

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**Title: **Wednesday, November 9, 1977 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's a distinct pleasure today for me to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, sitting in your gallery, the distinguished Ambassador of France to Canada, His Excellency Xavier de la Chevalerie.

His Excellency's term of office, his appointment to Ottawa, was a very recent occurrence, August 24 of this year when he presented his credentials. This is his first visit to western Canada, and we have urged him to return.

He has had a very distinguished career, previously as Ambassador to Senegal and Mexico. He has had very senior positions with the government of France. His visit here today is a response to our 1975 visit and mission to Europe.

I would ask at this time that His Excellency stand and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

**head: PRESENTING PETITIONS**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to table with the Assembly a petition signed by some 4,000 Albertans requesting the removal of South African wines and spirits from Alberta government liquor stores.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 101****The Temporary Anti-Inflation Measures Amendment Act, 1977****Bill 97****The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce two bills. The first bill is The Temporary Anti-Inflation Measures Amendment Act, 1977. The purpose of this bill is to confirm and implement the recent award made by Mr. Justice Bowen in respect to nurses in a number of Alberta hospitals, and to appropriately validate other agreements which are a consequence of making the award.

Mr. Speaker, the second bill I wish to introduce is Bill No. 97, The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1977. This being a money bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of the bill, recommends the same to the Assembly. The purpose of this bill is to

increase the remuneration of the office of the Speaker of this Assembly to \$18,500 per annum effective December 1, 1977, bearing in mind and reflecting the very significant increase in the duties and responsibilities of the Speaker.

[Leave granted; bills 101 and 97 read a first time]

**Bill 90****The Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1977**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a bill, being The Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1977. This being a money bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to give legislative authority to the investments from the capital projects division of the Alberta heritage savings trust fund which have been approved by Committee of Supply.

[Leave granted; Bill 90 read a first time]

**Bill 100****The Appropriation (Supplementary Supply) Act, 1977**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a bill, being The Appropriation (Supplementary Supply) Act, 1977. This being a money bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this bill, recommends the same to the Assembly. The purpose of the bill is to give legislative authority to the supplementary expenditures which have been approved by the Committee of Supply.

[Leave granted; Bill 100 read a first time]

**Bill 104****The Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2)**

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a bill, being The Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2). The purpose of this bill is to provide to local governments greater efficiency in administration. It will also provide for the Lieutenant Governor in Council to make decisions on annexation of Crown land when it has common boundary with a municipality.

[Leave granted; Bill 104 read a first time]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 104, The Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2) be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

### head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table with the House the reply to Motion for a Return 107.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file a copy of the annual report of the Alberta Law Foundation.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual report of the Department of Social Services and Community Health. I would advise hon. members that we don't have sufficient to distribute today, but they will be around shortly.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to table the annual report of the Department of Municipal Affairs for the year ended March 31, 1977. Copies will be circulated to all members.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a minority report with regard to the Alberta heritage savings trust fund.

MR. SPEAKER: At best, this could be a filing.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to amend my presentation, I would indicate to the Assembly that I would like to file that minority report.

### head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, with your leave, I'm honored today to introduce to you, sir, and through you to the Members of the Legislative Assembly, a class of students from my constituency, from the Ernest Manning Senior High School. [applause]

I mentioned to the students we would get that appropriate response, as we do annually. I have had the opportunity to meet with the class and with their teacher Miss Hazel Brown, although briefly, and to discuss some of the issues facing our nation and our province. I'm very pleased that they have made the effort to come to the Legislative Assembly. They are sitting in the members gallery, and I'd be delighted if they would all stand and we could accord them the welcome of the Legislature.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, approximately 20 members of Edmonton's Free Southern Africa Committee. They are here in connection with the petition I tabled this afternoon. They are seated in the public gallery. I would ask them to stand and be recognized by the House.

### head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

#### **Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the federal anti-inflation program is now entering its third year of operation. Alberta's involvement in the federal program was based upon our desire to assist in the fight

against the inflationary psychology which, in 1975, had reached serious proportions across the country. In February 1976, under the authority of the Alberta Temporary Anti-Inflation Measures Act passed by this Assembly in December 1975, an agreement was signed between Alberta and Canada which resulted in the application of the federal act and the national guidelines to the province's public sector. The private sector was to be controlled by the federal government.

The Alberta act and agreement were due to expire on March 31, 1977. At that time, however, it was felt that the inflationary psychology had not been dampened sufficiently. Accordingly, Alberta's participation was extended to December 31, 1977. The reasons for this decision were discussed at length in this Legislature last spring.

Our participation in the national program has been warranted and, on the whole, we feel that it has been successful. However, Mr. Speaker, after careful consideration, the Alberta government has decided not to extend the Alberta Temporary Anti-Inflation Measures Act and the anti-inflation agreement beyond their expiry date of December 31 of this year. This will mean that the federal act and national guidelines will not apply to the Alberta public sector beyond that date.

As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the federal government has announced that it will be introducing to Parliament amendments to the Anti-Inflation Act which will allow for an orderly process of decontrol beginning April 14, 1978, as well as legislation to create a national monitoring agency.

With respect to the public sector in Alberta, Mr. Speaker, the position of the province is that all contracts which terminate on or before December 31, 1977, would be subject to the national guidelines and to review by the Anti-Inflation Board.

Alberta's involvement in the program was based on the understanding that it would be temporary. It was only on this condition that we accepted the federal program, since it intruded into a number of important areas of provincial jurisdiction. Therefore we will be watching the decontrol and postcontrol periods very closely to ensure the federal government does not interfere in provincial matters after the economic emergency — referred to by the federal government when the program was initiated — has ended.

### head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

#### **RCMP Activities**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the first question of the Attorney General. It really flows from a question asked in the House of Commons this morning by Mr. MacKay, one of the members of the opposition. The question deals with the RCMP and tampering or opening mail that would impinge upon the Laycraft inquiry. My question to the Attorney General of Alberta: does the Alberta government have any evidence of the RCMP tampering with mail?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I assume the question relates to the Laycraft inquiry, and I would like to give the same kind of response I have given in this House with respect to one or two other rumors or allega-

tions: I don't want to confirm or deny rumors. Mr. Justice Laycraft is sitting, and I think it's clear that when the Laycraft inquiry has concluded, I will be in a position to have to make some sort of response to this allegation or suggestion and to others that have arisen in the meantime.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I really re-pose the question in light of the fact, as I say, that it was asked in the House of Commons this morning, and the implications that it really has for the RCMP, especially if this isn't in fact the case. So I ask the Attorney General: is there anything further he can say that would tend to clear the name of the RCMP under this particular question that was asked this morning?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I think we have to be careful to understand that the RCMP in Alberta operates in two roles, one in which they are responsible to the provincial Solicitor General and Attorney General for different phases of their work, and one in which they are responsible only to the federal government. That latter category is the conduct of the security service in this province.

As my colleague the Solicitor General has said on several occasions in this House, we are not privy to the conduct that may go on by the security service in this province. We don't know what they are doing. We don't seek to know what they are doing. They are on national security matters, which do not fall within our jurisdiction.

So I really can't assist the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. If the suggestion is that there may be some misconduct of the type he is describing and if it touches upon Laycraft, of course, I'm not going to deal with it. If it may touch on other matters, that may be conduct of the security service and I would suggest that that question is better put in the Parliament of Canada.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General. Can the minister advise the House whether or not this government has received any evidence of that kind of tampering, outside of Laycraft? I realize the Attorney General is not going to answer questions with respect to that. But in terms of the other complaints, have any complaints been brought to the attention of the Alberta government? Have they been investigated?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any suggestion that there has been conduct by police forces, or anyone else, in tampering with the mail that flows to and from the provincial government, its agencies, boards, and commissions — outside the context of Laycraft.

#### **Post-Bail Detention**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to direct the second question to the Attorney General, with regard to the practice of some Alberta judges of putting people in jail if they come to court without a lawyer after bail having been granted in the first instance. Has his department made a ruling on this particular situation, in light of the fact that some members of the legal profession have been in discussion with the

Department of the Attorney General since '76 on this?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I observed the same news article the hon. Leader of the Opposition did. I'm not aware of the facts in that article. They will have to be something that we check and I can confirm later, if the House is in session. If not, I will speak to the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in addition to the news article, while the Attorney General is checking, could he check to see if there has been a reimbursement or pay-out to individuals who have been jailed under these circumstances by the province's insuree, and how many there have been?

MR. FOSTER: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I'm not clear. Pay-out by whom and for what?

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, let me put the question this way: is the Attorney General aware that on at least one occasion the province has paid out damages to an individual who has been jailed as a result of such action by an Alberta judge? Has it been just one case, and how much was paid to that person?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of, I think, one case where funds were paid by the province with respect to improper arrest or detention. Whether or not that case arose out of this kind of circumstance, I don't know. I simply can't recall the facts of that situation.

MR. CLARK: Would you check that please?

MR. FOSTER: I will.

#### **Medical Treatment — Minors**

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Would the minister inform this Assembly if he had any discussions or complaints in regard to doctors giving treatment to minors for emotional, drugs, or whatever the case may be?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member would have to be more specific than he has been in the question. I'm not aware of . . .

MR. KUSHNER: I'll try once again, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister received any complaints, or did the minister have any discussion with doctors or citizens in regard to doctors giving treatment to minors without parental permission?

MR. MINIELY: No, I have not received any such complaints.

MR. KUSHNER: Supplementary question to the minister. Would the minister welcome a government member's bill pursuing such legislation?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I think that's the hon. member's privilege as a private member if he wishes to introduce such a bill.

DR. BUCK: That could be a federal matter, John.

#### **Syncrude Manpower**

MR. TESOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. I wonder if the minister might inform this House if the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower has an ongoing program in place, one with continuous communication between Syncrude officials and Advanced Education officials, whereby the shortages of skilled Alberta workers would not be so great if a third plant were to become a reality. In effect, is there a program whereby the skill problems experienced by Syncrude might be surveyed so Albertans will be educated in the necessary skills, in readiness for a possible third site?

DR. HOHOL: It is a significant question, Mr. Speaker, and I have to say yes, there is one, the kind of vehicle or mechanism we talked about in the House yesterday. It moves about somewhat, with emphasis as they change in the north and across the province. But generally we have an extremely effective approach to predicting, within some zone of tolerance of error, the nature of the work force in Alberta generally, in the north specifically, and with specific reference to the possibility of a third plant.

#### **Nurses' Pay Increase**

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Perhaps he could advise the Assembly as to how funds will be provided to fund the 9 per cent salary increase for nurses as a result of the bill introduced by the hon. Minister of Federal and Inter-governmental Affairs.

MR. MINIELY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll be requesting a special warrant to fund that 9 per cent.

#### **Sugar Factory Closure**

DR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism. Would the minister please comment on any negotiations he may have had with B.C. Sugar concerning the closing of the sugar factory at Picture Butte?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, last Monday the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and I met in my office with three senior officials representing B.C. Sugar. We were not apprized of the agenda until they arrived. They were there to inform us that because of a number of things, they were going to have to close the Canadian Sugar Factories plant in Picture Butte and consolidate their operations in Taber. They assured us at that time that the 68 people, I believe it was, mentioned as employees of Canadian Sugar Factories would be looked after as best the company could. The vast majority would be integrated into the Taber community and the Taber plant. Some of the senior people who have been working for the company for some time would be used to sort of phase out the Picture Butte plant. In all cases this would be done with union people understanding the situation and concurring with it.

DR. WALKER: Supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture. Would the minister consider helping the sugar beet growers in the Picture Butte area in any way because of the extra mileage now required to get their product to the factory at Taber?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the company does in fact make provisions for sites where sugar beet farmers can deliver their product aside from the actual site of future operations in Taber, where the only plant will be located after the closure of the Picture Butte plant.

It's also my understanding that one of the major reasons for the closure of the Picture Butte plant is a reduction in the tonnage of beets located adjacent to that plant. In fact, a fair amount of product moving into the Picture Butte plant at the present time is in at least as close proximity to Taber as to Picture Butte.

So it would appear, Mr. Speaker, that it would not be necessary to extend any additional assistance over and above what the company is prepared to do, in order to ensure that existing beet farmers have an opportunity to continue their production and deliver to Taber. There may be one or two isolated exceptions to that which, I have been told, the company is going to look at with some consideration for a different proposal in that regard.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Supplementary question to the Minister of Business Development and Tourism. Did the officials indicate in conversation that the Taber plant would require expansion to take care of the new in-product from the Picture Butte area?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, what was indicated was that the Picture Butte plant is now operating a maximum of 35 to 40 days per year. It was felt that that wasn't enough days to make the operation viable, so they decided this consolidation had to be undertaken because of transportation and other factors. In the consolidation it is felt the Taber plant will operate for some 85 days instead of the normal period of a lot less.

DR. WALKER: Supplementary to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Since Picture Butte will now lose a large part of its tax base, is there any assistance the Minister of Municipal Affairs might suggest to help them get over this blow?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the tax base will probably not be adjusted too dramatically in the short term. I realize there will be a long-term flow of population, but I think the town of Picture Butte will still survive as a major service centre for the agricultural industry in the area, and may well be a facilitator, a residence community, for the city of Lethbridge as an alternate source of human settlement.

Most of the responsibility, though, will rest on economics and will be the responsibility of Business Development and Tourism. However, we will continue to work with the town of Picture Butte to provide with them with any interim assistance in terms of budgeting, or to deal with the municipal question directly. We have attempted to get hold of the mayor, but he is out right now.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Supplementary to the Minister of Transportation. I wonder if the minister could indicate at this time that the bridge between Picture Butte and Lethbridge to make a direct route for job opportunity, et cetera, will be accelerated.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Macleod raised that matter with me yesterday, and we have now accelerated the planning and design stage for the bridge.

DR. BUCK: Just before the election?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Could the minister be more specific and indicate the timing that construction will start and when the vote will be taken?

DR. BUCK: That would tell us when the election is.

DR. HORNER: That's not possible at the moment, Mr. Speaker, but I'm sure the hon. Member for Macleod, in whose constituency Picture Butte happens to be, will be made aware of it as soon as it is available.

DR. BUCK: We'll know when the election is, Hugh.

#### **Hog Marketing**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. It flows from the Harries report that was tabled in the House yesterday. In view of the fact that the ceasefire, I guess one might call it, imposed by the minister was based on the study, now that the study is completed is that ceasefire going to continue? Specifically, will the hog board still be ordered to market all hogs to the packers?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, there are two reasons behind my thinking in regard to whether or not the Alberta Hog Producers' Marketing Board would be allowed to withhold hogs from the market. The first is that on review of The Marketing of Agricultural Products Act and the plan that has been developed under that act and approved by either Executive Council or the Agricultural Products Marketing Council, I don't believe sufficient authority rests within the plan or the act to provide the Alberta Hog Producers' Marketing Board with the authority to withhold producer-delivered hogs from the market.

Perhaps more important than the legislation which exists is the fact that when the Alberta Hog Producers' Marketing Board was voted into existence by a producer plebiscite in 1969, it did not, in my view, bring with it both the right to say to producers of hogs in Alberta, you have no alternative but to market hogs through the Hog Producers' Marketing Board, and the right and authority to suggest that in that situation the board in fact would not market hogs at all, leaving a producer of hogs in this province no alternative but to keep his hogs on the farm.

So it would be my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the Alberta Hog Producers' Marketing Board will not be in a position to withhold hogs from the market on a weekly basis without going through the provisions of a producer plebiscite.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Would the government favor a producer plebiscite on this matter, in view of the controversy which occurred over the summer?

MR. MOORE: I think I answered that question, Mr. Speaker, by saying it would be my position that the Hog Producers' Marketing Board in fact would not be allowed to withhold hogs without going the route of a producer plebiscite.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of the suggestion in the Harries report that deficient plant facilities have led to lower prices to the producers, is the minister satisfied after reviewing the report that genuine competition does exist among the buyers, since the deficit in supply we have in Alberta and B.C. should mean higher prices regardless of the facilities of the packers?

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the hon. member, in asking a minister whether he is satisfied, he is of course putting a question which in a very outright way asks for an opinion and would lead to debate in which other hon. members might wish to join if it weren't in the question period.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me not try to draw the minister into a debate, then, and be very non-controversial and say, has the minister assessed the question of competition among the buyers?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I've basically had only the same opportunity the hon. member has to review the report provided by Dr. Harries. What I want to do in relation to not only the contents of the report as they relate to the Alberta producer price compared to other North American points, but also some of the suggestions contained in the report with a view to improving our hog producers' position in the marketplace is, first of all, get a reaction from the Hog Producers' Marketing Board, other farm organizations, producers themselves, and indeed Members of this Legislative Assembly as to the various comments and statements in the report. During the course of the next few weeks I hope those comments will come in. We'll then have an opportunity to assess what, if any, action will be taken on the suggestions made, assess in fact whether we've gone far enough in terms of trying to find out the facts on what a producer price in Alberta should be. So it would be some weeks, Mr. Speaker, before I would really be in a position to make any recommendations with regard to action the government might take.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of the rather large increase in profits registered by the packing chains — 33 per cent for Canada Packers, 22 per cent for Burns — will any follow-up study be commissioned to assess the point Dr. Harries made about inadequate slaughter facilities? The question, Mr. Speaker, relates to whether the government will follow up the study to assess whether, in light of these profits, the companies have been investing a sufficient share of those earnings in upgrading their facilities.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I guess I keep answering questions that haven't been asked. I just answered that one by saying that after some weeks of assessment, and input from the Hog Producers' Marketing Board, the packing plants, individual producers, MLAs, et cetera, I would then be in a position to consider whether additional work of that nature needs to be done.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister outline to the Assembly why the impact of retailing was not included in the terms of reference of the study when the Harries report was announced?

MR. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can. First of all I felt it was important that we try to deal with the matter as quickly as possible. I didn't feel a 60-day period was sufficient to broaden the scope of the work I had asked Dr. Harries and his firm to do.

In addition, the dispute which existed was between certain packing companies in this province and the Hog Producers' Marketing Board. It was those two bodies — which I had been meeting with from time to time, both separately and together — that I was dealing with directly. I was able to obtain agreement from the packing companies involved to open their books completely to Dr. Harries and his group, in order that they might have an opportunity to ascertain the facts. I was not in a position on August 22 to get that kind of agreement from others in the whole chain of food marketing in this province, and therefore felt it was not very useful to ask our consultant to undertake a study beyond the terms of reference I gave to them.

MR. NOTLEY: One final supplementary question to the hon. minister. During the time when additional studies are taking place, when meetings are being held with the marketing board, farm groups, and what have you, in view of the fact the minister has indicated that withholding action will not be permitted, is the government considering any interim program or proposal to ensure that the packing companies don't take advantage of the interim situation when the review and assessment of this and additional information is being made by the government?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, that's proposing the packing industry will in fact take advantage of the fact that the report has been handed in and the so-called 60 days of normal operations are over. Of course I will be monitoring that situation daily and weekly to ensure we're approaching at least something we've had during the course of the last several months in terms of price relationship between Alberta and other points.

I would indicate to the hon. member as well, Mr. Speaker, that contrary to the accusations which were being made outside this House by both the Member for Spirit River-Fairview and the hon. Leader of the Opposition, the price Alberta producers received the last 60 days for hogs in this province, in relation to other points in North America, was substantially better than the 60 days before the action I took on August 22. Contrary to the information that may have been provided outside this Legislature, there was in fact no loss of \$1.5 million to producers during

the last 60 days; in fact a considerable gain over what had occurred 60 days prior to that.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question or two to the minister, flowing from the minister's first comment with regard to the government's position that the marketing board couldn't hold back hogs. My question to the minister is: has the minister advised the Hog Marketing Board that that is the position of the government of Alberta? What agreement with the Hog Marketing Board has the minister worked out during the period of time that these discussions will go on?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, no. I have not advised the Hog Producers' Marketing Board of those facts. It comes as a result of the review that I've done over the past few weeks with respect to the legislation and the plan, the history of the Hog Producers' Marketing Board, the manner it was first started in this province, and the mandate it brought with it in 1969. I felt, Mr. Speaker, it was important that I answer that question in the Legislature today in the way that I did. I'm sure that the Hog Producers' Marketing Board will be aware of our thoughts in that regard — if not today, certainly tomorrow.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure they will be aware this afternoon.

A supplementary question to the minister, though. Mr. Minister, is it your intention to sit down with the Hog Marketing Board before the end of this week to attempt to work out some sort of gentlemen's agreement — if I might use that term — that would stay in place until you have had these meetings, got the various input . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. leader please revert to the ordinary parliamentary form.

MR. CLARK: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Is the minister going to arrange a meeting with the Hog Marketing Board this week to work out some sort of arrangement between the Hog Marketing Board, the government, and the packers until such time as the minister has had a chance to get the input from the groups he mentioned, and some action can be taken by the minister?

MR. MOORE: At the present time, Mr. Speaker, I'm not anticipating a meeting this week. But certainly I would be willing and prepared to meet with the Hog Producers' Marketing Board at any time to discuss both the contents of the report and the concerns that they may have arising from the report.

I should say in addition, I'm not anticipating some complete breakdown of the hog marketing system over the course of the next while. I find the people who operate, in terms of the chairman and the board of directors of the Hog Producers' Marketing Board, reasonable kind of people who are searching for answers. Certainly I think they will want to take time to review this report and the various actions that might be taken to resolve the situation, either by themselves or jointly in co-operation with government and the packers. Certainly that's my aim, and I think it's the aim of the Hog Producers' Marketing Board as well.

MR. CLARK: Just one last question to the minister. Is it the minister's intention to take the initiative and set up a meeting with the Hog Marketing Board at the earliest possible time — if not this week, certainly next week?

MR. MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I'm not sure I will be speaking with the chairman of the Hog Producers' Marketing Board later today as to what form or what time any meetings will take place. I simply do not know until I have spoken with him.

#### **Condominium Legislation**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Is it the minister's intention to give second reading at this session to Bill 55, The Condominium Amendment Act?

MR. HARLE: Not at this session, Mr. Speaker. I think the members are aware that public hearings were held immediately before the start of the fall session. I just recently received a transcript of those proceedings, and I would like to give consideration to the matters raised at that time.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise whether he's made a decision for his department to assist the funding of a condominium advisory board?

MR. HARLE: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the minister did set up an advisory board, seeing that the advisory board would be reasonably new and wouldn't be acquainted with property management, would the minister consider establishing procedures so directors can get information on legal and technical matters from the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs?

MR. HARLE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is alluding to some discussion that occurred at the public meetings, at which it was indicated it would be a very useful process to have an organization which would have the interests of condominium owners and people involved in condominium corporations, so that we could carry on some discussion regarding the legislation. It's only gone as far as that at the present time.

#### **Tax Discounters**

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, my question arises from several unanswered questions from the last spring session to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Is it the minister's intent to help financially the student legal aid of the University of Alberta in its program of combatting tax discounters?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, can I answer in this way: student legal services and the community income tax program made a proposal to me. The amount of their request was considered to be too large. There has been a series of meetings since then, and the present state of the matter is that I am awaiting a grant

application from this group in a form that meets with the requirements of the regulations that govern grants.

MR. STROMBERG: A supplementary to the minister. Could he inform the Assembly of the amount of the grants requested by student legal aid?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I forget at this time. The original request was made several months ago, and I'm sorry I can't recall the amount.

MR. STROMBERG: My last supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Has he given consideration lately to providing funds similar to what other provinces have for their student legal aid groups?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of what other provinces might be doing.

#### **Annexation Applications**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. I'd like to know if the minister can indicate approximately how many municipal annexation applications he has under consideration at this time.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, because of this government's policies over the last four or five years, this province is experiencing a very tremendous economic growth.[interjections] Specifically, the policies of decentralization and balanced economic growth are affecting the municipalities in a new way, with a new sense of dynamism. From day to day we have to deal with many of these reflections of this growth through annexation procedures. We currently have several before us. I'll be recommending these to my colleagues in cabinet very soon.

MR. NOTLEY: Several. Is that all?

DR. BUCK: Did the minister say that they're piled up to the ceiling, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Can the minister tell the House how long some of these applications have been before him?

MR. CLARK: A long time.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the numbers are . . . They're on a daily basis. They rotate through the Local Authorities Board to Executive Council. I would not like to state specifically which ones I have, because if I do it would of course be a positive recommendation. We like to consider them, because there are some provincial policies that should be weighed in these deliberations. But we deal with them on a very current basis. If the hon. member has read the orders in council from last week, he'll notice that the vibrant town of Lacombe has experienced an annexation. We'll deal with them on a very current basis.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I guess we could debate how current "current" is with the minister, but that's another problem.

Mr. Speaker, specifically, could the minister indi-

cate if he has a time frame that he can inform this Legislature when the applications concerning Fort Saskatchewan and Bruderheim may be dealt with? Will it be this year, this month, or this century?

AN HON. MEMBER: Probably.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if I have those applications I will deal with them presumably by the end of the year.

DR. BUCK: Fire him and get two, Pete.

#### **Premier's Trade Mission**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. I wonder if the Premier could bring us up to date with regard to any reports prepared following his trip to the U.S.S.R. and the Middle East, and whether those reports can be made available to us in the Legislature. That was one area of questioning.

The second, Mr. Speaker, is with regard to Canadian grain marketing. The Premier also indicated he would be meeting with Ottawa. Has the Premier done that at this point?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, to respond to the hon. member's question, I took my remarks in the Legislature on October 12 — which I thought were relatively lengthy as they were — to be a report with regard to the trip to the Soviet Union and the Mideast. Certainly there are aspects that arose out of my report on October 12 that I would be delighted to elaborate upon if the hon. member specifically wishes to direct questions to me.

Quite obviously in the areas of energy, grain marketing, and technological exchange, a number of follow-up items by the government are occurring. The Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs is in charge of a task force that is pressing forward in the areas relative to trade and tariff initiatives, as reflected in this year's Speech from the Throne. In addition we have a report, which to some extent I summarized in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, regarding world energy outlook. That is being made available to the government here and to the agencies of the government. It is a forecasted report, and at this time it is not our intention to go publicly beyond what I've said in the Legislative Assembly.

However, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member also referred to the matter of grain marketing. I believe I answered in this House as recently as eight days ago that in my discussions with the Prime Minister in Edmonton, I raised with him the matter of grain marketing. I told the Prime Minister when I met with him that I was in the process of completing, with the Minister of Agriculture, a letter with regard to recommendations on grain marketing strategy. That letter has now gone to the Prime Minister, and I await the response.

At some stage — and I'm not sure that I can elaborate at this stage — I would like to make public the general nature of the recommendations that were made. But I would prefer — and I think it would be in the public interest — to see what the federal government's response might be to the recommendations, and at that stage make them public. It may be before the spring session of the Legislature, but it could well

be in the spring session; and I would be very pleased to report to the House.

#### **Vandalism in Parks**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. Has Writing-on-Stone Provincial Park been closed because of vandalism or for some other reason?

MR. ADAIR: No, Mr. Speaker. The park is not closed, although a restricted area has been placed around the writings on the rock so that they can be protected, and it was placed there because of vandalism.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary. Is the department endeavoring to rehabilitate the petroglyphs, or the writing on the stones?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, we're attempting to protect those that are still there. I'm not sure about rehabilitation. I would have to get the hon. member's interpretation of what he meant by that.

MR. TAYLOR: One further supplementary. Is the department taking security measures to protect some of these excellent things like the writing on the stones, the dolomites, the hoodoos at Drumheller, et cetera, where vandalism periodically takes place and eventually will destroy these wonderful assets to the province if we don't do something about it?

MR. ADAIR: Yes, Mr. Speaker. That's an excellent question. I think that probably prompted what we did at Writing-on-Stone: to create a situation where they were protected, and yet by guided tour could be seen by the public at large. So there is a movement in place to protect those, I think, very important remnants of the past for viewing by the public at large.

MR. TAYLOR: One further supplementary question. In this area, has the minister considered something like the technique used by highways to put up a sign — \$100 fine for littering, or \$100 fine for destruction or vandalism? It seems to me to have a very definite effect in reducing vandalism.

MR. ADAIR: Yes we have, Mr. Speaker.

#### **Coliseum Proposal — Calgary**

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the minister in charge of Calgary affairs. Can the minister inform this Assembly if he had any further discussions last week with reference to meeting with the Calgary committee for constructing a coliseum in Calgary?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I suspect the hon. member is referring to the Calgary Exhibition and Stampede Board. Could I advise the House that last spring I was advised by the Exhibition and Stampede Board that with some financial assistance from the city of Calgary they had retained the Stanford Research Institute to do an assessment of what they perceived to be the major facility needs of the Calgary and southern Alberta area. Last week I met with repre-



sentatives of the two bodies, the Calgary Exhibition and Stampede Board and the Stanford Research Institute, and the mayor when we discussed the situation on a very general basis. I was advised at that time that the report would be concluded several weeks from now.

#### Minority Language Education

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Education. It's a follow-up to questions I raised in the Assembly on October 20 with respect to the review of minority language education being undertaken by the provinces as a consequence of the premiers' conference last summer. Can the minister advise whether the Alberta portion of this study is being undertaken in-house by the Department of Education, or will there be outside consultation?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the nature of the study is factual; in other words, a catalogue of matters as they presently exist. The personnel in the Department of Education are quite capable of putting that information together and submitting it to the secretariat of the Council of Ministers of Education.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In addition to that factual compilation, will there be any effort to contact various ethnic groups with specific interests in the field of minority language education in the course of this review, to add to the factual assessment some of the specific concerns of these varying groups?

MR. KOZIAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the report is basically a catalogue of things as they are, as opposed to what might be or what desires for change there might be, that step is unnecessary. However, in terms of what programs the government in Alberta might implement on their behalf, we would of course at any time welcome suggestions for change.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Education. Is the minister in a position to inform the Assembly what the encore will be after this study is completed across the country? Is it the intention of the government of Alberta to undertake public hearings on the question of minority language instruction to consider what policy initiatives could be considered?

MR. KOZIAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, the entire report, which will have basically a catalogue of all the circumstances in the 10 provinces, will be before the Council of Ministers of Education at its meeting in Victoria in January 1978. Thereafter, once the completed report has had the consideration of the council of ministers and received its approval, the completed report will be submitted to each of the 10 premiers in Canada. Then, in accordance with the statement that nine of the 10 premiers made in the first ministers' conference in New Brunswick in August, I expect the premiers of various provinces will indicate what the position of each province would be in this area.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. During the Premier's remarks when this session opened, he indicated that Alberta's French-speaking population is about 2.4 per cent, and 2 per cent of the classes are in French language instruction. My question to the minister is: in view of the fact that some non-French parents choose to have their children educated in the French language, does the department have any statistics on the number of French-speaking citizens who are not able to enrol their children in French language instruction?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is correct, in that no doubt a number of, if we can call them, Anglophones are enrolled in Francophone programs. Happily, in this province there is no distinction in terms of origin as to who can enter such programs. The programs are available for whoever wishes them, and that is the approach we intend to continue to provide in this province in terms of second-language instruction.

With respect to the second aspect of the hon. member's question, I do not have statistics available that would indicate where there are French-speaking students who are denied such programs. Basically these programs are available wherever numbers warrant in jurisdictions throughout the province of Alberta, whether by way of the students having these services within the jurisdiction they normally reside in, or by way of movement on a daily basis to nearby centres which would provide such facilities.

MR. NOTLEY: A final supplementary question. Will the minister assure the House that in fact obtaining that information will be part of this in-house study, this inventory of the availability of the programs?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, in the information to the council of ministers, we will provide a general indication of the availability of programs in this province. Whether it be by census division or otherwise, my memory doesn't serve me well at the moment. We will provide some information to the council which will deal with that aspect.

MR. SPEAKER: We've run three minutes over the time. I've already recognized the hon. Member for Bow Valley. Perhaps he'd like to ask his question tomorrow, unless the House agrees to go over the time still further.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, I like to rise on a point of personal privilege, if I may.

The Member for Clover Bar on Monday last, Mr. Speaker, presented me with this air-conditioned trailer tractor from rural Alberta, and my constituents have instructed me to present to the hon. Member for Clover Bar a manure spreader in the latest possible format.

MR. CLARK: The score is 1-1.

DR. BUCK: Maybe the Deputy Premier could fill it.

MR. SPEAKER: I trust that the House will accept the Chair's assurance that this subject of the fertile imagination of the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo was not the subject of notice to the Chair as required by the standing . . .

May the hon. Minister of Government Services responsible for Culture revert to Introduction of Visitors?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**  
(*reversion*)

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I may be somewhat late, but I would like to state that long before many of us appreciated and reflected on the importance, and may I say uniqueness, of our great nation, the members of the Canadian Women's Club, through their activities, were virtually missionaries in kindling in us the pride of nationhood.

Mr. Speaker, we had in our gallery 58 ladies from the Edmonton Canadian Women's Club, with their president Donna Dragich. I would like to ask the balance of those still here to rise and accept the appreciation of this Assembly.

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 November 8: Mr. Musgreave]

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me today to speak to the motion of the hon. Minister of Education.

As a parent of a handicapped child who could never proceed very far in our system and yet has become a useful citizen of our province, and as a parent of a daughter who has graduated from university, I've some pretty strong views on our present educational system in Alberta. In my opinion I think it's one of the best. I have two other children who fall between these two extremes.

As other members have said, I must say that my views, too, have changed on this matter since the motion was first introduced. In my review I've talked with many people in the system including Professor Chorny of the University of Calgary who, among other things, has been a teacher for many years and has been a teacher of English during that period of time, also my son-in-law who is a teacher of English in a high school in the city of Calgary.

Many members have talked about their early experiences with special teachers who were great models of discipline and integrity whom all of us remember so well. In my view it is perhaps best said that these teachers gave to us a joy of life and a joy of pursuit of education for its own good, to become a whole citizen, rather than for the fact that it would help us earn a living or anything of that nature.

Mr. Speaker, my education has been spread over

several years. In 1974 it was my good fortune to return to the University of Calgary for a credit course in Canadian economics. I must confess it was many years since I graduated from Carleton University in Ottawa. I was very impressed with the plant, the facilities, the libraries, and all the rest of it. But I was most impressed with the professor, his excellent understanding and his wide knowledge of economics. I would say that there was no way that I would want to go back to the kinds of educational processes that I was subjected to 25 years previously when I was going to Carleton.

Mr. Speaker, I learned in my studies that in terms of vocabulary and oral literacy, students today achieve much higher scores and read far more books than ever before. Research in this province and the rest of Canada shows that achievement in skills has grown considerably in recent years. Just in 1977, grade 12 students scored generally higher in chemistry achievement tests than they did just two years previously in 1975.

In stating my belief that Alberta has a fine educational system I realize that I am placing myself at odds with those who are currently advocating back to the basics. I see today in the local newspaper there's a local professor who is advocating much the same thing. In my view it is too simplistic an approach. Perhaps it reflects an uneasiness in our society. To some the school system is a good target on which to vent our frustrations. To some it's become a symbol of concern and belief that our schools have failed to provide and develop literate human beings.

Yet is it just to blame teachers and schools for what we perceive to be the failure of our society as a whole? I agree that hard work, honesty, and integrity are still very important and we must do all we can to instil these in our young people. I agree that the three Rs are still very important. But evidence suggesting that illiteracy among students has increased is insufficient and inconclusive.

I suspect that what the concept back to the basics means to many people is a return to the instructional methods used in the past, namely, drills in spelling, grammar, the parsing of sentences, and similar exercises. Will such instructional methods give us better readers, writers, and speakers? Mr. Speaker, going back to my own days in Victoria School in Calgary I remember I loathed grammar because I was very poor at it and yet I enjoyed writing, reading, and eventually, speaking. I think as we develop and use these skills we become more proficient in them.

I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that basic skills should not be taught, but first of all we need a very clear definition of what the basics are. We want our children to learn interrelated skills of reading, writing, speaking, listening, and thinking. How should they be imparted to students? Recent trends in education have been decidedly away from the teaching of skills in isolation and the traditional emphasis upon grammar exercises, sentence parsing, and other drill work. Instead educational processes stress the importance of teaching language arts skills in conjunction with one another. In this way skills are used to reinforce each other. The effectiveness of this approach has been borne out by educational research in many areas.

In the case of reading, for example, one of the dangers of back to the basics is that it can encourage

the separation of the teaching of reading from the teaching of content. The result can be the teaching of reading as an isolated skill rather than as a means for the communication of information, ideas, and experience.

Similarly, available research on the teaching of language, composition, and literature suggests that the isolated teaching of skill elements — grammar, usage, vocabulary, and spelling — is very hard to justify. The whole process of language acquisition and development is far greater than the sum of its parts, namely, grammar and spelling mechanics. It is easy to forget when we become concerned with the basics that our best learning occurs when we are performing real and significant tasks such as writing stories, letters, and reports for oral presentation; and reading factual articles, stories, and real, significant messages.

One of the reasons we have school children visiting this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, is to witness in its real context the legislative process which they learn from books. Such activities demand not only the use of skill elements in a real context, but they are crucial for the development of creative and imaginative thought processes. The development of the intellect will not be brought about by isolated drill work on grammar and spelling. We should be wary of any attempt to make the mechanics of the English language anything more than a means to an end.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted just to point out what I think was a very significant reaction of some people to the Premier's speech on back to the basics. The Premier was very careful to emphasize in his speech that he wanted a considered, balanced debate on this subject. I would just like to quote from a letter I received from the Local Council of Women in Calgary. They indicate that while some people feel most families are functioning well and that back to the basics is going to restore everything to what we thought was normalcy they say:

Statistics from our own Government departments on the other hand, clearly indicate that there is a great deal of stress on the nuclear family resulting in mental and nervous breakdown, child neglect and abuse, divorce, and indirectly, criminal activity by juveniles and adults.

They go on to say they are:

distressed to hear some MLAs suggesting that options, including some aspects of Family Life Education, may be cut out because these options are not wanted by the public.

Mr. Speaker, as I've discussed this matter at some length I too would say that I think we should be very careful . . . I would suggest that debate to this point has been the most informative, balanced, and sincere that I've heard in my short stay in this House.

I would now like to point out some concerns in other areas of education, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned earlier, I had some long conversations with Professor Chorny. I'm also indebted to a teacher in my constituency who helped me in this matter. It bothers me that some people who have an excellent education suggest that all the ills of society would disappear if we went back to the basics. Now these people were happy with these basics, but they fail to remember that the majority of our citizens never go past these basics in formal education.

As I mentioned earlier, communication skills are

more than just reading and writing. Art is an important graphic communication skill. The use of a telephone is an important skill. To some of us it's a horrendous intrusion on our privacy, particularly if you have teen-age children in the home. I was most impressed by the slide presentation on Kananaskis Park in the lobby of our House. It put together audio, visual, and reading in one beautiful display. It was an excellent example of good communication.

Mr. Speaker, in the field of science certain basics are required. We live in a scientific age. We need it for logical thought. There are certain basic physical and chemical principles we must know about. We must understand certain biological and ecological systems. Particularly in our resource and agriculture industries, science is very important. But can you tell me where the basics in scientific education end?

Similarly, in preventive medicine. A constant theme of mine, Mr. Speaker, has been to do something about rising medical and hospital costs by being more emphatic in the field of prevention. But in the field of prevention for good health, the basics are physical education, good nutrition, and learning of life-long fitness activities. Surely we wouldn't want to play down these important options?

Let's move on now to the area of mathematics. Going on to university in a scientific or research career, the basic core curriculum outlined by the Department of Education includes such subjects as curve geometry or trigonometry. These are basic to some people. To an engineer they're very minor. But to others who cannot calculate interest on a sales contract, or make out an income tax return, these subjects are frills beyond their understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased with a recent government announcement of the substantial input to our Canadian history texts that will be provided out of our heritage fund. I think Canadian and Alberta history and geography are obviously very basic to our way of life. But I think our basic education should also include the history of our native people, our transportation and communication systems, and our basic industries. What about regional differences and history of industrial pioneers and federal political structures and how they evolve; the responsibilities of various government levels and how they are elected and evaluated? Some people will say, let's eliminate social studies and bring back history and geography. Any one of us, if we think for a moment, will realize that living in a complex society we cannot have our education system crammed or crushed into simplistic basics of history and geography.

There are those who say we should reject such options as crafts, mechanical and woodworking shops, culinary arts or consumer education. Can they, in all honesty, reject these subjects for children who will never enter a high school building or any university as a student?

Mr. Speaker, we have many concerns about spending our heritage dollars. We spent a lot of time debating our Planning Act. We have concerns about our environment. We have a variety of bills that come before this House. But I don't think there's any single factor that concerns any one of us more than the education of our young people. We have to allow for human differences. We have to allow for differences of mental and physical capacities. There has to be a wide range of basics to meet these needs.

Even in Britain, with a triple stream of education compared to our one stream, they have many opportunities for choosing a variety of subjects. Perhaps a better definition of core instruction and a clear determination of basic schooling is necessary. But do not forget, Mr. Speaker, that a rigid core of instruction restricts individual opportunity. As we try to move to a more balanced society — not dependent on natural resource depletion or just agriculture — it is very important that our education system should develop all citizens so they can live to their maximum as human beings in a vibrant, modern society.

Mr. Speaker, coupled with a back-to-the-basics movement is the call for the reinstitution of departmental examinations at the grade 12 level. When these were cancelled in 1973, it was because such examinations were not producing the results desired. The exams were only capable of measuring and evaluating the achievement of students on a small portion of educational objectives. They also created a system in which teaching was conducted for the examination. The lecture method of teaching was favored over the less efficient, but more effective, discovery method. The acceptable practice was for teachers to present information which the student memorized in order to pass the exams.

With these recognized ills, can any solid reason be found to justify the reinstitution of across-the-province exams? It has been argued that external exams, such as departmentals, are needed to maintain standards. Is it not more true to say that the departmentals provided an artificial means of measuring provincial standards, a measure that in itself was never perfect? The scaling procedure was designed to produce about the same distribution of marks in each subject from year to year, so it actually hid any changes in standards which occurred.

It has also been shown that the establishment of departmental exams as statements of student competency leads to less desirable forms of teaching and instruction which is intended to prepare students for an examination situation, rather than educating them broadly. Furthermore, in some people's opinion, the call for the reinstitution of departmentals is aimed at the universities. It's a rather modest attempt, or a hidden attempt, to restrict the entry into university on the basis of the marks achieved. Yet in North America the whole movement until now has been to make a university education available to as many people as possible.

Perhaps part of the reason for the resurgence in the demands for basics and high school examinations is a reaction to the freedom — often called the permissiveness — of the '60s. The backlash against that era has brought about an attempt to turn the clock back to the 1950s. This attitude is reflected in current opinions about the educational system. The liberal curriculum — and that's a small I, Mr. Speaker — is under attack. People have become suspect of the wide range of subjects available for study.

But, Mr. Speaker, our society is far different than it was in the '50s. These courses reflect these differences. Back in the '50s we didn't care about pollution or the dangers it created for our environment. We dreamed of placing a man on the moon and we have achieved that. We dreamed of a cure for polio and that has been achieved. All these things have greatly affected our way of life. We simply cannot

turn back the clock. We must look ahead to the '70s and '80s. Our educational system needs creative and imaginative approaches to give our children the knowledge and skills which will be required in the years to come.

Our problems have been increased by the number of students. In the 10 years between 1961 and 1971, the number of full-time students in Canada has more than doubled. There is a higher percentage of Canadian population now attending school than any other country in the world. Mr. Speaker, we should be proud of these developments for they have presented us with a challenge: the provision of quality education for all young people. One of the creative aspects of this debate, and indeed the debate here today about education, is that people are concerned about our schools and are seeking answers to the challenge before us. But, Mr. Speaker, it will not be met by going back to the instructional methods of the past. Our system needs the basics and the freedom to develop methods of better instructing students in the vast store of human knowledge. For no one can deny that the future of Alberta and Canada lies with our young people who are now in our schools.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I say the present education system is working well. The information explosion surrounding our students would be a challenge to any one of us who was educated many years ago. I would suggest that any change in our present system should be made only after the greatest amount of concern, study and debate has been exhibited by all concerned.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to rise at this time and take part in the debate. I have enjoyed what was carried on last evening and again this afternoon. There have been many aspects of our goals and objectives studied during this debate, and I don't propose to repeat all of them. I certainly have been impressed with the degree of interest this particular subject caused throughout our province. The fact that we feel the need to spend time in this Legislature discussing this particular aspect of education is only proof that the people of Alberta are as sensitive as we are to the education of our children. We have to recognize that if we are capable of passing on to the next generation something we have learned, plus the ability to learn, they will have just that much better opportunity than we had.

I think most of us in this room today are to a degree second generation Albertans; we probably all had a very basic education in our formative years. Many have had the opportunity to continue their education to a higher degree and have been very successful in many fields.

I think what we are trying to discuss here today is how we can instill the desire to learn in our young people. When we talk about goals and objectives what we are really trying to do is motivate our children, because you can instigate many forms of curriculum, but if the desire isn't there, if it isn't acceptable and isn't interesting, it doesn't seem to have the same effect.

I think a lot of social changes that have taken place in this country affected the opportunities schools had to control the interest of the children while they're seeking their education. We sometimes blame the schools for a lot of problems caused externally.

We're expecting our schools to be a cure-all for some of our social problems.

There's no doubt in my mind that the family relationship a generation ago had a lot more impact on children as they grew up than it has today. In this modern age, it's very difficult to have that same close family relationship most of us enjoyed a generation ago.

I think we have to recognize that in our schools we have to be able to instill in a few short years that are very formative in a child's life the knowledge and the desire to be competitive, to go on and seek higher education, and motivate him to the degree that he will excel in his own chosen field. Because the leaders of tomorrow in industry and government will be the ones that learn during those formative years to excel in organizing their time.

I've heard much discussion in the last day; I think when we talk about back to basics we are trying to say there is only so much that can be done in a given number of hours. If we expect our school system to be all things to our children, and take some of the responsibilities we should be taking at home, we simply run out of time. Something has to be sacrificed if we're going to place on the school system the responsibility for a lot of the things that should be done as a family unit and as a social part of our life. Certainly if we have to divide time in our school system to take care of a lot of these other portions of education that I don't feel are the responsibility of the school system, something has to be left out.

There's no doubt we require in this province people with many technical skills. The chemical and petroleum industries today are importing people from other places to fill the need for specially trained people. I think our school systems and further education are capable of training these children for the next opportunity — of employment. Possibly they'll have the best opportunity in the world to seek higher education and be employed in the province of their birth. We found in the past that many parts of our country have had to see their best educated people leave their province to have employment. I would be proud to see the children of our province well educated in all the specialties required to make this province function, and able to be employed in the province they were born in.

There's no doubt in my mind that in this particular province at this time we have the greatest opportunity anywhere in Canada. I'd like our children to be educated to be able to take part in that particular opportunity.

Thank you.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity this afternoon to participate in this debate. I have especially enjoyed this debate, partly because it set me last evening to a few reminiscences I haven't had the occasion to think back on for many years. I once marched at a Christmas concert to the tune of *Marching Through Georgia*; we then cleared the desks away and had a square dance afterwards in the school building. Of course that was just a year before they closed down the one-room school and made me go to a centralized school; then three years later moved me to a high school.

Mr. Speaker, in reflecting on that I thought of all of the parental involvement there was in the education

of that day — very close family involvement. Families had to fight to keep the school open. Families had to be concerned when their sons and daughters went from a one-room school to a somewhat centralized school, when they saw the sudden change in the grading that occurred from one to the other.

In my own experience, Mr. Speaker, I went from a centralized school to a centralized high school. In so doing all four of us in grade 9 had the shock of our lives. Two managed to pass: one without conditions; the other with conditions. The one who passed was very fortunate. He was able — and it was very unfair to the other students in grade 10 — to have the greatest collection of books for best improvement in the subjects in the year of grade 10. It was a loaded situation for the other students, because he was so low to start with, that he had further to go.

Mr. Speaker, enough of that approach. I'd like now for a few minutes to bring to the topic before us some of the objective thought I have applied to education in the number of years I've been in Alberta.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say I think this debate is most timely. It has had a great and beneficial effect on this Legislature and on many people beyond this Legislature. I think that over the past few years the public has developed an uneasy feeling about some of our institutions; that includes elementary and secondary education. I don't know about other members except what I've heard in the Legislature, but in my own case I was motivated by this resolution to go out to talk to teachers, to school trustees, to people on the executive of my political association, and to my neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the greatest benefit of this resolution is the fact that it initiated, stimulated, and gave rise to that discussion and made people think carefully about what they expected from the school system, an ongoing exercise which I submit has already produced some changes in attitude, a better understanding, not just here in the Legislature, but well beyond it. I think that has been the great benefit of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, while I have the opportunity I want to express a concern I had when the resolution was placed before the Assembly. The concern was that we as an Assembly might be seduced into believing that we could start from scratch with our educational system. Clearly that's impossible. Clearly we have an establishment out there. My concern was that we would be debating, speaking, and considering the topic as though we had a blank paper and could start restructuring anew. That's obviously not possible; a debate of that nature could obviously have led nowhere. But what in fact I think has happened, and what I hoped would happen, has been that we have discussed a shift in emphasis; in some cases, relatively major. I would deem it a minor but very important shift in the focus of our school system.

I think we had a good school system. I think we have a good school system. That doesn't mean it couldn't be better and that this exercise isn't worth while. But, Mr. Minister, I wouldn't like to see us debating — and we have not done it — in a sense that suggests that we throw out the baby and the bath water, but rather that we add a little soap to the bath water from time to time, and maybe add a little more bath water and take a little of the old out.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the goals and objec-

tives: one development which has pleased me is the production of this document. I note, or believe I note, a recognition in this document which I didn't find in the first document produced by the Department of Education, a recognition of the necessary involvement and responsibility of the community. I think that's a very important development.

Mr. Speaker, I don't really wish to get into the differentiation between the goals of schooling and the goals of education. As far as I'm concerned it's well-nigh impossible, if not impossible, to separate one from the other. If we're going to develop self-discipline and self-understanding and a positive self-concept, surely we do part of that when we develop learning skills: finding, organizing, analysing, and applying information in a critical and objective manner. Surely to do that requires some self-discipline, et cetera. The one is found under the goals of education; the other under goals of schooling. So I would just like to say that I think we've had a positive improvement here, and I think it's important to be reminded constantly that what we're looking at is, I hope, a shift in focus and emphasis.

Mr. Speaker, I did wish to comment on a few questions the minister raised in his opening remarks on this topic. I think the questions really were to get the Assembly thinking, in terms of how broad the responsibility of the school system should be. I believe questions such as schooling or education were raised in terms of the amount of economic growth, how to control technology, meaningful work through the expansion of technology, the balance in our society between the haves and have-nots.

Mr. Speaker, I don't see those questions as being ones which should be addressed in the elementary and secondary school system. I see the requirement of our elementary and secondary school system being to enable students to have the background to address those questions. I can't address those questions now with confidence, and I'm getting fairly gray — what little is left to get gray. It seems to me that more than education is required. It takes a lot of experience and understanding of value systems, and I don't believe that degree of understanding should be the challenge of our public schools.

Mr. Speaker, in the few moments I have, I'd like to suggest that we need to be prepared to accept more community involvement. We need to return — and I think the expression "return" is correct — a greater degree of co-operation between parents, teachers, school boards, and government to our educational system. I think that as our society grows and our institutions get larger, we tend to find minor dissatisfactions and to start blaming to a degree when we should be working together more closely. I think a more positive approach there is going to be an exercise which every individual involved in the system will have to review on his own. It's going to be an exercise which will come about very slowly and probably with each generation.

Mr. Speaker, I think that much of it takes place at the level of the individual school; the attitude of the teachers, the principal, the school secretary, the caretaker, the parent-teacher organization in that school. I would like to see every effort made at that level. I would like to see us as an Assembly, the minister and his department, and school boards give the flexibility to that local school — as local as they can be in this

present day and age — to undertake the responsibility of basic education in the best way they know. Because it's at that school site, in that school building, and in those homes from which those students come that appreciation of education, love of learning, the unique approaches necessary to engage children in a positive way — all those things occur at that location. It isn't in this Assembly; it isn't in the Department of Education. I think that always needs to be borne in mind.

Mr. Speaker, in summary I guess I am suggesting that as a true conservative I'd like to see perhaps less emphasis on some options we've had, especially on electives or options which are defined as necessary. Once in a while, in my experience with my daughters in the school system, I've run across necessary options. That's not an option; that's a misleading and confusing play on words.

MR. APPLEBY: Compulsory option.

MR. YOUNG: Compulsory option, the hon. member says. I think that's correct. So I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we try to evaluate again what's necessary at the local school level but have an eye to the reduction of some of the options, have an eye to the responsibilities which properly belong to the community and which should not be loaded on our school system, on our teachers, but rather on our churches, community leagues, and most of all on our parents.

Mr. Speaker, I have skipped over some of the material this afternoon because the House is engaged in a pursuit of time, in my opinion. We've had some tremendously good speeches on this subject.

But I wanted to make one more point. I guess in a way it's taking me back a bit to the goals of education and the goals of schooling. But it seems to me — and the point relates to the French language, if I can use that as an illustration. I've heard many comments, I had a phone call last evening about the attitude of that constituent with respect to the French language in our country. I would say that as far as I'm concerned, the learning of a second language is very beneficial to the understanding of one's own maternal language. In many cases, we really don't understand the nuances of our language, the grammatical forms, word usage, the different concepts of life and society. If we learn a different language, we are open to many of these concepts, a much broader and more thorough understanding of our own situation, of our own language.

Mr. Speaker, there is no point in saying to someone, you must learn a different language, you must learn a second language. But there is some point to saying that it is helpful to a thorough, better, mature understanding of one's own language. It is helpful in international trade. It is helpful, if you will, in Canadian unity. If for nothing else, let's do it for Canada.

But the point I'm trying to make is that it has to be done from a positive perspective, not from a forced perspective. I guess if I say nothing else this afternoon, it is my strong feeling that what's important in education must take place between the teacher and the student, with the support of the parents, the school boards, and with our support.

I think this debate has been important. I think it has suggested a somewhat narrower frame of re-

sponsibility than we have tended to accept over the last 10 or 12 years. I think it has accepted that the basic capacity to express oneself, to calculate, to analyze, to be able to continue study as one goes through life is the main function of our school system. It's not so much driver education and it's not some other things which I could list.

Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed the debate very much. I enjoyed very much the communication and the debate I had with my constituents while I tried to prepare my notes. I think, Mr. Speaker, that has been and will be the major benefit to come from all of this. Because they in turn received some of my views. I think by virtue of that exchange we have come closer to a consensus of what's important for education.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon with humility, as the hon. Member for Banff mentioned the other day, with regard to this particular debate. We have heard many excellent speeches in the last two days — and last spring — on this particular motion. Much of that debate — I would say almost all of that debate — was extremely well thought out and members, I think, spoke from the heart when they addressed themselves to this particular motion.

I must congratulate the minister for bringing this particular motion to the Legislature last spring. I think it's important that we've had debate, not only last spring, but also this fall, in that in the intervening time I think many segments of the public have become attuned to the attention that we are giving to the goals and objectives of education today.

Also I think it has provided the opportunity for other groups such as the Alberta Teachers' Association and Alberta School Trustees' Association to respond and submit their views. There are others as well, and I congratulate them for doing that.

Also, Mr. Speaker, a number of the remarks have been rather detailed, in that they related to specific items outlined in *The Goals of Basic Education*, 1975 as well as *The Goals of Basic Education for Alberta*, 1977. I would like to make my remarks a little more general, but still related to these two documents, as well as to the comments of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, educational goal statements such as we have here have been prescribed over the centuries, with the school providing the primary means of achieving the particular goals outlined. But I think it's ironic that some of the most inspirational statements of goals have really not been that useful because of their generality. I would like to recall some of the statements of the past. The first is by Jean Jacques Rousseau: "When my pupil leaves me, I grant you, he will neither be a magistrate, a soldier, nor a priest; he will be a man". I think it's very inspirational. Yet it doesn't do much for developing a curriculum if you're going to have this as a goal.

Secondly, a quote from Friedrich Froebel in 1932. He says: "the Purpose of Education is the realization of a faithful, pure, inviolate, and therefore holy life". Again, inspirational. Again difficult, I think, to develop a curriculum from.

A third one: Alfred Whitehead, 1949, in his book *The Aims of Education*. He says: "Education is the acquisition of the art of the utilization of knowledge". Again, I think that is too general, Mr. Speaker.

However, I don't believe the goals outlined in this particular document are of the nature of those I have

described. They indeed are general to a degree, but I think it's necessary that they be general. If the goals spelled out are too specific, then I think that it is too restrictive and therefore more difficult to develop a curriculum from.

In Alberta, Mr. Speaker, we've had a history of re-evaluating our goals of education, although I believe this is the first time that it's ever been done in the Legislature. I think that it's important that we do reassess our goals and objectives in this type of setting and that we continue to do this in the future. We need to have a clear statement of goals, is what the hon. minister said last spring. He said: we need to have a clear statement of goals in order to emphasize what is to be done by our schools and secondly to establish direction as to how education is to be accomplished. So there is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, of the need for this kind of exercise.

Last spring and in the last few days we've often heard the expression back to the basics, or return to the basics. I was looking at some remarks my grandmother made back in 1926 when she returned from a convention in Calgary to the little village of Craigmyle, Alberta. It was the United Farmers association convention. Her report, on the educational aspects of that particular conference, was that an emphasis came out of the meeting that there needed to be a return to the basics, and more physical education in the schools. Some of these same concerns we're hearing today. But at the same time we have employers lamenting about new employees not being able to write, spell, or follow directions, and universities claiming an increasing percentage of freshmen are deficient in basic communication and mathematical skills.

Mr. Speaker, if indeed there has been a decline, which I doubt, that's not the question of this debate. The question of this debate, I believe, is whether or not we want the so-called basics — and I think we usually think of the three Rs when we think of the so-called basics — and whether they should continue to have a high goal priority. I don't think there's any doubt they should be of the highest goal priority in our elementary school system, and possibly in our secondary system as well. But, as the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder said last evening, restricting education to the three Rs is maybe really "too basic". A number of us have gone through that kind of system, and in the school system he mentioned there was no music, art, or formal physical education. So I think the goals outlined in this document, which relate to more than just the three Rs, are very important.

In further commenting on this particular document, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to see there is separation of the goals of schooling from the goals of education. Although the goals of schooling are listed separately from the goals of education, one small criticism I would have of this document would be that I think the goals of schooling should be a subset of the goals of education. However, it is emphasized in here that under the goals of education the schools should have a particular role.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I was comparing this particular document with the one put out in 1975, and I would think most of the goals included in the 1975 document are listed in the new one. However, I think there is an emphasis being placed on certain items,

such as the need for more history and geography in our school systems, with the necessary local, national, and international mix.

Mr. Speaker, there's reference in the motion as presented by the minister, to prioritizing the goals of education. I think it's interesting, that both The Alberta Teachers' Association and the Alberta School Trustees' Association have submitted what they refer to as their priorities, referring back to the 1975 document. I think it's interesting that there's very little difference in the way they prioritize the particular goals and objectives, and in fact I think there were only two significant differences — they really weren't that significant — in their ranking. Also, going back to 1973, the Lethbridge public school system carried out a study, where they asked the public, teachers, and students to rank the particular subjects in the school. The rankings for elementary and secondary schools were not all that different, and I think probably not that much different from the way they would be ranked from the discussion we've heard in the last few days.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the time I just want to make a couple of quick points that I think summarize what I've heard in the last few days.

First of all, there is a definite need for a statement of goals based upon the needs of the individual and the needs of the society in which we live, and I think that is the case with this particular document. I think it also needs to be said that the identification of the needs of the individual and society is really a most complex task.

The second point, Mr. Speaker, is that I think we do have an excellent education system. This has been pointed by other members, and it was pointed out last year in the OECD report the minister referred to. I think it's also important to recognize the importance of building on this good education system, and I think that the debate we're having today, as well as last spring, is part of that building process.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, I think it's important that we recognize the role of the school in the whole process of education. I think there has to be a recognition that other institutions in our society have their role to play in educating our youngsters. A number of the members in the debate in the last few days have pointed out the necessity for the home to teach such things as respect and responsibility.

The fourth point: the minister and others have pointed out that changes have occurred over the years in our goal statements, but the basic purpose of instilling knowledge, skills and attitudes has remained relatively constant over the years. I agree with one of the speakers before me today, that before any major changes take place in Alberta, careful consideration and thought is necessary.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Banff pointed out last evening the importance of having teachers who are devoted to their profession. They have to have a love of learning, love for their subject, and a love for their children. I think it's put very well by a quote I have here, an 11-year-old boy's description of the best teacher he ever had:

He knew his stuff cold, but he tried to get us excited in it instead of pushing it at us. He worked us hard but made us feel good when we improved. We always felt our ideas were just as important as his. The thing is, he wasn't just a

teacher. He was a person!  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to consider certain bills on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader, 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 is an amendment to this bill. Are you all familiar with it?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 66 be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

#### **Bill 71** **The Nursing Assistants** **Registration Act**

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

There are two amendments to this bill. Are you all familiar with the amendments?

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make one or two comments on the bill. The bill combines nursing aides and nursing orderlies into an organization called nursing assistants. I believe there are somewhere around 7,000 nursing orderlies, most of them are men, and probably 4,000 or 5,000 nursing aides.

One part which concerns some of the nursing orderlies is the fact that they may no longer be able to discipline their own members. I assume that when this bill comes into force, the nursing orderlies, having two members on the board, would continue to be



able to discipline their own members pretty well as they're doing today. I wonder if the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight would deal with that particular aspect.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I would point out just one thing. I gave the hon. Member for Drumheller some information — he mentioned 7,000 orderlies. Probably he could not read my writing. That should be about 700.

To deal with the matter of discipline, the intent would be that the board which supervises the registration of nursing assistants will ensure that a certain standard be achieved. The act provides that this standard has to be achieved through the organization to which the orderly belongs. In the future a person could be either a nursing assistant or an orderly, because the educational curricula will be the same for both, the standards they have to adhere to are the same, and we already know their salaries are the same. So I can see a melding of the two occupations in the future.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say that I believe nursing assistants, both nursing aides and nursing orderlies, are doing an excellent job throughout the province. They're part of the health team in our hospitals that provides the service patients want.

I'm sorry I used the [number] 7,000. I really meant 700 or 800. I understand there are about 1,000 nursing orderlies in the province. I think the fact they are now getting a bill with proper representation on the board should enable them to have their own register and to keep the standards both of nursing aides and nursing orderlies very high, in order to give the best possible service to patients.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 71, The Nursing Assistants Registration Act, [be reported] as amended.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 72**  
**The Alberta Insurance**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

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

There is an amendment to this bill.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, just a brief word on the amendment. The amendment corrects a change which was made in the original amendment before the House. The change was made inadvertently, and was brought to the attention of departmental officials by the Insurance Bureau of Canada and Mr. Cooper. I commend them on their alertness.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment brings the legislation back to the original intent and aligns it with insurance legislation across Canada, which was also the original intent.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 72 be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 85**  
**The Social Development**  
**Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2)**

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

There is an amendment to this bill. Are you all familiar with the amendment?

MR. ASHTON: I have some comments. Hon. members of the committee will remember that the bill has been referred back to committee for a relatively minor amendment which doesn't affect the principle of the bill. However, I do feel compelled to make some comments. I realize that maybe some hon. members wish I would restrain that compulsion at this late hour, but there are some important things here to consider.

Members will recall that this bill was introduced together with The Domestic Relations Amendment Act, and that amendments to both acts are somewhat related. The amendments in both acts, particularly in The Domestic Relations Amendment Act, have some very important implications for the rights of women in this province.

I have received many representations respecting matrimonial property rights from individual Alberta women and from women's groups. However, I have not received one representation from any woman or any women's group in Alberta with respect to these very important bills that were introduced a couple of weeks ago.

I have, however, received three representations from men. One was a telephone call, the gist of which was to applaud what we are doing in one of the principles, one of the many objectives, and that was to save the taxpayer money. The other two representations were letters in which men clearly expressed that they felt these bills were biased against men. I disagree with those opinions. But I think it's important to consider what is happening here.

What concerns me, Mr. Chairman, is a matter of priorities. It's my personal experience that in the vast majority of cases there are no assets to share from a broken marriage. In fact, particularly in the urban areas, in most cases the only asset to share is the matrimonial home which is almost invariably jointly owned by the husband and wife. In many cases it's not a matter of considering the sharing of assets, it's a matter of considering the sharing of substantial debts.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, together with the domestic relations amendments, doesn't deal with the sharing of a rich man's assets beyond a marriage breakdown. It deals with the vast majority of cases where monthly income is the major issue. We're not talking about sharing of assets but about sharing revenue. These bills will affect thousands of Alberta women who are concerned about putting bread and butter on the table every day, not about sharing assets that don't even exist. So I suggest these bills

we're giving consideration to are very important, and that importance should be recognized.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 96**  
**The Trust Companies**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

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

There is an amendment to the bill. Are you all familiar with the amendment?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 96, The Trust Companies Amendment Act, 1977, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 98**  
**The Motor Vehicle Administration**  
**Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2)**

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

There is an amendment to Bill 98. Are you all familiar with the amendment?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I move that The Motor Vehicle Administration Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2), be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 63**  
**The Financial**  
**Administration Act, 1977**

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

There are amendments to the bill. Are you all familiar with the amendments?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to the amendment and respond to some matters that were raised during the course of second reading, particularly by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

With respect to the amendment, Mr. Chairman, I'll essentially repeat what I said during question period a few days ago: the act is an umbrella act and, as introduced, has included within it the universities, colleges, and hospital boards. While it was never our intention to alter the existing situation with respect to colleges, universities, and hospital boards, those bodies did make representation to a number of my

colleagues and me, to the effect that they ought not to be dealt with in the legislation in that way, despite the fact they were aware we were going to exclude them by regulation from all but the provisions of the act dealing with long-term borrowing.

They argued that in view of their special, autonomous status they ought not to be excluded by regulation but by the legislation itself. As I indicated during question period, I felt that argument was sound and one that ought to be responded to. We have done so by introducing the amendment which would remove colleges, universities, and hospital boards from the provisions of the legislation, save those provisions dealing with long-term borrowing.

Two matters were raised by the Leader of the Opposition during debate on second reading. Specifically I was asked to outline how Treasury would assume the pre-audit function from the Provincial Auditor's office.

Mr. Chairman, the office of controller has been in Treasury for approximately two years. That office was created for purposes of preparing for the assumption within Treasury of the pre-audit function. It is organized as a unit within Treasury. The controller is Mr. Al O'Brien. I'm sure that a number of members of the Assembly are very familiar with Mr. O'Brien, as he's occupied a very senior position within Treasury for a number of years. I would like to say to members of the committee that I personally am very, very delighted that we were able to have someone of Mr. O'Brien's experience, abilities, and dedication to his job to assume the office of controller.

Mr. Chairman, that office will assume responsibility for the system of authorizing payments, for accounting and financial reporting, and for systems and procedures required to ensure effective financial management and control. In essence he'll be responsible for the day-to-day administration of these areas, that are covered within the provisions of The Financial Administration Act, and will report directly to the deputy provincial treasurer.

As I indicated, Mr. Chairman, Mr. O'Brien has been working for approximately the past two years in preparation for assuming these pre-audit functions. Indeed he now has a staff of 24, and much of the work that's necessary in preparation for assuming the pre-audit function has been going on and is now going on. For example, these persons are now working on new forms and writing manuals that will be used by the departments in connection with the pre-audit system.

When the actual transfer of responsibility for the pre-audit function occurs, which will be next April 1, approximately 85 people will move from the Provincial Auditor's office and join Treasury. They are now working in the pre-audit area within the Provincial Auditor's office and will essentially continue in Treasury the same type of work they are now doing. In short, Mr. Chairman, I anticipate that the pre-audit function will continue pretty much as it has in the past and as it would have developed had it remained with the Provincial Auditor.

In that connection, Mr. Chairman, I would call members' attention to the changes in the legislation that are brought about by the expenditure officer provisions and the accounting officer provisions. That legislation provides the mechanism of control with

respect to certain disbursements.

The other item raised during second reading was the timing and form of public accounts in future, as the controller will be responsible for financial reporting and the preparation of public accounts. I don't really see any significant change in either the form or the timing of public accounts. Undoubtedly there will be changes, in the sense that the present form of public accounts has evolved over a number of years. There are always improvements in the form of financial reporting, and I would expect that to continue. But that's an evolving process that would have gone on whether the system had remained as it is or been transferred to Treasury. In resume, in respect to public accounts, I would expect the form and timing to be essentially the same as they would have been had there been no change. Mr. Chairman, I believe that deals with the matters I was asked to comment on when the bill reached committee stage.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I trust that members will bear with me for a few minutes. At the outset, might I say on behalf of my colleagues and I that we have confidence in Mr. Al O'Brien, who I note is in the gallery, and who we had the opportunity to work with when we were the government. The government has made a good choice in Mr. O'Brien, and I don't want my comments to deflect from Mr. O'Brien's appointment.

Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Upon looking at the legislation in a bit more detail, I suppose we'd have to say this is basically permissive legislation through the act. We've done a little checking and we find something between 50 and 60 sections of the act where it says "the Treasury Board may" or "the Treasurer may". Mr. Provincial Treasurer, this is one of the real problems we have with the legislation. I just draw your attention to Section 4, for example: "The Treasury Board may determine its rules and methods of procedure". Then:

The Treasury Board may formulate general management policies relating to the business and affairs of the Crown and Provincial agencies and do such acts as it considers necessary to ensure that those policies are carried out.

Mr. Provincial Treasurer, the point we're making is that I appreciate there has to be some flexibility in this act. But from our looking at the act, it's basically so permissive that if a person looks at this piece of legislation and at what will be in place after April 1 next year, it's virtually impossible to follow, in the legislation, who has the responsibilities and where.

I look at page 9 very quickly; Section 4(3), Section 5(1), and Section 7:

The Treasury Board may make such regulations and issue such directives that it considers necessary in connection with the exercise or performance of its powers and duties under this or any other Act.

If the treasury board isn't going to issue regulations and directives, who in the world is going to? Mr. Treasurer, I think we should start pretty basically there, as far as treasury board is concerned. I'd be very interested in hearing from the government why the legislation has been drafted in such a way that, in our judgment anyway, it's very, very permissive. I know there has to be some flexibility. But when one looks at the act, I think flexibility has been carried to

the point here where it's impossible to really get a feel as to who is going to be responsible for what.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I think I can answer that comment very quickly. I don't have any hesitation in saying that the responsibility rests with the cabinet, then with the treasury board, and with the Provincial Treasurer. I'll deal with the "permissive" question in a moment. In my judgment there's no question that's where the responsibility rests. Essentially, if you look through the act, the cabinet, the treasury board, and the Provincial Treasurer have the capacity to control the system totally. I think that is essential. Because of that, it's clear that's where control rests. It's equally clear that you can't function efficiently with a totally centralized system. So we have permission to pass to various bodies, and what have you, certain aspects of control that are set out in the legislation.

But as to responsibility, I see the matter very clearly this way: if we pass a certain function, say a pre-disbursement control function, to an agency and it turns out that that is not properly done, I have no hesitation in saying to the committee that the responsibility for that comes right back here; to the Treasurer, to the treasury board, and to the cabinet. So I don't really follow the argument that because there is in the legislation a capacity to pass some of these control mechanisms or decision-making in certain areas to other bodies, there's somehow a whittling away of responsibility on the part of the Treasurer or the treasury board. It just never occurs to me to interpret the legislation in that way. We have the capacity to control it. If we choose not to exercise that capacity by permitting a body to carry out certain functions on its own, and something goes wrong as a result of that, surely the responsibility, the criticism, has to come home to those who permitted it to be done that way.

MR. CLARK: That eliminates any further questions. Those were the answers I wanted to get in *Hansard*, because clearly when we see the government moving in this direction, and moving the pre-audit function where it has, it's our judgment that the responsibility rests clearly on the front bench and in the hands of the Provincial Treasurer. That's basically what the Treasurer has said here today. In our judgment it's entirely too flexible. But as long as we have in *Hansard* the comments made by the Provincial Treasurer today, they will be there for us to use in the future.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make a comment in connection with public accounts. I agree substantially with what the hon. Provincial Treasurer has said in regard to public accounts. I do think, though, that Public Accounts will function pretty much as it is today, providing the controller and the auditor general attend the meetings. If either is not there, it will leave a vacuum. I'm simply mentioning that I think both the controller and the auditor general should make plans to attend Public Accounts meetings.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I would anticipate that not only would the auditor general and his staff be available to the Public Accounts committee, but almost of necessity there will be occasions when the controller and his staff would also need to be availa-

ble to the committee. So the point the hon. Member for Drumheller raises is valid, and I certainly anticipate the system functioning in that way.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 63 be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 70**  
**The Motor Vehicle Accident**  
**Claims Amendment Act, 1977**

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

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 70 be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 80**  
**The Alberta Labour**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

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

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 80 be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 81**  
**The Department of the Environment**  
**Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2)**

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

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 81 be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 99**  
**The Statute Law Correction Act, 1977**

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

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 99 be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 95**  
**The Glenbow-Alberta Institute**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

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

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 95, The Glenbow-Alberta Institute Amendment Act, 1977, be reported.

[Motion carried]

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

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

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 68 be reported.

[Motion carried]

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

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

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 69 be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 54**  
**The Petroleum Marketing**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions . . .

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like this held until the minister — or if we want to get involved in the debate on it . . .

DR. HORNER: If there is some further debate on it in committee, I'd suggest it be held.

MR. CLARK: Very good.

DR. HORNER: By the way, the minister is ill today.

MR. CLARK: For the information of members of the House, I want to refer back to the recommendation to the ERCB on the Petalta plant, the whole question of subsidization, and so on.

MR. HYNDMAN: I'll adjourn the debate, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Motion carried]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, before moving to report, I'll advise that the Assembly will next go into some third readings.

I move that the committee rise, report progress, and beg 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 bills 66, 71, 72, 85, 96, 98, 63, and begs to report the same with some amendments.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration bills 70, 80, 81, 99, 95, 68, 69, begs to report same, and asks leave to sit again.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, for the assistance of the Assembly I'll give an indication of some of the bills which we would now proceed to in third reading: Bill 46, The Banff Centre Act; Bill 56, The Forest Development Research Trust Fund Amendment Act; Bill 58, The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act; Bill 61, The Farm Implement Amendment Act; Bill 62, The Auditor General Act; Bill 65, The Utility Companies Income Tax Rebates Act; Bill 73, The Motor Transport Act; Bill 74, The Environment Conservation Amendment Act; Bill 75, The Energy Resources Conservation Amendment Act. We'll proceed with those at this moment, Mr. Speaker.

#### head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS** (Third Reading)

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried]

No.	Name	Moved by
46	The Banff Centre Act	Kidd
51	The Wildlife Amendment Act, 1977	Adair
56	The Forest Development Research Trust Fund Amendment Act, 1977	Bradley

No.	Name	Moved by
58	The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2)	Leitch
61	The Farm Implement Amendment Act, 1977	Moore
62	The Auditor General Act	Leitch
65	The Utility Companies Income Tax Rebates Act, 1977	Leitch
73	The Motor Transport Act	Horner

#### **Bill 74** **The Environment Conservation** **Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 74, The Environment Conservation Amendment Act, 1977.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just making a very brief comment as far as Bill 74 is concerned. I think we've spent something like four or five occasions during this session debating Bill 74. It's not our intention to prolong the debate, other than to say that we think this is a most regrettable and backward step as far as the government is concerned, for all intents and purposes, really, emasculating the Environment Conservation Authority. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, we're going to vote against the legislation again. We think it's regrettable, and just very, very backward legislation.

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Horner	Paproski
Appleby	Horsman	Peacock
Ashton	Hunley	Planche
Backus	Hyland	Purdy
Batiuk	Hyndman	Russell
Bogle	Johnston	Schmid
Bradley	Kidd	Schmidt
Butler	Koziak	Stewart
Chambers	Kroeger	Stromberg
Chichak	Leitch	Taylor
Cookson	Little	Thompson
Crawford	Lougheed	Topolnisky
Doan	Lysons	Trynchy
Donnelly	McCrae	Walker
Farran	McCrimmon	Warrack
Fluker	Miller	Webber
Foster	Miniely	Wolstenholme
Harle	Moore	Young
Hohol	Musgreave	Yurko

Against the motion:

Buck	Clark	Mandeville
R. Speaker		

Totals:	Ayes - 57	Noes - 4
---------	-----------	----------

[Bill 74 read a third time]

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried]

No.	Name	Moved by	No.	Name	Moved by
				1977	
			83	The Social Services and Community Health Statutes Amendment Act, 1977	Stewart
220	The Blind Persons' Guide Dogs Act	Little	84	The Statutes Repeal Act, 1977	Doan
75	The Energy Resources Conservation Amendment Act, 1977	McCrae	86	The Domestic Relations Amendment Act, 1977	Ashton
76	The Provincial General Hospitals Amendment Act, 1977	Kroeger	MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, concerning business tomorrow, we have received information that members of the opposition are agreeable to continuing with government business after consideration of questions and returns. That is agreeable to the government, so we will proceed in that fashion with the Order Paper tomorrow afternoon.		
78	The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2)	Horsman			
79	The Nursing Homes Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2)	Paproski			
82	The Industrial Wages Security Amendment Act,	Trynchy	MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at half past 2.		

[The House adjourned at 5:35 p.m.]