas stations. When we talk about supporting private enterprise versus socialism, I think there is no doubt where I stand on that issue. I stand on the side of private enterprise. Some people have asked me which side of this motion I am going to speak on, the socialist side or the private enterprise side, presumably meaning that the mover of the motion, the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake, is on the socialist side. I don't think that's the case at all, Mr. Speaker. There are degrees of private enterprise. There's the individual entrepreneur who tries to serve the public by providing gasoline services on the corner. On the other hand, you have these very large organizations which expand their influence around the entire world, and they have been called multinational oil companies.

Well, Mr. Speaker, both these groups fit within the framework of private enterprise. It seems obvious to me that the one has a great deal of influence over the other. So I would like this afternoon, if I can, to state the case for the individual small businessman. We as legislators in this province should be interested in seeing not just that the multinational oil companies succeed and make a profit. They will. Does anyone question that? But what we should be concerned about is seeing that the individual entrepreneur, the small businessman, also has an opportunity of making a profit, no matter where he may be in the province of Alberta.

What we have today in Alberta is a zone system

with regard to the pricing of gas to the individual operator. I have had it urged upon me by the Medicine Hat branch of the Automotive Retailers' Association and by their provincial president that what we need to do is equalize tank wagon prices in Alberta. I think really that's the intent of the motion before the Assembly today. And I'm impressed by that argument. I'm impressed by the argument because it seems inequitable to me and to everyone else I know in my constituency of Medicine Hat-Redcliff that there is a difference of 8 cents a gallon between the city of Medicine Hat and the town of Redcliff, and the city of Calgary and the city of Edmonton. In addition — and why, no one can tell me — there's a difference between the city of Lethbridge and the city of Medicine Hat of 4 to 6 cents a gallon in the price of gas at the pumps. When I asked my friends and constituents, who are small businessmen trying to serve the public in Medicine Hat, why this differential exists, they say they don't really know, and they can't really find out from the companies they are dealing with and the companies from which they are buying the product which they sell on the retail market.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think there's something wrong when that exists. And I think we as legislators have a responsibility to discuss this matter in the public forum as we are doing today. Perhaps the exact terminology used in the motion may not suit some of the members, as has been raised today. But I think it gives us an opportunity to discuss this question in general.

A further suggestion has been made to me by the automotive retailers in my constituency that the multinational oil companies or parent companies get out of the retail business. Now perhaps that's straying too far from the intent of the motion. But I would suggest that there's a good deal of merit in that, because I think we really have a responsibility to encourage a private enterprise economy . . . The hon. Member for Clover Bar will have an opportunity, now that he has returned to his place, to rise and state his views on this subject. And I'm sure we're all waiting . . .

DR. BUCK: I thought I'd misheard something. I was just checking . . .

MR. HORSMAN: I see. Perhaps we agree on something for a change. But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there are members of this Assembly who have different backgrounds and we've heard expression of that point of view earlier today on this subject.

I would like to state the position I have tried to make that it's not just a question of seeing a profit made by the oil companies and/or refiners operating in Alberta. Certainly we want to see them make a profit. And profit to me is not a dirty word. It may be to the Member for Spirit River-Fairview; but to me it's a very essential ingredient of our private enterprise system.

MR. NOTLEY: Agreed. Right on.

MR. HORSMAN: But the same thing applies at the pumps. I suggest we have an obligation to examine this question. Perhaps we don't require legislation to bring about some equity in this field. Maybe all we need is some moral suasion in order to do that. Now,

there are members who suggest that these larger companies are not subject to moral suasion. However, I think we should try that approach first. I know that in certain fields there have been ministers of the Crown who through their departments have been most successful in applying moral suasion to these oil companies with respect to renewal and review of surface rights, leases, and that type of thing, and I applaud them for doing so. In most cases that has come about.

If I may digress, some time ago in this Assembly I raised the question of the attitude taken by a company known as Many Islands Pipe Lines Ltd. with regard to the review of surface rights compensations to the landowners. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview took an interest in this no doubt because of the fact that Many Islands Pipe Lines is solely owned by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Interestingly enough, they have now, after much reluctance, agreed to review those rates. For whatever reason that came about, I am indeed very grateful. However, I initially raised it in this Assembly, for whatever that's worth, I think that that type of moral suasion on these giant companies, such as Sask. Power can often be beneficial. I think we should try that because the day is coming, Mr. Speaker, when I think it will be very difficult for me to stand in Medicine Hat and try — I'm not going to try very hard — to justify an 8-cent-per-gallon differential in the price of gas at the pumps in Medicine Hat as opposed to what it is in Calgary and Edmonton. I would like the ministers who are directly involved in this matter to take a very good, hard look at this whole question.

So, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I disagree with the comments uttered in the Assembly this afternoon by the Member for Banff.

MR. KIDD: Are you speaking on this motion or another motion?

AN HON. MEMBER: He doesn't know.

MR. HORSMAN: Perhaps I should say this to him outside the Assembly, but it seems to me that we have to consider not just the position of making a profit from the point of view of the multinational oil companies. But let's look at the little guy on the corner too. Let's look at him and let's see if we can do something for him. Let's look at the user of gasoline in Medicine Hat and Redcliff and . . .

DR. BUCK: You'd make a good minister. You cover both sides, Jim.

MR. HORSMAN: . . . and Lethbridge, although Lethbridge has a better deal at the pumps than my constituents have.

This summer I had the occasion to be in Saskatchewan for part of my holidays.

DR. BUCK: The cost of living is cheaper.

MR. HORSMAN: Really, I was astonished to go into Prince Albert National Park and find gasoline selling at 53 cents per half gallon.

AN HON. MEMBER: A hell of a deal.

MR. HORSMAN: That's \$1.06 a gallon. I made an inquiry on that subject . . .

MR. DOWLING: Socialist Saskatchewan.

MR. HORSMAN: I made an inquiry on that subject, Mr. Speaker, and I was surprised to learn that despite what the hon. Member for Clover Bar says, the provincial sales tax is higher in Saskatchewan than it is in Alberta. I found that out, anyway.

DR. BUCK: A brilliant deduction, Jim.

MR. HORSMAN: I would think we can follow the lead given to the rest of Canada by the Minister of Transportation and take the same look at this question that we're taking at rail freight rates. I think the inequities that exist throughout Canada as far as rail freight rates are concerned really apply on the provincial level as well, as far as this question of transportation costs loaded onto people in outlying areas by the multinational oil companies is concerned, no doubt with a view to pleasing the greater populations in Edmonton and Calgary. But in this case I must speak on behalf of my constituents and urge the passage of this resolution.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words about the resolution. I want to congratulate the Member for Lesser Slave Lake for bringing the resolution to the Legislature. After all, this is the place where we should debate the differences of opinion we have on issues, and where we can get together and agree on certain issues.

I wasn't really impressed with the dissertation of the Member for Banff.

DR. BUCK: Same party, but just different sides of the House.

MR. COOKSON: He was probably flying a kite. When the member starts laying out the costs that go into a gallon of gasoline and takes off all the tax we have to have to operate the province, and ends up with 14 cents, or something, to cover all the capital costs, and that there's no profit or anything left, it reminds me of the farmer who started out with absolutely nothing. He worked hard for 40 years. He never paid one cent of income tax during all that time, because he had no profit. At the end of the 40 years he had a sale and walked out with a quarter of a million dollars.

I look at some of the large multinational corporations a little bit like this. You know, you can bury a lot of profit in a lot of paper, but it's there. These institutions grow, and more power to them. We need that kind of growth in order for them to expand, develop new areas; in this case, gas and oil fields, and so on.

It's a fact, though, Mr. Speaker, that powers tend to work against decentralization — and I'm talking about large multinationals now and, generally speaking, those that are in the profit picture of developing our province — which is really diametrically opposed to what we as a government are trying to do. If you understand the economics of the thing — the very fact that they have to make a profit, otherwise how are they to survive — in order to do that they have in many instances to consolidate, centralize in certain areas. It's the only way they recover costs. You can

talk about transportation, labor, cost of materials in outlying areas, and so on, and this is just a fact of life. One only has to look at the growth of the province, Member for Banff, to realize that those large corporations and other institutions developed throughout the province know this, and have in a sense developed on that basis.

The fact of the matter is that large corporations don't have a social conscience. That's the problem. And we as government have to direct them in this area. [interjections] We have to encourage them. Otherwise Imperial Oil wouldn't have pulled out of the hockey broadcasts. I really miss Imperial Oil doing the hockey broadcasts. They had a social conscience for a while. Then it sort of evaporated, because there was no profit in it. So I think we as government have to serve as their social conscience. And I don't confine this simply to — and I hope I can raise the Member for Sedgewick-Coronation off his seat — oil and gas companies. We can broaden the terms of reference and include large machine corporations, and I'm thinking in particular of agricultural production. The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation knows that you have to consolidate and centralize in order to be productive. I hope he'll be able to speak on that before our time runs out.

Anyway, we have a situation where we have the Calgary/Edmonton corridor. In the past much of the major growth has taken place through that particular area. Part of it is due to transportation costs. The oil and gas wasn't found in Edmonton or Calgary. It was found in a large number of areas that now have to pay the penalty because they don't live within that corridor. I think the hon. Member for Calgary Currie touched on this. The oil and gas didn't originate here, it originated out in Drayton Valley . . . Where's my friend from Drayton Valley?

AN HON. MEMBER: In the boondocks.

MR. COOKSON: . . . and out in the Bonnyville area, in the Lacombe area, in the Medicine Hat area, Turner Valley, and we can go on. That's where that resource originated. It seemed practical to pipe all that material into two or three central areas, refine it, and then through tokenism wheel a little bit back out to those areas and charge a little bit more because of the freight.

DR. BUCK: Don't forget, Manning put it in the ground, Jack.

MR. COOKSON: It's unfortunate we didn't locate the refineries out in those spots to begin with. So I have to stand in my place, defend the resolution, and hope that perhaps something can be resolved to balance out some inequities in transportation.

Mr. Speaker, government has to derive some method of counterbalancing the inequities suggested here today — the differences in the bulk-tank prices and so on — that are throughout the province. We do this in a number of ways, and I want to pat our own government on the back in this regard. Through our decentralization program we have been able to balance out some of these inequities so that everybody, not just particular areas, shares in the growth of Alberta.

I think I could spend all afternoon talking about the

growth of our smaller towns and villages, and the stabilization of the smaller industries throughout Alberta, simply because this government has given encouragement in a number of ways. We've done it through . . . Sorry about that. I have quite a bit to say yet, Mr. Speaker. I'll try to get to the key point of my delivery, then perhaps we can adjourn. People are getting hungry.

We have done this in the area of airport programs. I have to pat the Minister of Transportation on the back — I do that occasionally, Mr. Speaker — for the highway programs that he has developed. We have done that in agriculture by way of processing plants. We have developed the rural gas program. All these things help balance out what I feel is maybe an inequity in terms of transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we'll be able to continue these programs. If for some reason we can't make an adjustment directly through the oil companies, we can continue through our funding, and so on, to create orderly growth throughout the province, so that everyone enjoys our resources.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the balance of the debate this afternoon.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, some of the reasoning I have been listening to here this afternoon is as garbled as the motion itself. I'm just amazed. You put a heading on a motion and then you don't talk about it. But then whatever you do talk about makes even less sense. To listen to the discussion here this afternoon, you would think that all the little service stations are out in Medicine Hat or Macleod, when in fact there are just as many in Edmonton and Calgary. So what are we talking about the little operators for; that hasn't anything to do with this motion. The pricing structure you're talking about — some of these things are leaving me cold. You'd think that all the poor people live in Special Area 4 and all the rich people live in Edmonton, and I can assure you that I see some pretty fancy shiny cars coming out of Special Area 4, and I don't really think those people want to be looked upon as poor cousins.

Now, I'm not making any political hay on this, I'll assure you, Mr. Speaker. The member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff said, well I'm going to say it because it sounds good in Medicine Hat. My constituency isn't listening very closely right now. [laughter] But I want to suggest this to you that when we talk about inequities — when somebody decides to move to High Level, why does he do that? Take a look at land values in Red Deer at \$500 an acre, and it doesn't produce any more than land at High Level at \$100 an acre. I'm suggesting the cost benefits have to be weighed. If I can sell my land at Red Deer for 500 bucks an acre and I move to High Level and buy it back at \$100, I guess I can afford to pay a little more for the gasoline that runs the equipment to run that place. These are the kinds of things we talk about: why does a gallon of gasoline have to be so high here and so low there? There's such a thing as volume. You could make a dollar on one gallon of gasoline and still starve. You might make 7 cents on a gallon of gasoline and get rich. There are so many factors here.

I remember a fellow sitting in my office one day selling a customer of mine some shares in what was called Victoria Mines in B.C. He wrote out a cheque

for 500 bucks and said, isn't this great, the price of silver is up and the indicators are it's going to go higher; I think I just made a great buy. But Victoria Mines never did move. In fact they disappeared, even though the assessment showed the silver was there. What he found out, of course, was that this mountain was isolated. While the silver was there and you could dig it out, you couldn't get it out of there because the cost of transportation would kill you. So his cheap purchase of shares didn't mean anything.

Location has a great deal to do with setting up price and cost structures. Now, we're just going to talk about the biggest project ever; as I hear it, \$10 billion to build a pipeline from somewhere to somewhere else. Is the price of the gas going in one end to be the same as the price coming out of the other end after you spend \$10 billion to build this thing? It simply doesn't make sense.

I sell equipment. The Member for Lacombe said I should be interested in this equalization thing. Sure, I had the minister from Peace River come down and buy a piece of equipment that weighed about 14 ton. After we agreed on the price he said, that'll be delivered, of course. I suggested to him that for another \$650 it would be delivered. That doesn't increase the value of that machine at all, but because it's here and it has to be taken over there, somebody has to pay some money.

So, Mr. Speaker, this thing leaves me cold. As a matter of fact I'm sitting right in front of what I thought was the free enterprise member from — I'm not sure now whether it's Spirit River or Lesser Slave Lake. [laughter] I think it's time this session was over, because the debate is going all over the place. I don't know whether I dare sit with my back to you from now on. It seems to me that if this government can support this kind of motion, maybe the Member for Lesser Slave Lake who proposed it could rush out and buy 69 black shirts and we'll start wearing them.

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, in view of the time, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree to the motion by the hon. minister to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, insofar as we'll be in Committee of Supply at 8 o'clock, perhaps you could ask leave of the Assembly to have the House be in that condition.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree that when the hon. members reconvene at 8 o'clock they will be in Committee of Supply?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The House stand adjourned until the Committee of Supply rises and reports.

[The House recessed at 5:32 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.

Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure (A) 1977-78

Department of Education

MR. CHAIRMAN: For your information, I will read first. Previous Estimates Voted, Main Estimates: \$3,329,133,077; Supplementary Estimates (A): \$130,000,000; Total Estimates to Date: \$3,459,133,077. We are not required to vote on that.

If you will turn to page 4, Financial Assistance to Schools: \$548,035,000; This Supplementary Estimate: \$130,000,000; Total: \$678,035,000. Are you ready for the question?

Agreed to:

2.1.1—Provincial Contribution to the
School Foundation Program Fund (SFPF) \$130,000,000

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee of Supply rise and report.

[Motion carried]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I gather the Speaker is unavoidably detained very briefly at an important function. In order that a report be made, I would suggest that the Member for Lacombe, Mr. Cookson, take the place of acting Speaker at this moment and that, Mr. Chairman, you report to him. He can put the motion to the Assembly with respect to the supplementary estimate just passed.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Mr. Cookson in the Chair]

DR. MCCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration a certain resolution and reports the same.

Resolved that a further sum not exceeding \$130 million be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1978, to supplement Vote 2, being the financial assistance to schools program under the Department of Education.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the Assembly accept the report?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

2. Moved by Mr. Koziak:

Be it resolved that this Legislature assess the goals and

objectives for elementary and secondary education and consider the priorities to be attributed to those goals and objectives.

[Adjourned debate May 16: Mr. Kidd]

MR. KIDD: It's with a great deal of humility that I rise to speak on the motion. Before me we've had speakers who have a great deal of background in education and a great deal of real in-depth knowledge. However, as a parent who has raised some children and as one who speaks for my constituents, I think it's proper that I do say something.

As a professional engineer, I make certain analogies between this debate and a debate that would be based on discussing a professional group such as engineers, because I really sincerely believe that teachers are professionals. Therefore I would like to make it clear that, as a layman, the comments I make are in the context that I sincerely appreciate the dedication, the knowledge, and the contribution that the great majority of our teachers have made to this province. That's the context in which I make my remarks.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

We have had a great proliferation of literature on education, and I think we've all read some of the very important comments that have been made. I refer to The Goals of Basic Education for Alberta, prepared and submitted by the Curriculum Policies Board on September 2, 1977, a very important contribution; also a submission to the Minister of Education of the province Alberta by the Alberta Teachers' Association on May 12, 1977. I think those are very important background documents.

However, I guess I just have to make my comments right from the heart, representing my constituency. I have done that. I've discussed with a great number of my constituents what they feel about education. We talk about the three Rs and that's very important, but I think it's a little outdated. In all my discussions I think I could almost talk about the three Cs. Number one is communication; that is reading, writing, and viewing — viewing gives me a little problem. But there's no question about it, in this modern day and age a great deal of the education we and our children get is by viewing. So I have that as my number one C, and I have three Cs. I really have five Cs, and one is science. I don't know whether we can put that in as a C or not. But here are the five Cs I have.

What I'm really doing here in my discussion is going to the end product right now and saying what I would like my son or daughter to have as the end product, the basic skeleton as the end product. And the basic skeleton as the end product — my own feelings, but modified somewhat in my discussions — is really the four Cs and one S. They come out this way. Communications: the ability to read and write. Computation: I don't think we can fail to have some knowledge of computation. We have to have some knowledge of mathematics, how to add and so on. I'll say a little more about that. Let me just sort of flesh out a framework to start with.

The third one is citizenship, and citizenship involves a knowledge of history, a knowledge of the great heritage that we have in this country. There is no

way you can understand citizenship without the background of history and of our political institutions.

The next one I'd have is culture. I think an understanding of something more than just adding one and two is important. You know when we all listen to a great opera, to wonderful music, to great talent, or we see a ballet — God bless us, we must be stirred. There is something there that stirs us up to much more than just the dull, mundane aspects of being an engineer, if you like.

The other one I'd flesh out is science. I think the person who is graduating from grade 12, your or my child, must have some basic framework of science. In that basic framework I don't think they need to know in detail all the great, very scientific aspects of it. But you know when Newton sat under that tree and saw that apple fall, something happened to him. He developed the law of gravity. When you get teachers such as Einstein who transmit that great thrill of the basic ideas of science — the fact that mass has energy, and the idea that when a man flies to the moon and comes back he is a little younger than when he left. Did you know that? That's exactly what happens. He is a little younger than when he left. Those concepts, that great thrilling concept of education . . . Gee, I'm getting carried away here. Am I doing all right? [laughter]

AN HON. MEMBER: Carry on.

MR. KIDD: Again, in talking to my constituents, to my wife, to my relatives, and to everyone I've talked to, a great important aspect of education is the kind of teachers my children have had. Some of those teachers just uplift the children. There is no question about it, that is the number one thing.

If you go to rural or urban communities, the quality of education that children get is so much related to the quality of those teachers. With all due respect, it seems to me that somehow, perhaps because we have bigger schools — maybe that's an aspect of it — perhaps because we as parents think we know so much more, but the aspect of teachers having a greatly respected position in the community has been diminished somewhat.

I've also said that I respect the dedication of teachers, and I say this with due respect: perhaps The Alberta Teachers' Association might in some way change their concentration — and I think they are doing it — from the aspects of more salary to the aspects of professionalism in the profession of teaching. It's a tough one, I know. But the respect of teachers by the parents has been lost somehow. We must get it back.

Here's one thing I'd like to say: in industry over the years one thing has happened. It's happened in every industry I know of. That is that progress is not just to become a manager, just to become some one who supervises. All intelligent industries have had other levels of achievement than just being managers. I think this is not a new idea. I know the people who know about teaching know this has been tried. But to get ahead in the teaching profession now, you become a principal. I think good teachers make good principals. But I don't think it's necessarily so that good principals have to be good teachers.

I'm suggesting then that you have a level of master teachers — or some good word — as in industry, and

that those teachers are respected for their ability as teachers and are paid accordingly. We have so many fantastic principals. The only way they can get ahead is to be a principal, the only way they get more salary is to be a principal. But if they had a choice — don't stop them from having a choice — and could be a master teacher or professional teacher or something else, they would accept being a professional teacher at a good salary, a salary that is commensurate with what they would be as a teacher. I think that has to be looked at. One of the things that held it back is there hasn't been funding for that sort of thing. I think we as a province have to look toward funding that sort of thing so we have these really good people having the choice of going on to be supervisors or going on to be real professionals. In the teaching profession they're way behind, because that's happened in industry over the years. That's a thought I just put forth.

A few other things — because I know there's a great number of people who want to talk and have a great deal more to contribute than I have on this. I'd just like to sum up a little, because I'm not a long talker. I guess when I said the four Cs and the one S, that's the basic framework. I'll say it again: communications, that comes up top flight; computation, you've got to do that. When I say citizenship, culture, and science, I really don't think you can make them disparate. They have to go together. That's the great thing about logic. When you talk about communicating, when you talk about talking and about logic and saying things logically, I think the great science of mathematics contributes to that logic. So they fit together.

I don't want to be critical, but when I look at the goals of basic education for Alberta I have a great deal of trouble separating in my mind schooling from education. I think it's a worthy attempt. But I have a great deal of trouble separating them. Because when they talk about citizenship — and that's what they talk about in the goals of schooling, and they say it quite rightly — citizenship is from the school, from the family; you can't separate them. Again I come back to the teacher. As to citizenship, the teacher says what he can but he must set an example.

To sum up, the number one thing I see for education — and my God if you can do this you have the whole thing won: if you turn out a boy or a girl from grade 12 and through that whole process they're imbued with a desire to learn more, to go on and learn, boy, have you got an educated person. That's number one for me, without any question.

Secondly, on balance — you know departmental examinations are something that have been discussed. I have mixed emotions about examinations. I have two daughters. One studies, works hard, and passes exams because she has worked hard and knows the subject. The other one — at 10 o'clock at night she gets out her textbook and, having a photographic memory, by 2 o'clock in the morning she memorizes that thing from A to Z. In the morning she goes in, writes, and gets a much higher mark than my other daughter. Two days later she doesn't know a damn thing! I think we have to have some guidelines along the way. I really believe we need examinations, but certainly I'd say only 50 per cent. You have to have some background of real knowledge of what this kid knows, not just test him in an exam.

Thirdly, I really believe the teaching profession should carefully examine those factors which have decreased its respected position in the public view. I say that without being critical.

The fourth one is: we've had good discussions in this Legislature, and we will have more. They're very important. But, again, going back to industry, let's work toward a general agreement on the curriculum. Let's then take off from there, have stability and go ahead.

Five: I support adequate funding of education in Alberta as a clear priority item.

Mr. Speaker, the sixth one is: let's all agree that we're working towards improvement in our present excellent education system in Alberta.

Thank you, sir.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, that's a pretty tough act to follow, but I'm going to try my best. May I congratulate the minister for moving this motion in this Assembly. The majority of my constituents are certainly behind the minister, and encourage him on to the goals and objectives in the education of Alberta's greatest natural resource, our school children.

Mr. Speaker, in assessing our education needs for the future and in order to make our priorities work through the education system, we must realize there will always be need for review in certain areas. I would like tonight to speak on one aspect of the total education system, the area of special education, an area of an overall tremendous program of funding teachers to teach in this field.

Mr. Speaker, expenditures by the Department of Education on special education in all school divisions, counties, and districts amounted to \$18 million in 1975, compared to total expenditures in all areas of education of \$619 million. This means that the department spent 3.3 per cent of its budget in special education.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to outline the school foundation program regulations, which set out the formula for paying parents who provide the transportation for their children to special education schools. This is taken from The School Act, Section 8: where a parent and a board enter into a contract under Section 157 of the act, the board shall be paid the rate approved by the board for payment to a parent, but not exceeding the lesser of 33 cents a mile between eligible transportation pupil residence and school or bus route and — here comes the hooker — or \$3.25 maximum per day for each day and for each district to which the parent provides transportation for an eligible transported pupil.

Mr. Speaker, we have the situation in the Camrose constituency where the parents of two mentally handicapped children have to travel 38 miles both ways, from where they live to Camrose, twice a day, in order to take these children to the opportunity classes provided in the city of Camrose. This makes approximately 76 miles per day, but according to the regulations I just read they are only paid \$3.25 per day for the transportation of their children. A civil servant in Alberta travelling on government business gets paid 22 cents per mile. Going on this rate, the parents would receive \$16.73 per day for the transportation of their children. Instead, they are getting one-fifth of the amount a civil servant gets.

Mr. Speaker, we can argue that parents have some

financial responsibility to their mentally handicapped children, but we can equally argue that the parents of a mentally handicapped child have certainly experienced a considerable hardship. Being a parent of a mentally retarded child, a handicapped child, takes total involvement from morning to night. In the case of the two families mentioned, if their children were evaluated as mentally retarded the Department of Social Services would take over and supply absolutely free transportation by taxi from their doorstep to the school and back again. If the parents of the two children were eligible for welfare, transportation would be subsidized. If the children were handicapped, again social assistance would take over. But, Mr. Speaker, the two kiddies mentioned live in rural Alberta, not in our large cities where transportation is not a financial burden. In the case of the two parents mentioned, and I suspect many more parents throughout rural Alberta, I wonder if the Department of Education fully realizes the financial burden the \$3.25 has caused some of our citizens. Has the minister ever realized what it's like living in the boondocks, as an hon. member indicated in this Assembly?

Like all young married couples in debt, paying for a home and other necessities, the wife is unable to seek a job to subsidize their income because of her responsibilities of driving their child 100 miles per day to school. The husband is using the only car they have in his employment and has to go into debt to purchase a second car for their mentally handicapped child's schooling, all on the allowance of \$3.25 a day.

Mr. Speaker, I would recommend that The School Act be amended. As the act presently stands, school is mandatory for all children except those who cannot be accommodated by the system. For example, the responsibility of the school board to a child with learning difficulties ends when a child is referred from the regular school to a special school outside the system. Examples are the Evelyn Unger School or the Winnifred Stewart School. If for some reason the child cannot continue at this special school, the school board is not responsible for placing the child in another special school. As well, the Department of Education gives these special schools unconditional financial grants. Therefore, neither the department nor the school board has any control over the use of this money, the quality of these schools, or the qualifications of the teachers.

Mr. Speaker, some children are presently being driven as far as 50 miles because their district schools do not have programs which can accommodate their disabilities. Obviously these children do not have the same rights as normal children. However, there is no reason in the world why children with learning disabilities should not have the same rights to education as everyone else.

Thank you.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to rise this evening and say a few words about the resolution presented to the Legislature in the spring of '77, to assess goals and objectives for elementary and secondary education and to consider priorities to be attributed to those goals and objectives.

I've taken the opportunity to read some of the speeches given earlier in the year and to review some of the comments that have been made. Through the

summer I've had an opportunity to discuss with some of my people some of the concerns they have. I've also had an opportunity to read some of the correspondence between the minister and through the professional body of The Alberta Teachers' Association, the school trustees.

I would like to say generally about the goals and objectives: aside from the follow-up, to me it's important to the public that we as representatives of the people set the tone for our school system. I say this because of the tremendous investment in education the people of Alberta have through us as legislators. For example, statistics show that in '75-'76 this province spent over \$600 million in education. We just presented a bill this evening for the figure for '77, with a further \$130 million to recover losses because of inconsistencies in the year-ends. The investment involves over 450,000 students in the province, which I think works out to something like \$1,400 per student per year and involves over 22,000 teachers. In looking at the provincial budget, I would suggest that this is probably one of three major expenditures by the province, with a tremendous potential in terms of what happens after the funding is expended.

To me education is big business. What comes out of our school system is really a reflection of what the electorate wishes. I underline that education must be the result of input from teachers, parents, superintendents, and school trustees. It can't be one or two; it's part of all that. In the debate I didn't seem to pick up this general comment.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that I reflect the views of my people. Those of you who know me well will forgive me if I incorporate a few fairly frank remarks of my own that I think tend to bridge the gap — if I may put it that way — between parents, the general public, and the teachers.

First, despite the fact that the Legislature is paramount, I'm convinced that unless we get total co-operation among these bodies — parents, parental organizations, teachers, teacher organizations, trustees and their organizations — precious little will be accomplished in making any general shift in education. I say this in all sincerity. I would also add one other large body, Mr. Minister, and that is the Department of Education. Following this discussion, it is extremely important, based on my feeling as a representative of the people, and all the legislators here, that we have to give positive direction. We can't be distracted by factors over which we may or may not have any control. It's important that we go through the process and come down firmly with the kind of position I would like to see us take in the way of direction.

In the area of goals, and I say this in sincerity, I believe the private schools have been a method of adjusting to some of the weaknesses of both our public and separate school systems. My experience has been largely with the public system, so perhaps I shouldn't speak for the other. But in general they may have some of the same weaknesses. In this respect I am a supporter of private schools, without getting into some of the weaknesses of private schools. I can only say that in the smaller private schools, parents and teachers, particularly parents, will set down the goals of education. They will also set down the goals for teachers. This may be a form of rough justice for some, but it seems to work.

Therein I perhaps underline the difference between the large — I think the Member for Banff touched on this — impersonal kind of thing that we now know as our central school system, and some of the more private types of schools on a smaller scale, where parents, teachers, and pupils are far more intimate and closely tied to the responsibilities they face. I would say this: in the case of our private schools it involves commitment both in time and finance on the part of parents and this may, to some degree, be lacking in our larger impersonalized school systems.

I have said that goals and objectives of education cannot be determined without pretty deep deliberation and total support by all involved. Young people are quick to see the shallowness and inconsistency of our adult world. Perhaps, Mr. Minister, I can touch on just a few examples in relation to some of the goals which have already been expressed as important, and I don't take this away from the worthy objectives.

One suggested goal is to develop "an interest in participating in the cultural pursuits of creative expression and appreciation". Then I visualize that student going home and watching, for perhaps three hours, the Archie Bunker type shows we often see on television.

Another suggested goal is to develop "skills for effective utilization of . . . leisure time". I find this perhaps a little difficult for the student who has to ride a bus 30 miles or more and is faced both night and morning with the daily chores, which may involve milking a large number of cows throughout the school year, and resides possibly 30 or 40 miles from the nearest recreational complex. I think this has been touched on too as one of the problems some of our students face.

Another goal suggested is to develop "a sense of community responsibility which embraces [responsibility] for law and authority, public and private property, and the rights of others". Then I visualize a local strike by teachers which causes layoff of bus drivers and supportive staff. I ask myself how the adult world can attempt to project these kinds of goals and objectives to our young people if we ourselves aren't a part of them or don't support them in our own world.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, and take a number of the suggested goals and perhaps be critical of them. I don't think that is my intent. I wouldn't continue then to emasculate the goals of schools and education. But I just want to make that point and to further substantiate and support the case that many of our young people are growing up with a rather cynical view of the adult world, and that all of us — again I say schools, the parents, trustees, superintendents, legislators, and the church is involved in this too — must participate and be a part of it if we're going to work for these lofty goals.

By and large, Mr. Speaker, I think our school system has done a good job, but the gap between school and the parent continues to exist. I think the Member for Banff touched on this. I personally believe that educators could enhance their image, and I'm suggesting that we should maybe look at the type of situation which occurs in the case of our people in the medical profession. They have both the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Medical Association. I think probably a division of the negotiating part from the actual professional beliefs and

code of teachers would be, perhaps, a good move. I think in some of the literature I have read some consideration is being given to this.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should be looking at granting more authority to the teaching body with regard to disciplining their own members. There simply has to be a better way of dealing with incompetency in the classroom. In saying this I don't want to take anything away from the very capable, dedicated teachers whom all of us were exposed to during the history of our educational process. In fact it's highly likely many of us wouldn't be in this Legislature today if it wasn't for the capable instruction we received in the school system.

I simply say there is no room for incompetency in the classroom. The risk is far too great in terms of the numbers of young people who have to pass through those classrooms. A better way has to be determined to improve the image of our teachers; some way found to do it, through screening or perhaps giving them more authority in terms of disciplining.

I think it's important that we as legislators define the goals of schooling and education. Whether these goals are in a certain order may be pretty fine tooling. I notice in some of the correspondence, Mr. Minister, there is some criticism of separating the goals of schools from the goals of education. Perhaps my theme is that they both work together, therefore separating them is not the easiest process. In terms of priority, perhaps it is fine tooling. I don't think it's that important, but it's important that they be stated.

If I read correctly what everyone is saying, I conclude everyone wants to get back to the basics. I also conclude not everyone means the same thing by this phrase. For example, as a trustee I well remember debating the removal of the music program in our schools. Because of budget constraints we had to do this. Many of our trustees at the time argued that that was a very important program in terms of our schooling system. At one time we debated, for example, what value courses in agricultural mechanics, shop courses, had.

I think those of us who are parents and have had the opportunity to have had children in these courses will realize they have extreme value for certain young people. Where one might come home bright-eyed and bushy-tailed about the time he spent in the shop that afternoon, setting and adjusting the brakes on some car; another one might come home and be just as excited about their work with regard to Shakespeare.

I guess what I'm saying in terms of basics is that I don't think, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Minister, we should ever revert to that narrow tunnel concept of the '50s, where the only successful student was an academic student and the rest were failures. We've come a long way. The federal government helped us in those vocational courses. I'm sure parents would really be upset, and I know teachers would, if we were to develop tunnel vision again and say, well you have to pass these academics and so on because university is the next approach, and we know that only 5 or 10 per cent of our young people will achieve this goal.

I think we can argue that perhaps we've had too much proliferation of courses and that we have to take another look at that. Proliferation of courses creates problems other than just the fact there may

not be teachers qualified to instruct. It's a cost factor, and in our smaller schools where you don't have the facilities it's a physical plant problem. Certainly it's a cost factor, because you end up with smaller numbers of students per teacher and this to some degree becomes a cost item. In this respect we're doing not too badly on balance in that area, in my observations. I think we can get support for that.

Has the system deteriorated in quality? I think most parents and many teachers will say yes. If you ask them why, the answers range from "teachers don't care" to "parents don't care". Neither response suffices. As administrators of the large education funding, we must determine whether we really have slipped in terms of quality education. In this respect, Mr. Minister, I would commend the approach you're taking with regard to evaluation of our educational system. I await with considerable interest the results we will determine from our examinations throughout the system.

In conclusion I'd like to say this, Mr. Speaker. In general there's no easy way through life. We all are subject at one time or another to tests of some type or another. We went through that period when there was considerable criticism of those standard, stereotyped exams that came from the Department of Education. We had the Dr. Worth report on education. We had the kind of criticisms that Susie came home with an upset stomach and little Johnny is close to a nervous breakdown and so on from having to face those exams. But I can suggest that if we aren't able to cope with those exams at some time in our life, we're going to have real trouble trying to cope with life. We have to face up to some kind of standards.

In conclusion I would suggest that we can improve our system. We have a good system. Hopefully I've offered some constructive suggestions as to the way in which we can do it. We have to have courage to do some of these things. I think our government has shown this in the past. I hope we will come back to some kind of examination. Perhaps, Mr. Minister, this doesn't have to be left until secondary school. Perhaps little Susie should have an exam. You know, those exams did one of two things. They not only tested the student but they also tested the teacher, and that's extremely important.

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I also want to rise and say a few words in regard to education. As I see it, we've never been better off. We've never had better trained teachers or better facilities, yet together we're somehow slipping in education. To solve this problem I think we will have to work together toward that goal of solving it by better standards, by setting better examples ourselves, and preparing our young people for better lives.

We can talk about the three Rs, getting back to the basic skills, goals of education. You can really play with words in the English language. I can speak five of them, and a little bit of English, and I certainly see it that way — speak for about two or three hours and not say very much.

But the way I look at the three Rs, I look possibly at the three living Rs: respect, something you don't buy but must earn; then rights, which we hear very much about today. Everybody wants rights, but with these rights you have to have responsibility. That's what is lacking in our society today. We're setting a very bad

example, even in our courts, in discipline in schools and homes. To cite one example in our courts: a student may do something wrong and he goes to juvenile court. The first thing the lawyer will say is don't plead guilty, though you are guilty I'll get you off. Now what are you telling a young person — that you must not say the truth to maybe succeed?

Education cannot be solved just in classrooms. I think a lot of it, most of it, has to be done at home. We are lacking in discipline. I don't think you can blame the society and the environment, or the church, or the community. That responsibility has to lie with the father and mother. I am convinced that we have excellent teachers. But our teachers too are frustrated and possibly even sick with the system they have to teach under. Authority and responsibility have been removed from them. They begin to question if the principal, or the administration, or even the trustees will back them. Sometimes the best way is to take the easiest way out, and a lot of them are doing that. We can't blame anybody but ourselves. As I mentioned before, when we threw away discipline we also threw away respect.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be a member of this Assembly, and I am very happy that our Minister of Education is looking into the area of education to improve the education system.

I think it has to be said on getting back to the basics — a lot of our schools are teaching the three Rs, many of them aren't — but I honestly believe that until we ourselves start displaying examples as adults . . . I feel that sometimes our young people are setting a better example in society today than adults are. Maybe all these things are because we've never had more, yet in quality of life we've never had less. The reason for that is that our family units are not as close together as they were at one time. Yes, I remember that day very well, when we used to have family Christmases. The family would be together, listening to one another, respecting one another. Today — well what's the use of getting down there anyway, I think I'm going to go to Honolulu, or Europe somewhere. At that time, when maybe we didn't have very much in dollars or material, we had a lot in life, enjoyment, and enjoying one another. I think we did, at least that's the way I see it, not only as a father who has raised two sons but, as well, working around our education system. I can see a great display of concern that children do want discipline and are looking for discipline. It is most frustrating when I sit as a witness in a courtroom — why, I even hear a judge say, I don't want to hear any more; I've made up my mind, but go ahead anyway. So our examples, as I see them, are not very good.

Therefore, to resolve this problem, I don't think there are miracles or super people. I don't think you have to be an engineer to be successful in life. Do you need to be a doctor? I think you can be successful and happy by being a good tradesman. I don't care what skill or work it may be. It may be only picking papers on the street, or working with a pick and shovel. Somebody has to do that work, and that somebody is a father or a mother who probably has daughters and sons at home. I don't think getting degrees is the answer, but by bringing respect and responsibility, not only to our education system but to our society in general.

I was very, very glad to take part in this debate. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I'm also pleased to have the opportunity to participate in this debate tonight. I feel the way I think most members in this House do, that the education of our young people is of paramount importance to Alberta society. Personally, I'm quite happy with the document entitled *The Goals of Basic Education For Alberta*. While I've also heard some criticisms of the document, perhaps from the standpoint that it's not specific enough, having read it over a few times personally and giving it considerable thought I doubt that such a statement of goals and objectives should really be more specific. I think it would be difficult and perhaps even dangerous to attempt to [rank] the items enumerated in this report. While we've had goals in Alberta for many years, I nevertheless think it's important for us to reassess these from time to time, particularly in an era such as we have today where knowledge is expanding in an exponential way. It's going to be necessary for us to pause and reassess our goals more often as time goes by.

I think, in fact I'm sure a lot of members of this Assembly have given a lot of thought to this subject since it was first raised in the throne speech last spring. I know I have talked to a lot of students, teachers, parents, and many people throughout my constituency. I have to admit that as a result of the exercise of talking to many people and thinking about the subject, my views have changed considerably over the past several months.

With regard to basics I'd like to talk about just two items, basics and perhaps examinations. Although I'm a product of the Ontario school system, I really doubt that there is much fundamental difference between our two systems. I suspect a one-room country school in northwestern Ontario wasn't all that different from a one-room country school in rural Alberta. I know from experience in working with many engineers, training many young engineers, that whether they graduate from the University of Toronto, the University of Alberta, the University of British Columbia, or Nova Scotia Tech, engineers are relatively indistinguishable in their abilities. They all seem to have comparable educations.

At any rate, at the time I attended school my elementary school years were spent in a one-room country school where the teacher taught upwards of 40 children in all grades, from 1 through 9. My training was, of necessity, very basic indeed. There were the three Rs and that was it. We had no music, art, or formal physical education. In fact, depending on the season, our physical education consisted of hockey or baseball at recess or noon hour. We played hockey on the local creek bottom when it froze over. I recall also that for exercise we fought a lot, both the boys and the girls. In fact the hardest I ever recall being hit was by a girl about my age from next door. I was only 6 at the time, but I did deserve it. I don't know why that was unless it was because it was an Irish township named O'Connor. Maybe that had something to do with it. It's funny what one recalls from school days. I recall getting the strap the first day I went to school. It was because a neighbor lad and I were fighting on the front porch of the school and were unlucky enough to get caught by the teach-

er, a young lady from a faraway city. She spent some time trying to find out what we were perturbed about. We couldn't convince her we weren't angry at all. All we were doing was really just having fun. I'm getting off the track, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry.

What I was trying to say was that my education was very basic: the three Rs, if that's the word for it. In fact I think it was really far too basic. I'm happy my children have had the opportunity for a good Alberta elementary education and to get more of the fundamental aspects I missed, other than the three Rs.

I attended high school in the city, however, and that was much different, although we continued to have absolutely no options through grade 12. As I recall, all subjects including French and Latin were mandatory. In grade 13 we had two option areas: those who wished to enter a technical career such as engineering took a math/science option, whereas those who wished to perhaps go into medicine, dentistry, or forestry took a botany/zoology/biology type option. So essentially we had two options in grade 13. When I contrast that with the system my four children are attending I see appreciable differences, although I believe in Alberta my children had very few, if any, options through grade 9, junior high. From grade 10 on of course they had many options.

I guess then the question to pose is which system is the best. Until recently I tended to believe the old system might have been superior. Now I'm not at all so sure. One has to go on personal experience, and I must concede that the young people I know — my children, their friends, and the many young people I know in my constituency — in my opinion have a much better overall education than my contemporaries and I had at the equivalent age. The young people I know today tend to communicate well; they are articulate. I think they are more self-assured and better able to express themselves than we were at that age.

However, I can see both sides of the question of options. In the old system I experienced, many students became discouraged and at some point along the line would drop out of school. Many students weren't really academically inclined and couldn't tolerate Latin. They couldn't stand the thought of four years of Latin — I'm just using that as an example, it might have been other subjects — so they quit the system, whether it be grade 9, grade 11, whatever. I wish I had statistics on that. I don't, but I think something less than 50 per cent of students graduated from the Ontario high school system at that time. On the other side of the coin, it was fortunate that in those days one could apprentice with a minimum of formal education. I think perhaps grade 8 or 9 was all that was required, and of course many students did that.

As I understand it, in our system today it's possible to graduate with a high school diploma with 100 credits. Of course these can be obtained in a number of ways. There are easy and hard math courses, there are relatively easy English courses and hard English courses, and so forth. So one can see how it's possible to graduate from high school and be more or less articulate, or more or less qualified in an academic way in the core subjects, depending on the quality or difficulty of the options the student has chosen. One would hope the child would take options of the highest quality possible relative to his

or her ability. If this is the case, I guess I wouldn't find too much fault with the system.

Personally though, I think it's preferable that a child stay in school and get a diploma and the benefits of a general academic education, rather than drop out and get on the streets too early. Also many trades today require, if not a high school diploma, at least about grade 11 in order that they can apprentice and become a journeyman tradesman.

A lot of us tend to be somewhat lazy even as children and I worry that some very able children might opt for easy subjects, whereas they should be challenging themselves and taking the most difficult. I wonder if a number of young people arrive at grade 12 with 100 credits, sufficient for a diploma, yet haven't really prepared themselves for a career they may suddenly decide at the age of maturity that they really would like to get involved with. They may have decided earlier, because it was easier, to get 100 credits in an easy way. Then comes grade 11 or 12 when it's, if not too late, at least very difficult. They look back and wish they had taken the harder subjects, challenged themselves, and got their 100 credits the hard way. That seems to me to be some degree of risk in the present option system.

I don't really know what the statistics might be in this area. I would hope guidance counselling in school is sufficient that our children are made aware of the risks of not taking options which suit their abilities, to avoid opting for the easiest courses possible. If that's the case, if they're getting this kind of guidance and are in effect challenging themselves and taking the right courses for the right career, I think it's probably all right. But I have some worry in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I think most of us would agree that a child should expect something more from a grade 12 education than just the basics, or the three Rs if that's what we call them, important as the basics are. I guess the real question is how much more a child should expect. Like the Member for Banff, when I talk about the three Rs and the basics I would certainly include a second language, the sciences, physical education, and social studies with an emphasis on Alberta and Canadian content. But it seems to me that motor mechanics, home economics courses, shop courses, those sorts of optional courses not only make school more fun for the student but provide the student with useful life studies. Furthermore, this type of option may also serve to allow a child to recognize his or her aptitude for a certain kind of career. I don't think anyone would really argue with the fact that drama or debating, this type of course, would help increase a child's self-confidence and ability to communicate.

But obviously there has to be a limit. For example, should the teaching of how to fill out an income tax form be done in the school or in the home? Driver education, photography — there are many subjects I'm aware of that are offered in one way or another in various schools that certainly tend to be at the remote edge of what might normally be considered viable options. I tend to think that perhaps many of these option courses should be offered to interested students by the school system outside of regular classroom hours, perhaps at noon hour or after school. For example, I think we would all agree that driving skills are highly important, and there are a lot of

students who really can't afford to go to a commercial driving school to obtain that course. I think most every student likes to drive as soon as they get the chance. So if that kind of course were offered in other than normal classroom hours I think students would opt to take a course that way.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it really comes down to a question of priorities. Obviously the basic courses should take precedence in the system, and if we really are detecting a trend of declining skills in the basics, which I would assume from a quick reading of the MACOSA report is indicated, I think we should be tightening up to some extent: a bit more emphasis on the basics, a bit less emphasis on the options. But personally I don't really think a drastic shift is required.

One of the difficulties we face in our society is undoubtedly the increasing number of single-parent families. It would seem to me it's likely more difficult for the average single parent, who is generally working during the day, to provide the same degree of home instruction in some of the option courses we talked about, whether it be preparing income tax or driving, that might be available in a normal family situation. Also I think it's a fact that fewer families are attending church today than in the past. So the kind of option education that used to be offered in the home and the churches is not as available today as it was. Therefore, I think we have to consider that when we're looking at what should be offered in our schools.

In concluding my thoughts on the subject of basics, Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that in my view the objective is surely to produce a well-adjusted individual, a person who is happy, who has acquired a feeling of self-worth, who has acquired appropriate skills to allow him or her to achieve a career and make the maximum contribution to society.

One young person said to me recently that if the system turns out a graduate who has great academic knowledge, perhaps equivalent to that of an Einstein, but does not have confidence or a feeling of self-worth, then in the view of that young person the system had failed. I would tend to think there is a considerable degree of truth in that.

Mr. Speaker, on the subject of examinations, I think it's obvious to us all that we need some kind of examination system in order to assess how an individual student is doing, how a particular school system is doing, how students across the provinces are doing, and how our teachers are doing. I think the old universal departmental examinations obviously achieved that purpose, at least to a considerable degree. That system of examinations had its drawbacks, as all members know; the problem of a student perhaps having a bad day, or even just being nervous about writing examinations and doing badly, whereas normally during the year he or she might have been a good or perhaps even an exceptional student. In looking at material, I've seen a thought expressed that teachers sometimes taught with the idea of getting the student to pass the examination rather than concentrating on the overall subject, although in thinking back over the years, I have some doubt about the validity of that point — at least the importance of it.

I recall a very good school principal who told the

grade 13 graduating class that I was in, boys and girls, don't waste your time fearing examinations. He said, they are natural exams and a natural part of life. You will be facing examinations of one kind all your life, so you might as well get used to the idea now. The next year, when I got into the engineering faculty, I found that to be true because, as I recall, all the exams we wrote — about 30 to 35 a year — were finals, and we were allowed two supplementals. I recall in our first year of class, fresh out of high school, complaining to the dean about the brutality of this. The dean told us we had to correct our thinking and forget everything we had learned in high school in that area. He said the method no longer counted. The name of the game now is the right answer. He said, I don't care how you get the answer, you've got have the right answer. That theme carried throughout the course, and he used as an analogy a bridge. He said, I don't care how perfect your methods were in designing that bridge; if it falls down, you have indulged in the wrong exercise. The only thing that matters is the right answer.

I think perhaps the same philosophy could apply to some other professions, such as dentistry or medicine. I'm sure it wouldn't be much comfort to the patient, for example, if my friend from Clover Bar extracted the wrong tooth, even though his methodology was perfect, or if the Member for Macleod removed the wrong organ, even though he did the job perfectly.

AN HON. MEMBER: He does it on the side.

MR. CHAMBERS: So in some professions it's only the correct answer that counts, and perhaps in training for those professions total examinations where all of the mark rests on the examination is good training. However, I think a majority of our citizens are not required to make these life and death decisions on a regular basis. I don't [recall] making too many of that kind lately, but examinations where a student's total effort for the year stands or falls on one two-hour examination can be a pretty cruel business. In my view, the ideal answer probably lies somewhere in between.

I think the hon. Member for Banff mentioned 50 per cent as being one thought. I was thinking of something less, maybe 25 per cent. I suspect that even 25 per cent would be sufficient to motivate a student to put a lot of effort into achieving the right results in that examination, yet not be living in fear that a year's work might be wiped out just because he had a bad day. But examinations, even if they accounted for 25 per cent or 50 per cent or whatever, would again allow an evaluation of our province-wide systems and of our teachers as well as our students.

As to kinds of examinations other than departmentals, I firmly believe in using modern machinery to save on human drudgery wherever possible. It seems to me that universal computer-type examinations could be cleverly devised to accomplish an adequate examination purpose in most subjects. These could be graded by machine and save the teachers a lot of time. Personally I'd much rather see our teachers putting that extra effort into helping students, students who perhaps need extra attention, and in planning more exciting and more progressive courses than in spending their time grading routine examina-

tions. However, I guess we'd all agree there are some subjects where it's difficult to see how a machine could effectively do the grading. I'm thinking, I guess, specifically of English. I don't really see any alternative to an English essay insofar as judging the literacy of a student or his ability to cope with the language are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I've often wondered about teacher training. Our system here of course trains a student throughout his undergraduate years in a specific subject of education. While many specific subjects are studied within that course, the emphasis seems to be on methodology. Most Alberta teachers and education students whom I've talked to — including one of my sons, who's in third-year Education — feel this is the best approach. Judging from the obvious high quality of our Alberta high school teachers, I suspect that it probably is the best approach, especially in the lower grades.

There is another system, however, that was used in Ontario — and I say "was" because I don't know if it's still used there or not, but I know it was until recent years at least — and that is for a student to graduate in some specific area, whether it be in arts or sciences or whatever, and then attend a college of education for a year of intensive teacher training in pure methodology. I suspect this system might have advantages at least so far as teaching in the higher grades is concerned, where a higher degree of proficiency may be required by the teacher. I'm thinking here that, whether it be a study of a foreign language or a study of mathematics, perhaps a teacher who had a specialized degree of proficiency in that subject might just perhaps do a better job than the teacher whose primary training was in methodology. But I've an open mind on that subject. I do know a lot of Alberta teachers. I think they're doing just an excellent job. I'm not really too concerned in that area.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I sincerely think we have a fine educational system in Alberta. However, I think it's timely right now to assess our goals, and obviously there are areas where improvements can be made. Probably from the results we're seeing there should be slightly more emphasis on the basics, the three Rs, the core subjects or whatever we want to call them, while still maintaining our options to the maximum extent possible. It's a question of adjusting our priorities. I have confidence that our Minister of Education, with the advice of this Legislature and of the people of Alberta, will achieve the optimum emphasis of these priorities.

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak to this motion. First I think it would be reasonable to state what authority I have to speak. It's a good number of years since I left formal education myself; however, I have continued through the years. When I first joined the Calgary police force, the attainment of high school was the exception rather than the rule. But I did notice that a good number of the oldtimers, as we call them, who had education equivalent to maybe our Grade 5, Grade 6, or Grade 7, had exceptionally good handwriting, wrote marvelous reports, and gave very clear evidence. Possibly they were being schooled in the basics. Having a son-in-law who is a schoolteacher, I have kept up with the modern trends. And my daughter is a librarian. So if I get off track from time to time, they

put me back on.

I would like to state first, Mr. Speaker, that I consider this a most important motion. The problem posed by this motion is extremely complex and defies simple solutions. Probably the most serious mistake any of us can make in considering this motion is the tendency to oversimplify both the problem and its solution. Mr. Speaker, it would appear that this phrase "back-to-the-basics movement", which has taken on the proportions of almost a ground swell, is based on the perception that students, educated under the present or liberal approach, are lacking in communication and computation skills. To most advocates of this quiet revolution, the solution lies in the following: one, a return to the basics, which they perceive as the three Rs in elementary school, followed by English, science, mathematics and history in secondary school; two, more and tougher discipline; and three, a return to a standardized and province-wide set of final examinations.

Mr. Speaker, while it is difficult to find a comprehensive definition for "basics", Dr. Earl Hawkesworth, Alberta's Deputy Minister of Education, offered the following definition:

Officially the "basic skills" are [constituted of] those curriculum areas that are outlined in study for compulsory instruction. I would think the majority of people associate the concept first with the three R's but also with certain standards of behaviour and compulsory subjects as opposed to options.

So what he is saying — in effect, compulsory versus option — is the distinction between basics in determining the definition of basics.

So, Mr. Speaker, in coming to grips with this most difficult problem, most people — or at least all reasonable people — will readily accept that the world is a much more complex place to live in than it was, say, 30, 40, or 50 years ago. While none of us can with any accuracy predict the education needs of the future, we all expect that: one, the rate of social change will continue, possibly even at a more accelerated rate than we have experienced in the last several decades; two, scientific and technological advances will continue; three, leisure time will increase; and four, persons will change their careers more often.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, dealing with that last item of change of careers, this would appear one of the most radical changes of our generation. Our forefathers, our fathers, frequently stayed with the same occupation, even the same employer, for their complete working careers, while recent studies [show] that this present generation now growing up will experience at least three careers during its working life span and will retire much earlier than its forefathers. Doubtless the portable pension plans of our generation will accelerate this trend. So having accepted the proposition that life is and will continue to become more complex and specialized, therefore specialized training will be required, how then can those who subscribe to a return to the basics, as defined a moment ago, reconcile these two apparently opposed positions? I deliberately selected the term "apparently opposed", as personally I see no conflict whatsoever. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that unless a thorough foundation of the basics has been established, the student will find it difficult, or even impossible, to compre-

hend more advanced studies.

Recently we had an article in the *Calgary Herald* where students from a particular high school said, save the spelling, teach us to talk. Numerous students said:

Life is based on communication and high school English classes should teach communication.

Another quote:

Forced to make a choice, most students felt they would prefer a high level of verbal ability to a high level of competence with the written word.

Another quote:

... basic grammar should be learned at the elementary or junior high school level [rather than high school].

I think this is rather a significant point. Here the high school students are saying it should have been taught in the elementary school. And many of them recognize that they were in fact literary cripples as a result of this lack of grammar. In another quote the university students, on the other hand, were blaming the high schools for not developing it. So as I said a moment ago, unless the student has a thorough grounding in "the basics", he will find it almost impossible to comprehend more advanced studies.

Probably the finest athletic team of our time was the Green Bay Packers, that football team recruited, organized, and trained by that great legend of our time, Vince Lombardi. Vince Lombardi's theme was: learn the basics; there is no way you will ever learn to execute the more complex plays until you master the basics. I think that will apply in most things we do.

I was talking to a house painter the other day, a very, very skilled painter. I said to him, did you serve an apprenticeship? And he said, yes, I did. Do you remember your first day? Yes. What did you do that day? Well, he said, that day and many, many days after, I cleaned brushes. I think this applies throughout.

The famous French painter Paul Cezanne, who died in 1906, practised three basic art forms every day of his adult life: cubes, spheres, and cones. Every morning of his adult life he engaged in this. He felt that if he didn't have those basics, there was no way he could go on with the more complex art forms. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the common denominator of all of this world's 'great' has been work, practise, perfect. For those who would seek the short cuts, there is disappointment and frustration ahead. Maybe we can even relate our failing Canadian economy to a growing contempt for tried and true paths to success, that five-letter word, "work".

We have attempted to define "basics," but during the course of this debate I would also venture that there are two other terms which will require either definition or clarification. Those two terms are "schooling" and "education". I believe the definition will become evident as this state progresses.

Most people would agree that schools are not solely responsible for all the goals of education. Schools can accomplish only so much, given the limited number of hours in the day, the number of students and the diversity of their needs, the quantity and the quality of the human and material resources at their disposal.

Before I go any further, I notice a look from the Premier, who is determined that "work" has four let-

ters rather than five, sir. My apologies.

Other institutions — the family, church, media, interest groups, and government agencies — all have a major part to play in the total education of the student. But may I for a moment comment on the impact, or the influence, of the media on this total educational package I speak of. Our parents and our grandparents depended almost entirely on the printed word, mostly the newspaper, for the dissemination of information. Recent various studies indicate a radical change from this method of receiving news and information. A report by the Canadian newspaper alliance disclosed, just about a year ago, that only a very, very small percentage of the public reads the Canadian front page stories and that Canadians are relying more and more on electronic media for news coverage. They no longer have to read.

Now let's take a look for a moment, Mr. Speaker, and determine whether this is good or bad. A publication put out by the American studies on criminal activities, called *Violence in the Media*, determined that ghetto children were spending in excess of four hours per day in front of the television set. Children of a higher socio-economic level were spending less than half that time, two hours or less. So we have to determine whether it is a good or a bad influence. If it is bad, it is certainly affecting the wrong segment of children. It should therefore be of concern to all of us to determine and have some control of the quality of the material coming into our living rooms today which is forming part of the total education package.

Mr. Speaker, two other issues would appear to be closely related to the debate of back to the basics; that is, discipline and departmental examinations. I will comment briefly on each of them. Having spent most of my personal life in an environment of almost rigid discipline, starting with my school days I attended Crescent Heights High School in the city of Calgary when the late Mr. Aberhart was the principal and probably one of the most rigid disciplinarians I ever experienced, followed by police service and a term in the Canadian Armed Forces — as I say, I followed a life of more or less rigid discipline. Therefore my views must be considered biased. However, in retrospect I cannot see that either my generation or I generally suffered unduly or experienced any lasting harm from our exposure to discipline.

The last point I would make, Mr. Speaker: that of standardized province-wide departmental final examinations. It would appear from reading several studies which have been conducted that there is more to commend final standardized departmental examinations than there is to criticize them. Early in 1976 the University of Calgary administered a preliminary writing test to 600 freshmen, which is reported in this particular newspaper clipping. Nearly half — that is, 47 per cent — were unable to write an essay in a satisfactory manner. A writing ability test was then prepared by 2,060 freshmen. Of these, 1,137 failed. Fifteen per cent of the balance were said to have serious writing problems. Once again, these students blamed themselves? No. High school. We go back to the other area. High schools blamed elementary. Well the buck has to stop somewhere. And as to the point I made earlier, until the basics are mastered, there is no way they can go on to further studies.

A second study, in 1977 by an Edmonton separate

school system, suggests students' abilities in verbal and math skills have seriously declined since 1971. Professor James Balderson, Department of Education Administration of the University of Alberta, says schools are giving higher marks for works of similar or lower quality. He says something is obviously wrong with this situation, given the results of studies throughout North America which show a significant drop in the overall quality of education. His comment was: schools, just like corporations, need external auditors. This is the function that the standardized departmental exam can fulfil.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity of speaking to this motion. I would like to compliment the minister for bringing this motion before the Legislature, and I hope this debate will assist him in formulating future policies of his department.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: My comments will be short, Mr. Speaker, as most of the statements that can be made about Government Motion No. 2 have been quite well stated. However, I would like to have recorded some of the remarks one of my constituency school boards sent to me. They say:

Generally speaking, the division is more impressed with the proposed goals of basic education than the former unofficial interim edition, dated 1974. The separation of the "Goals of Schooling" from the "Goals of Education" appears very reasonable and sound. Also, we definitely agree with this delineation and the more limited role for the school. The proposed goals are expressed in language more understandable to the layman and educator alike.

The school board and staff also have indicated to me that they do have some concerns. Their recommendations are that the goals should cover ECS as well. I would agree with them that a couple of the goals of education should be included in the goals of schooling; namely, the developing of intellectual curiosity and desire for lifelong learning, and developing the ability to get along with people of varying backgrounds, beliefs, and life styles. It's also hoped that the homes, schools, churches, and various agencies of the community and governments can adequately assume an increased role for the goals of education.

One of my school boards had some reservations that impending changes in the goals for basic education and changing roles for the school were a bit rapid, and it would take time for all those concerned to be fully aware of the change.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to state a little philosophy about education. I don't expect I can reach near the eloquence of the hon. Member for Banff. I believe the school system has really been successful when it turns out grade 12 students who are prepared to continue their education, if that be their wish; ready to assume their responsibility in society, able to apply for a job, knowing how to shop for goods they require, and able to properly read, write, and communicate. Of course the home has to assume a great responsibility to see that education is successful.

I personally never had very much formal education, but I have had a thorough going over by the school of hard knocks and experience. I have recently become very aware of teachers and the role they play in society. In the past I was always involved in too many

other community activities to be too much aware of the schools. But my son is a teacher, and he has been bringing many of his colleagues into our home. I find them to be a very intense group. They are very fun loving and very aware of their responsibility to their students, to the parents, and to society as a whole. I believe they are starting to take a more active interest in the community.

For instance, one of the local ATAs entertained me, the hon. Member for Macleod, and our wives at a dinner and they didn't hassle us too much either. They wanted to meet us and know what it was all about. Another ATA group invited my wife and I to a no-reason dance last Friday evening. In fact a couple of them were here with students today. They were a group I was proud to be with and have a fun evening with. Whenever they did discuss anything with me — incidentally, they didn't hassle me — it was a very enjoyable evening. They were aware I was out for an evening of fun, and so were they. So they communicated, and when they did they were intense and very aware, as I stated before, of their responsibility to students and parents. I really believe the students are in good hands now.

Regarding the minister and his responsibilities: there was an occasion when I was a little impatient with the minister, and so were some of my constituents. They by-passed both the minister and me and went directly to the Premier. When asked why they did this, they said the minister was too young and that both the minister and I were too new at the job. But I would submit to this Assembly that with the moves and so on that the minister has made lately in the field of education, he's really come of age.

Thank you.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I too welcome the opportunity to make some observations on the resolution by the Minister of Education. I have had much time to think about the resolution over the summer. As a father of five children, I have had the very fortunate experience of watching them grow, not only chronologically but through the school system in three provinces. I'm constantly amazed at the level of understanding they seem to achieve at an earlier and earlier age. Along with my wife I have been unfortunately unable to understand why the reading and writing abilities don't seem to be comparable. Although our children are far more able today to communicate ideas and new concepts to us, they don't seem to have the same ability to put it in writing. We have an 18 year old who leaves a note from a telephone call. Our 26 year old at age six did a better job, and we sometimes have difficulty comprehending that.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the authors of The Goals of Basic Education for Alberta. Since I've been a member of the Assembly, I along with the other members have regularly received my 20 or 25 pounds of mail per week, and generally in the area of education it has been in pamphlets or booklets that exceeded four to five pounds. I have had great difficulty assimilating what has been in those documents, but in this particular document I'm constantly impressed with the clarity of both the goals of schooling and of education which that board has published. I think it's a remarkable document, and many members, particularly the Member for Lacombe, have covered most of it.

About three weeks ago, along with some other members of this Assembly I attended a youth organization where the guest speaker was the Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff. He referred to that document. I recall that group of young people, who ranged in ages from, I would say, 17 to 22. Perhaps it was on the basis of the member's presentation, but after the meeting and talking to the member, I believe it was really on the content of the goals of schooling and education. There seemed to be a new awareness with those young people, Mr. Speaker, a new awareness that the legislators of the province of Alberta were at last becoming concerned with the field of education. One or two of them mentioned that to me and expressed some degree of surprise that, as opposed to being concerned merely with the spending of dollars and the enforcement of law and order, legislators were indeed concerned with education in Alberta. That was very refreshing. I realized later that part of it undoubtedly was due to the presentation by the Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff, but when I considered the content of his speech, I could really see where that idea came from.

Mr. Speaker, in the spring I took the liberty of sending to my constituency — which has 500 school teachers — a copy of the resolution from the hon. minister, with a covering letter to the effect that in my limited political experience here was the finest opportunity for people with the primary responsibility of delivery of education in Alberta to have input into the Legislative Assembly, and would the principals take a few moments and consider, with the teachers in their schools, the goals and objectives as they saw them in their schoolrooms and how they affected their children? Would they also make an effort to talk to the students within the schools and ask them to write their member on how they perceive the goals and objectives of education?

Mr. Speaker, I received a fair amount of response, and it is that response I would like to cover tonight. However, before I do, I think it's very important for us in the Assembly — I don't know what the average age would be in here; I look along the front bench and it looks about 38 to 45, with the exception of the extremities, and then I look at some of the other people, perhaps using the *Canadian Parliamentary Guide* where I get an average age of 51, which is probably reflective — it's important for us, in considering the goals and objectives of this resolution, to reflect a moment on when we were in the system. Perhaps many of us, who have not had the benefit of five children, try to mirror or recollect our experiences as students, as a couple of hon. members related tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I caution when I use the word "average", because last year we had an unfortunate occurrence in my constituency on the Oldman River which runs through the centre of the city. A man drowned, which was surprising because he was a member of the university and he had read that the average depth of the Oldman River was 12 inches. Unfortunately there was a 12-foot hole in the middle and he hadn't taken time to look beyond the averages. So I caution members of the Assembly that when we deal with averages, as the hon. Member for Calder says, make sure you differentiate between a mean and an average.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, if I may just take a

moment, of the 440,000 school children in Alberta not all have parents. They may have had parents, but they don't all have parents. Two-thirds of the women in Alberta work, and they work for a variety of reasons. Some of them have to work, some of them want to work. I think this has quite an impact on the lives of many young Albertans today, when you consider a typical day in their lives.

For example, we have a group of the Mormon faith, which sponsors a very successful family home evening program. Yet at the very meeting where I mentioned the Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff, there was a school principal in attendance who also taught a class of 28. He conducted a study with his youngsters and discovered that 23 of the 28 had both parents working. He related to me an example of one school day, and I suggest this is today in Alberta. Many youngsters wake up in the morning to find not their parents but a note attached to the lunch bag. They don't come home at noon because there's nobody home. They may or may not come home at 5 o'clock in the afternoon after school because sometimes the buses don't get back till 7:30. They may decide to participate in a sport within the school or, in the winter months, in hockey. They may come home at 7, or half past 7, or 8 or 9 o'clock at night to find that one or both parents are not home due to other commitments in the community. If one were to go through Macleod, Alberta, today — which is similar to many other towns — any day of the week, you would find the majority of the people are involved in community activities and are not with their children. So it's not at all unusual to find that school children today in Alberta are more influenced by their peers, because they spend more time with their peers than with their parents. That's a fact of life that I certainly didn't experience.

I'm 45. I look back and recall hitching up the team — I was not the oldest in the class, but the biggest — at 6:30 in the morning because I had to light the fire in the schoolhouse a mile and a half away. It wasn't a question of did I or didn't I light it, because at 30 and 40 below zero the proof of whether I got there in time was the thermometer on the wall. The Member for Edmonton Calder talks about 40 youngsters. Perhaps it was 20 to 40; I forget now. But I found there was a tremendous atmosphere in that classroom, not because I was in charge of the fire, but because there were only perhaps one, two, or three in any particular class. You had one teacher whom I believe everybody respected, because the teacher represented something I think most important.

As I was sitting here listening tonight, these recollections were coming back to me. As a result I have two pages of notes I don't intend to use. I couldn't help but reflect, probably the one single characteristic that stands out in my mind as a student in the Muskoka district in Ontario in 1946, or whenever it was, was that when you excelled at something in that little classroom appreciation was shown not only by the teacher but by your peers. As a result of that, it seems to me you tended to strive for excellence. You tended to strive to please, to impress. I question whether that's evident in our system today. I'm trying to relate this now to my children. I think it's a factor that's missing today. I'd like to perhaps go on to see if I could determine why.

In the response from the schools in Lethbridge,

they laid out many reasons they didn't want to debate the goals and objectives. But the concerns they had with the system — let me simply mention a few, Mr. Speaker. One teacher called me collect — I'm not commenting on his or her ability to write; as a matter of fact it was a "she" — and she said, one of the problems, Mr. Gogo, is that I as a teacher question whether my role in school is to teach people to respect authority, because I now believe in the last five years or so we've seen what the role of authority does to society. She mentioned, for example, the symbol of authority — a certain United States president — where that authority willfully and knowingly committed illegal acts. Is it right for us to teach authority in the schools, because can we honestly say we believe in respect for authority? I thought it was a very unusual comment from that teacher. I didn't discover until later — it may say something about me as a parent — that that teacher had taught one of my children the previous year.

Another comment was that the schoolroom, in many ways, has become a battleground — something that didn't exist, I suggest, when we were in the school system. The compulsory schooling as we know it — and, in Alberta, The School Act states, and our finances are arranged in such a manner, that school is mandatory until you're a legal adult. That's age 16. Yet within our school system we have many people who tend to view it as an adversary system, and cause no end of disruption within the classroom, knowing that if they keep it up long enough they won't be held to the point where they must correct themselves, but will be ejected from the system — as a computer would reject something from the system. So from ages 13, 14, 15 into 16, we have some students who come from all types of families perhaps, but I suggest they may be from one of the 13,500 single-parent families on assistance, or from one of the 60,000 to 70,000-odd single parents, which has become a real problem to the school system. But because of the age of 13, 14, 15, or 16, in The School Act, the law, the school really has no option but to try to keep that youngster within the school, thereby disrupting the normal classroom activities; thereby causing difficulties between the teacher and the principal, which then flow on to the superintendent of schools, which then becomes an issue, it seems to me, with the ASTA meetings I've attended.

That's a concern indicated to me from one of the teachers. Another teacher indicated to me that all children will learn if they're interested; the only reason some children are problems is because the teachers have not made them interested. Mr. Speaker, I think this says something about the basics of the three Rs. Surely there are many youngsters in society today who are just not capable of being geared to an assembly-line system of education. Some of them are extremely capable, and can learn at double the rate of others. Others are not quite capable of keeping up, because their interest cannot be maintained. This particular teacher suggested to me that perhaps we should have alternatives for those over 13 and 14, where they could spend some of their time in a trade school environment taking mechanics, taking carpentry — we used to call it manual training — instead of taking one period a day, perhaps half a day. Those youngsters within a school district could be grouped that way. That was suggested by a teacher with

20-odd years experience.

It's a fact of life, Mr. Speaker, if we are to believe statistics, that not only is the amount of information and knowledge available doubling and redoubling every fourth year — yet we still have the same school year today, 193 days in Alberta, that we had in 1945 — but a 6 year old today entering school has absorbed more knowledge in those six years than that youngster will absorb or be taught by a teacher in the next 12.

So the media, particularly the electronic media, today has certainly an undue influence on the learning ability and assimilation rate of a youngster, [more] than ever before in history. That's a significant factor that has to be considered when one looks at the goals of schooling as opposed to the goals of education. I simply reiterate that too often do we try to assume that the goals of education are simply the goals of schooling. I suggest, and other members tonight have put it much better than I, that they're distinctly separate, because it's only when you combine the mix with the goals of schooling to be that of the home, perhaps the church, certainly the community and that of their peers, do you really and can you really achieve a confirmation of the goals of education. I think too often that distinction's not made.

Someone mentioned to me that the public today, more than ever before in history, is apathetic. I can only speak of course with any authority with the constituency I represent, and we get far more people at city council meetings concerning dog by-laws than we do at school board meetings. I don't accept the argument that it's because they don't have a vested financial interest, because local requisitioning now is over \$3 million in my community in the public school system alone. Yet for some reason I think citizens are assuming that other citizens and parents are apathetic when perhaps they're satisfied, content, and happy with the level of education in our system today.

We seem to be reaching some point in our society when things are so good that we have to believe there is something wrong, and if we don't complain about something they think there is something wrong with us. I would suggest that . . . I look at my children and one of them can't fill out an income tax form. I don't think that's unusual; her father can't.

I visit the schools in the constituency, I look at the youngsters, I look at the teachers, and I talk to the teachers, and I think more than ever before in our history we have capable, qualified people looking after our children. I'm not talking about those who negotiate for salaries. I'm talking about those who are exposed to the children in the classroom.

I visit the school as often as I can, but certainly at least once a year with my youngsters' teachers — I now have three in the system — and I'm constantly amazed, not only at the youthfulness of the teachers, which is something new to me. When I attended school as a youngster, a teacher didn't get to be a teacher until she was over 40, I guess. But these young teachers are so interested, and how they can be interested in so many children is beyond me. The one case they continually make, and I don't see it being implemented, and I'm very concerned with it, is we tend to go with averages. As I mentioned earlier, I'll give an example of why they are dangerous. We talk about an 18.3:18.4 student-teacher ratio. The lowest in Canada. Big deal. Fourteen hundred and

eighty dollars per child. Big deal. But when you talk to the teachers. I had a teacher say to me, John, for heaven's sake, in grades 1, 2, and 3 there should be five, six, or seven youngsters in that classroom, because it's so important that the teacher get through to them and they communicate back to the teacher. In grades 10, 11, and 12 there can be 40 or 50 and I can handle them all right. But it just seems that school boards and departments of education have constructed those boxes so they will only hold so many people, and they've got to stuff them full, they just got to stuff them full — those classrooms. The one area where we would like to have some input is the size of the classes we teach.

I'm not talking about a superintendent. I'm not talking about a principal. I'm talking about a teacher who related that to me. I thought for a moment: the lowest student/teacher ratio in Canada. Isn't it great? But is it really? Couldn't we maintain that but balance the size of the classes?

Surely education, in the final analysis, not only prepares our children to be good citizens of good character able to fend for themselves in this world. Certainly it's beyond that: it's part of being a team. It takes two to love, two to hate, and it takes two to teach children. I suggest they are the legislators or taxpayers of this province, and the schoolteachers.

I think as never before our system — I don't like to go overboard and say it's the finest system in the world, but I've had a new appreciation of education in Alberta. We're served by an ever-increasing group of dedicated people. I think we in this Assembly should do all we can to help them achieve their goals: to build Albertans for Alberta.

Thank you.

MR. HYLAND: As I rise to take part in this debate, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to congratulate the minister for bringing it forth. Everyone else has got up and given their experiences putting their children through school. I think I'm going to have to approach it at a bit of a different angle. I haven't got that practical experience to speak from.

It's interesting that since last spring when this was put on the Order Paper we've heard about getting away from the basics, the three Rs, five Rs, or whatever. About a week ago I was at a roundup at home. One of the fellows came up to me. He was very disturbed and said, "It was advertised in the paper or on the radio that if we believe we're getting away from the three Rs, we're supposed to come and tell you." He said, "We are." I said, "How?" He said, "Just one very simple reason: I've got a daughter in grade 6, and I asked her the other night what 6 times 6 was. She honestly didn't know. She said, 'Just a minute dad, I'll go get my calculator.' Here we are; they get a good education in many things, but the only thing she knew was to press the buttons on that machine to make her math work."

I think this says a lot, Mr. Speaker. When I was in grade 6, boy I had trouble with my times table. I can remember writing 6 times 6 a good many times until I figured out what it was. There was no such thing as a calculator in those days.

Mr. Speaker, I think another goal or objective is: we must assess what the responsibilities of the schools, parents, and churches are. In a great many cases I believe more responsibility has been forced on the

teachers in the school system than what should be. Shouldn't parents have responsibilities to teach their children? Shouldn't the church also have responsibilities? It shouldn't always be left to the school to teach discipline, respect for one's property, and respect for one's ideas. Certainly this should come from the parents, from the church, and not just from the school. I think probably the way I'm approaching the subject is what one teacher described to me as in many ways the way they are approaching education: the shotgun approach. Try to cover as many things as you can, give the rounded idea and the parameters, and hope the rest of it fills in.

Mr. Speaker, I had a chat with one of my old teachers just a few days ago. I shouldn't say old, he won't like that — one of my former teachers, who incidentally taught my sister. He made the comment that he's done a lot of things in his life, but if he taught me some courses in English, he says he must have taught me how to talk to be in the business I am, because for somebody whose writing was as bad as mine, it sure wasn't my writing that got me here. The thought this man had was that four or five years back students were really different; they had more respect for property and teachers, and somewhere, somehow, they lost that respect. He made the comment that maybe, it appears the parents are taking over, or the church is taking over, somebody is taking over, because you can see a marked difference in these students in the last year. They seem to be having more respect for each other and for the teacher, and maybe things are starting to happen already.

I found it surprising that he also made the comment that a few years back, when I was in school, it wasn't unusual to find a student go from grade 8 to grade 12 with no absences. He said average attendance in class for a month was anywhere from 93 to 97 per cent. He says now attendance in class might be anywhere from 70 to 80 per cent, maybe 85 would be your high. Even with all our options, maybe we're not doing things right. If attendance is at this level, maybe we have to change some things.

Mr. Speaker, talking about respect and discipline, I remember when I first started school in grade 1, there was a grey-haired man walking down the hall and his name was Dave Pickard. He was the principal of the school. I tell you, he scared the living daylights out of everybody. Nobody wanted to see him. You were really afraid of him, but as you got closer to the grade 12 level, you realized that he had discipline, but he was your friend, he helped you, he was a very good teacher; and all this time, he had his discipline. As you got through school, you had a great deal of respect for him, and if he told you you could do something you would try your best to do it. You really believed him.

Mr. Speaker, the one thing nobody has talked about tonight, and I think it does have some bearing on it — and I can talk from experience because teachers have had their say, and engineers have had their say. I'm going to talk as a bus driver for a minute or so, because I had about 10 years' experience in that.

Bus driving in many ways is very important. Besides getting the children to school, the driver is the first person other than the family who sees that child in the morning. If the driver is owly, the chances are that might rub off on the child. I must say that in the years I spent driving a bus, I had a very

good rapport with the students. A couple of times I had a little trouble. I showed them who was boss. One of the first few times I drove bus I can remember turning one kid over my knee, which incidentally was illegal then and probably still is now, but to this day he is one of my best friends. After that I didn't have any trouble with him. Mr. Speaker, I think this is just to prove that discipline can be carried too far, but you still have to have some discipline, and to a point you can attain a great amount of respect with it.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments on the diploma and the "senior matric" courses, as they were known in my day — I guess they call them somewhat the same thing now — as many members of this Assembly were at a workshop a short while ago and heard a comment by a teacher, who I understand had taught in the Edmonton area for some 40 years. I think it is very apropos for this, because it would seem that when one excels in school in the matriculation subjects, one doesn't have the respect that one who excels in sports does: that is, one going toward the diploma program. I think this is very important. This gentleman said we must put something in our system that would give that person who excels in the diploma program the same — what would you call it — standard of acceptance and approval and put him on the same height as the sports person, so that there's not that difference between the two. I think when we get these kinds of things into our system, Mr. Speaker, it will help considerably.

Another comment we've heard tonight, and I've heard much of it in the last little while, is that we should lower the age for leaving school. I had a teacher make a suggestion to me that I think deserves a lot of consideration, Mr. Speaker: that of a leave of absence similar to a sabbatical leave many professionals can get. A child could leave school for a year and be able to come back. He said he has known children who have left early, or as soon as they were able to, and have been away a year and come back, and are much more responsible, have a much different outlook on life, and come back with the idea to learn. They want to learn. They become very good students and citizens. Mr. Speaker, to the minister: maybe things like this deserve much consideration. Maybe it's a way of keeping from lowering the leaving age and still making it able for these children to leave for a year and then come back and take up where they left off.

Mr. Speaker, that is about the extent of my shotgun approach. In closing, I'd like to say I have been very happy to participate in the debate, and that we may have done a great deal of philosophizing here tonight, but really let us remember that what comes out of this debate is going to affect the students and the people of Alberta for the next generation or two.

Thank you.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I beg permission to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I move we adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Before putting the motion by the hon. minister, might I say, on behalf of the chairman of the Private Bills Committee, that the meeting which had been scheduled for tomorrow morning at half past 8 has been rescheduled to Thursday morning at 10 o'clock.

May I also ask hon. members with regard to a proposal that has been made for Thursday afternoon in connection with Remembrance Day. The suggestion is that we might interrupt our proceedings at 4:25 p.m. when the commemoration or remembrance of the fallen of the three wars, who came from among the members of the public service, is to take place at the foot of the main staircase. It has been suggested

that we might open the main doors and that we might stand and observe a minute of silence while the Last Post is sounded, and then while reveille is sounded. If hon. members approve that proposal it will be arranged.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at half past 2.

[The House adjourned at 10:33 p.m.]