

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Monday, April 14, 1980 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **PRESENTING PETITIONS**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, it's my duty today to present a petition to the members of the Legislature. The petition is signed by over 10,000 people from southern Alberta to show their frustration with the water, pollution in the Bow River. It's from water users downstream from the city of Calgary. They are demonstrating their concern about the pollution in the Bow River. They have worked very hard in getting this petition over the last 14 days:

We the undersigned are calling to your attention the need for immediate action [covering] the state of pollution in the Bow River.

The people in the entire area served by this river are unable to use ... water safely.

We want action NOW.

The health and well being of our population is our Number One priority.

We demand tertiary treatment to remove all chemicals, phosphates, nitrates and heavy metals ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I apologize for interrupting the hon. member. However, the wording of the petition would indicate a certain amount of debate in it. Is the hon. member able to conclude shortly? Perhaps if the remainder of the text isn't too long, he might read it and then we'll go on.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Yes, I accept your ruling on that, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table the petition.

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

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the report of the Select Committee on Workers' Compensation. I also wish to thank the members of the select committee for their co-operation and dedication to bringing the report to completion. On behalf of the committee, I extend thanks to staff members Mr. George Hickson of the Workers' Compensation Board; Miss Donna Ballard, our secretary; and Mr. Keith Smith of the occupational health and safety division. The interest of the staff of the Workers' Compensation Board and the occupational health and safety division was much appreciated by the select committee.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Section 20 of The Credit and Loan Agreements Act, I am tabling the annual report of the Supervisor of Consumer Credit for

the year ended December 31, 1979. Also, pursuant to Section 10 of The Public Contributions Act, I'm tabling the 28th annual report for the 1979 calendar year under that Act.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Section 10 of The Government Land Purchases Act, I wish to table four copies of the report of activities of the Land Purchase Fund, together with the report of the Auditor General on said fund for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1979.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual report of the Department of Housing and Public Works.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Legislature, three hard-working ladies from my constituency. One lady is from Bow City, the only city in my constituency, and she lives on the Bow River. I'd like to introduce to you Mrs. Charlie Andrews, Mrs. Asplund, and Mrs. Franklin. If they would stand and be recognized; they're in the public gallery.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the House, a group of 38 grades 7, 8, and 9 students from the Fort Kent school in the Bonnyville constituency. They are accompanied today by two teachers, Miss Louise Dery — whom I take special pride in, as she is a former student of mine — and Mr. Allan Fotty, and two parents, Mrs. Wright and Mrs. Cabay. I would ask that they stand and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 65 grade 9 students from Bishop Kidd junior high school, located in the heart of the constituency of Calgary Forest Lawn. They are accompanied today by four teachers — their principal, Ed Marchand; Brendon Dumphy; Bill Hampson; and Monica Healy — as well as their two bus drivers, John Monique and David Terry.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that I was thoroughly grilled by them at a meeting at their school before their journey to the Legislature. I now have a better sense of what it's like to be on the ministerial end during question period. Having said that, I would ask all those special guests to rise and receive the cordial welcome of the House.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Bow River Pollution**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Environment. It's as a result of the tabling done by my colleague the Member for Bow Valley. Does the Minister of Environment or his department have indications as to what the exact conditions of the water will be in the Bow River this year?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult really to project that, because a lot of it depends on the flow of the river itself. If it's at a fairly substantial flow, we don't have as severe a problem with the sewage situation as we do at low flows. So that's non-predictable.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. The minister indicated in his remarks on Friday that there would be tertiary treatment in place by 1983 in Calgary. Could the minister indicate whether that tertiary treatment is going to be built, so that when the population of Calgary doubles in the early 1990s, that tertiary treatment facility will have the capability of looking after all pollution in the Bow River at that point in time?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Little Bow really asks a hypothetical question. He's making an assumption that the population will expand to that degree and, of course, in that respect it's perhaps hypothetical. But I could respond in this way: generally speaking our programs are designed to take into consideration the present growth and a normal growth rate; therefore, in that respect, if we're funding in any way, we take into consideration the natural growth of the area.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Could the minister clarify whether considerations have been taken for population growth or whether they have not? The answer the minister gave at the present time was totally general; that's number one. Number two, he doesn't know whether or not the population of Calgary is going to increase. [interjections] Well, what does he know? Can he be specific in the plans, in consideration of those tertiary treatment facilities, as to whether they are capable of taking care of an enlarged and expanding Calgary population? Are they or are they not? Can he answer that? He didn't answer that. He generalized about nothing.

MR. COOKSON: Again, it is a . . . I don't know what the hon. Member for Little Bow is getting upset about. I initially suggested it was a hypothetical question, which it is, because no one knows . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. My question was not hypothetical. It is a fact that the population of Calgary will increase. If the minister doesn't know that, he'd better get out of his position. [interjection]

MR. COOKSON: Of course it's a fact of life, Mr. Speaker. This province is growing all over, and it's the good policies of this government that make it grow. [interjections]

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. It relates more to the question of bacteria in the river. In light of statements by the city of Calgary health officer that the Bow River is unfit to expose human skin to, can the minister advise the House what measures he intends to take prior to the completion of tertiary treatment facilities' to ensure no hazard to public health between now and that time?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, that's a better question than the last one. But I'm not sure whether I have a better answer for the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn.

One of the most serious problems in all our streams and bodies of water in the province is bacterial content. We got on this subject last spring, I think, with regard to coliform bacteria and the problem they create. In all our treatment we simply deal primarily with the handling of specific nutrients that find their way into the system, and the breakdown of solid materials, so that the material that eventually finds its way back into the streams meets our minimum standards in terms of water purity. In that respect we can't filter out the bacteria, so we can't really deal with that problem. If we were to totally upgrade the effluent that finds its way back into our water systems, we would then have to chlorinate very heavily or use some other type of treatment to destroy the bacteria. Of course in doing that, we would turn loose a mass of liquid into a stream in which a lot of fishermen like to fish. That's the other problem that's created. Of course this concentration of chlorine would have a really detrimental effect on the fish within a stream, so we have to balance that with some of the other factors.

My suggestion, Mr. Speaker — and it's consistent with most health officials — is that no one should really be swimming in water that contains a substantial amount of effluent downstream from urban centres.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, could the minister advise whether he is giving active consideration to posting the Bow River downstream from the Calgary sewage treatment facilities, so that the general public at least has notice that there is a potential health hazard?

MR. COOKSON: I have no objection to that. Perhaps the Minister of Social Services and Community Health might want to comment on that, because it does come into the realm of the responsibilities of the local health unit, the board of health. I have no particular problem with that — if someone can guarantee that the signs will stay there.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the minister or his department given consideration to making changes in The Clean Water Act or in regulations that would force municipalities or anyone discharging fluids into a river to take out their domestic water below where their discharge is put in, as they're now doing in some countries?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, in reviewing that sort of process, I find that some European countries are making a practice of that. While we haven't really moved as far as any kind of regulation change, we certainly have had discussions about the possibility of attempting to promote that sort of design. It's a little difficult, and possibly late, for some of our larger urban centres. Another factor that comes into it is storm sewers, which remove a lot of the surface water and so on back to a tributary that's drained. There's a mechanical problem and a cost problem involved in attempting to do that. But as I say, we haven't closed the door on that option.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, if I may, to the hon. minister. Last Friday the minister indicated that the objective was to deal largely with the question of phosphorus as opposed to other types of effluents. In the long-term planning for a tertiary treatment facility in the Calgary area, what consideration was given to the build-up of other types of effluents, which the minister indicated last week may not be a problem

now, but may well be a problem down the road, in view of the anticipated population growth in Calgary and the industrial development in the area? What kind of advance program and planning are taking place now, so that in the construction of this facility that type of problem is looked into and dealt with now, as opposed to down the road at more cost?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it would necessarily be a problem to review it down the road, and not necessarily at greater cost either. For example, I think that if you had a specific industry, and in the liquid they were passing through the system you identified a high content of a particular element which might be a problem, then I think we could readily deal with it at the point at which it reaches the system. The present picture is that with some of the elements of a minor nature, we don't see a serious problem for some time. I suppose that until we saw some really serious point being reached, we wouldn't expand into any kind of tremendously costly system. It is extremely difficult to remove some of the elements found in water. One of the ways of handling that problem is simply to increase the volume of water through which these elements pass.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. The minister has indicated that ...

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. Member for Little Bow, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Forest Lawn; then, I believe, the hon. Member for Bow Valley.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, the minister indicated in his answer that the tertiary treatment plant that will be completed in 1983 will be adequate to meet the needs at that point in time. The minister also feels, as I interpret his answer, that that will meet the needs for 10 to 15 years down the road. My first question is: am I interpreting that correctly? Secondly, is the tertiary plant that is being contemplated, and being built, just for 1983 or for that projected period of time? Can other facilities be added to it with ease?

MR. COOKSON: Again, I think the Member for Little Bow has answered his own question, that it is being built for projections of population. Two plants are involved, the Bonnybrook and the Fish Creek in the case of Calgary, and in both cases the facility will be designed to handle phosphorus removal. As for expansion of those facilities to handle more serious problems down the road, I think that probably has to be looked at at the time it looks as if it's going to be a problem. We are in close communication with the city of Calgary on these issues, and I get really good presentations from time to time, especially from the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn. We'll simply act when we have to.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. This question flows from an answer the minister gave last Friday when he advised the House that the full study of the South Saskatchewan River system presently being conducted has expanded beyond the question of phosphorus to a more broadly based study. Can the minister advise the Assembly what steps he is taking to have that

study completed at the earliest possible date rather than the previously scheduled completion date — 1982, I believe?

MR. COOKSON: I can't really add much more to what I've said, Mr. Speaker. We work in terms of a budget that sort of defines our parameters. It is designed to be completed in '83. I have had discussions with my officials to try to speed up the operation. The move towards removal of phosphorus is an example of an interim measure which we think will be effective. As the study continues, if there are other areas we think we have to improve on, we'll act accordingly.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate whether the regulations are being enforced equally across the province between small towns and cities?

MR. COOKSON: Whether the Member for Bow Valley is referring to regulations with regard to phosphorus removal ... Specifically, in the case of phosphorus removal, at the present time we are placing before our government a sort of position we think would be acceptable to the public. One of our positions will be that the pollutant must not exceed one part per million in terms of phosphorous content in the streams. At the present time we think there are probably five cities that may have to comply with that maximum/minimum requirement.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate if any municipalities or anyone who's discharging fluids into the river has been charged under The Clean Water Act or any of the regulations?

MR. COOKSON: I think I'd have to take that as notice, Mr. Speaker. I haven't got the updated information, but I can get that for the member.

Nurses' Salary Dispute

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I was going to address my second question to the Minister of Labour and ask him to indicate to the House the present developments with regard to negotiations between the Alberta Hospital Association and the Alberta nurses.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, as is public information and as I believe has been discussed in the House, the Alberta Hospital Association and the United Nurses of Alberta have to report tomorrow, April 15, with respect to the conciliation board recommendation. I understand the United Nurses of Alberta are taking a strike vote at the same time. Beyond that, mediation has been under way since the announcement of the informal rejection of the conciliation board award. That mediation effort is continuing, although it is proceeding very slowly.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Can the minister indicate to the Assembly what contingency plans his department and the hospitals in the province have taken in light of the comments made that the services of Alberta nurses might not be available by Thursday of this week?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I think I can assure all hon. members that contingency plans are proceeding in a legal and proper way. I'm satisfied the members of the Alberta Hospital Association are gearing down their operations in a way that has the well-being of the patients as their first concern. If they're to act responsibly, they must of course take those actions insofar as any contingency plan the department would have. Again, I think hon. members are aware of the legal requirements that stand in the way of properly following procedures that would cause us to do anything.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister. Mr. Minister, is the department or the minister's office in a position to indicate to the Assembly that as part of the contingency plans, approximately one-quarter of the active beds in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary will be able to continue to operate using supervisory staff and auxiliary staff?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the hospitals that would not be involved by a work stoppage, of course, would be the provincial hospitals. The degree to which other hospitals that might be involved in such a stoppage would carry on to the best of their ability with managerial staff who are outside the bargaining units — whether that amounts to exactly one-quarter of the beds, I'm unable to say at this time.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Labour. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly there will not be any, how shall I put it, pre-emptive use of Section 163 of the Labour Act in this particular dispute? This is the emergency provision of the Labour Act.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I can only reflect for the hon. member that we'll have to see what the strike vote indicates and how it is proposed to be used, assuming that the strike vote might be positive. As is well known to all hon. members, there must be a service of notice. All hon. members are also aware that there are some 80 different situations, and it could be that some would vote to strike and others would vote not to strike. That is especially so, I would think, in view of the publicized offer that was made available, which does seem to have been a change from what was publicly known before about the nature of the dispute. It may well change some attitudes towards a strike; I'm not sure.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question, if I may, to the hon. minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Followed by a final supplementary by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NOTLEY: Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether there have been any discussions between officials of the Alberta government and the Alberta Hospital Association with respect to contingency plans that would include the use of Section 163 of the Labour Act?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I gather the hon. member is asking about my role. My role is to try to facilitate in every respect the conclusion of a mutually acceptable collective agreement, and I would certainly jeopardize

that role if I entertained any discussion such as the hon. member has suggested.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, the last supplementary question to the minister. During question period last week I asked the minister if he was prepared to become actively involved in those negotiations. My question now to the minister is: is he in a position to indicate to the Assembly today, or better than that, to give a commitment that he as Minister of Labour in this province will become actively involved himself in the negotiations between the Hospital Association and the nurses?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, again it gets back to what is meant by my personal active involvement.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, on a face-to-face basis: the minister, the president of the Hospital Association, and the senior representative of the nurses in the province.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, there may well be an appropriate time for such an event, but at the present time the mediation, which I am following quite closely, has proceeded. There are some difficulties at the present time. But again, I think it would jeopardize my ability to carry out my responsibility in the most effective manner if I were to stand here and indicate how I propose to carry that out.

Asbestos Fibre

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Labour too. It's a follow-up to questions last week concerning asbestos. Last week the minister advised the Assembly that the level of asbestos fibre in the air of one-twentieth of the amount allowed for workers was sufficient, in the government's view, not to lead us to any concern about danger in schools. Has the government of Alberta had an opportunity to review the new standard on asbestos level in the United States, which is now one-twentieth of the amount set by occupational health and safety, for people working in the industry with safety equipment?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I have some difficulty with the hon. member's statement of fact about what's happening in the United States. Some information recently brought to my attention suggests that a number of agencies in the United States are responsible for monitoring and controlling the amount of asbestos fibre in the air, that there is a variety of opinion, and that they are still searching to try to arrive at a general opinion, speaking not to the issue of the safety for workers in the area but speaking to the safety of the general public as to what the precise level ought to be. There is no agreement on that point.

A fair degree of monitoring is going on. I can advise, Mr. Speaker, that testing is being done at the University of Toronto with respect to certain products and certain fibre content permissible in the air. The same is true of the Underwriters' Laboratories. A number of other tests are being undertaken as well. At the moment, I have to reiterate what I indicated before: there is no known reason for concern.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the hon. Minister of Labour or the hon. Minis-

ter responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation with respect to whether the government of Alberta has specifically commissioned any studies on the level of asbestos in the air as it affects children, who are known to be more susceptible to it. Specifically, what review has been made of the new Ontario Environment Ministry's tentative level of one-fiftieth, as I understand it, of the occupational health and safety level in the province of Alberta? Have there been any studies with respect to the impact on the level as it affects children, who are more susceptible?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I believe that should be my question. I am advised from discussions with Ontario by the personnel in the Department of Labour who are responsible for standards that Ontario has done some tests and has established a standard. There is some question about where the standard came from.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that there has been a report of concern in a school in Edmonton. The fact of the matter is that that situation is already being tested. The only reason there is a concern there is that the material was used in a location to achieve soundproofing, and students were able to puncture the material with balls and the like, which could cause some surface exposure which would not now be coated over. That is presently being tested.

But let me reassure: I have information with respect to what Ontario is doing, what the Underwriters' Laboratories are doing, and what is happening in the United States, within limits, and again, Mr. Speaker, there is no proven health hazard of any kind throughout all this discussion.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the minister. My question relates to whether any studies in the hands of the government of Alberta at this time, and the information brought to the attention of the minister, have been commissioned to assess the difference between the level which causes concern with respect to asbestosis and the question of possible cancer. Has the government of Alberta any specific study that looks at that issue? Is it a question of just requesting information here and there, or has there been a systematic evaluation and study of that question?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, possibly I could assist the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview in his queries. The best knowledge we have in the division of occupational health and safety is that our standard of two fibres of asbestos per cubic centimetre is the same as in Ontario. The Ontario regulations are now under review too and, if passed, will be very similar to the regulations in Alberta. As to the studies, the same information that we have was made available to the Ontario people and, as the hon. Minister of Labour has indicated, assures us there is no reason for alarm.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation: what assessment has been made specifically by the government of Alberta with respect to a higher level of safety required for children, who are more susceptible to possible diseases as a consequence of being close to asbestos, and standards set for people working in the industry, who in many cases have safety equipment?

MR. SPEAKER: I regret interrupting the hon. member, but it does seem that these questions are becoming quite repetitious, not only within this question period but also having regard to a very recent question period.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, can I perhaps put a very direct question to the hon. Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation: has there been a specific review of the difference between standards that would be allowable for workers as opposed to the standards for the general public?

MR. SPEAKER: It would seem to me that howsoever direct or indirect, the degree of repetition doesn't change.

Social Studies Curriculum

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Education relates to the ministerial announcement of Thursday last regarding the social studies program. Do the minister and his department have any plans to consider a special, one-shot, front-end funding for such items as additional program development, materials, resources, and in-service, so that school boards are in a position to effectively launch the program in 1981 from K to 12?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, we would certainly be prepared to consider such a suggestion if there were a perceived need for it. I might say that just today a joint study on the cost of in-service instruction for teachers is being released to the public. I would prefer to consider the question of in-service generally, rather than with respect to a particular program, particularly since that study is now available to us.

Secondly, hon. members should be aware that with respect to the social studies curriculum, the 1978 curriculum has considerably more Canadian content than did the previous curriculum. My announcement last Thursday related particularly to making that content mandatory rather than to the development of new Canadian content.

In summary, there may be a need in particular grades to inject some additional Canadian content, but we do not believe that will be a major consideration relative to the curriculum. We believe that we can satisfy the terms of the announcement of last Thursday in large measure by making mandatory curriculum which is currently available, although optional.

MR. HIEBERT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The program was initially intended to be optional, at least until 1982. Could the minister advise the House why there appeared to be a sense of urgency (a) in making it compulsory, and (b) in shortening the time line?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be fair to say that during the past year we have observed some confusion in the educational system, by which I mean not only teachers but administrators and trustees, about the ultimate intention of the provincial Department of Education, given the fact that we're offering two social studies curricula at the same time. It was in light of that apparent confusion, which was unanticipated at the time of the original announcement, that we thought it preferable to designate the 1978 curriculum as the curriculum that will be used in the province.

I might say as well that when the original announcement was made, we suggested that we would begin to do

an evaluation of the 1978 curriculum almost immediately. Given the fact that we are going to make it mandatory in September of '71, of '81 — excuse me; I don't often live in the past — we will conduct an evaluation. But it will not be a quick, immediate evaluation; it will be an ongoing one. It will commence shortly, but it will not be aimed at finishing quickly after it begins.

MR. HIEBERT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since there have been perceived difficulties with the social studies program over the years, at what stage of development are the mandatory units relating to Canadian/Alberta history, geography, and citizenship, referred to in your statement last Thursday?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, most of them are already developed.

In response to the second-last question, I meant to say that it was not solely to avoid confusion that we made the announcement last Thursday. There has also been a developing concern in the province among educators, certainly among the general public, and among members of this Legislature, as a result of information that comes to us from members of the general public, about the thrust of social studies in this province.

One of the things I said last Thursday to the press outside the House, as well as inside, was that I believe in integrated studies — of which social studies is an example — but you can't integrate things unless you first of all have discrete information and facts that form the basis of your integration. You can't put things together until you first of all have pieces. While this does not suggest a retreat from integrated studies, it does suggest that our students must be more aware of the facts of our history, geography, and citizenship, which facts form the basis of integrated educational activity. You have to have pieces before you can put together a whole.

MRS. EMBURY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I believe the Minister of Education stated that he would consider some added assistance with regard to in-service for teachers. As I understand this is a great concern to teachers, would the minister please restate whether he is willing to put some money into in-service for teachers, or will this be left up to the local school boards?

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the question could be answered briefly; I had some misgiving when it arose a moment ago. With the debate of the estimates about to begin, perhaps questions with regard to spending would be better postponed until that debate takes place.

MR. KING: A very good point, Mr. Speaker, but I can answer briefly. I am willing to consider such a proposal if it is made to me by boards. It hasn't yet been made to me.

Heritage Foundation for Medical Research

MRS. FYFE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask a question of the hon. Premier. Is he aware when we could expect applications to be accepted by the Alberta medical research foundation?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I do not have that information, and I'm not sure I would be able to have it in a way in which I could respond effectively to the Legislature. With regard to the operations of the medical

research foundation, I would direct the hon. member and other hon. members to direct it by correspondence to the chairman of the foundation, Mr. Geddes.

Lethbridge Hospitals

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Could the minister indicate the present status of decision-making with regard to the municipal hospital and St. Michael's hospital in Lethbridge? Has there been a change in the minister's attitude over the weekend?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't say there's been a change in attitude, but there's been a change in direction in trying to resolve the strong differences of opinion that still seem to exist down there. The basic parameter still in place is that all new construction money will be devoted to the Lethbridge Municipal Hospital, in developing it as the major regional medical referral centre for the Lethbridge region. Having done that, we want to upgrade and renovate St. Michael's to keep it operating as a viable and modern active treatment hospital. At this point the debate seems to revolve around what programs will be contained in the renovated hospital. The hospital board has objected to our suggestion.

Therefore, over the weekend we met with Lethbridge residents representing the point of view of St. Michael's and assured them that the board would have longer to put their proposition to us, to see what their suggestions might be, and we would consider those. So I think the table for discussion is ready and waiting. We look forward to receiving the suggestions of the St. Michael's board.

Pine Bark Beetle Infestation

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It deals with the very serious mountain pine bark beetle infestation in the forested areas of southern Alberta. I wonder if the minister might be able to advise the Assembly as to the extent of the infestation, and what plans the department has to arrest the spread of this infestation which, if not curtailed, threatens the entire Eastern Slopes of Alberta.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, first dealing with the extent of the infestation, according to the estimates we now have, it is about 8,000 acres. I agree with the hon. member's comment that this is a very serious infestation. As to what's to be done about it, we are taking all action that can be taken. Specifically, we will be putting on one or more crews to cut the infected trees. We may be able to do some limited spraying. We also have in place a program of monitoring, primarily by helicopter, to give us early warning of any spread of the infestation.

MR. BRADLEY: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. There are a number of merchantable stands which have been affected by the pine bark beetle and have been killed. If the stands are not harvested immediately, the trees will dry out and check and will create a possible fire hazard. Are salvage operations contemplated at this time on those merchantable stands which have been affected?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I would agree with the requirement that they be harvested immediately after being attacked by the pine beetle in order to salvage the tree, although the hon. member is correct that if it isn't salvaged rather quickly after the infestation it will no longer be of merchantable quality. But the time frame is a year or so, as opposed to immediately after the infestation.

To answer the question specifically: yes, we have salvaging operations under way and will do all that can be done to salvage any of the merchantable timber that has been attacked by the beetle.

MR. BRADLEY: One further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I may. With regard to the effect which the salvage operations may have on the watershed and recreational use of the lands affected, could the minister give the House assurance that prompt action will be taken after the salvage operations to ensure that the areas are reclaimed and reforested as soon as possible?

MR. LEITCH: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can give the hon. member that assurance.

MRS. EMBURY: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. In view of the fact that this disease process in our pine trees is evident in Waterton National Park, could the minister please indicate if there has been any communication with the federal minister of our national parks, and if they also have any plans to control the disease process?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I have not been in contact with the federal minister responsible for forestry in the national park areas, but departmental officials have been in contact with their federal counterparts. We are receiving good co-operation from the federal forestry staff, and I have no reason to anticipate that there won't be a joint control program.

MRS. EMBURY: Another supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister please indicate if there is any monitoring of pine logs coming into Alberta from B.C. that might harbor this beetle?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, that's a matter I'd have to get some additional information on. I will do that and report back to the House later on.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a further supplementary question to the minister. It really is a result of information that has been brought to my attention that initially the beetle problem started in Waterton National Park itself. Is the minister in a position to indicate or to confirm that in fact the problem started in the national park? Not that I would want to be one who would start up another federal/provincial wrangle, but on the other hand, if that's where the problem did start and the federal people because of parks legislation were very reluctant to take any steps — is that the position of the Alberta forestry service?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that would be accurate. But again, I'd like to do some more checking on it. Actually, there has been an infestation in British Columbia and Montana. In addition, we've had a number of infestations over the years, although on a much smaller scale than is currently the case in areas outside the

national park. As to where this current infestation actually originated, I'd need to do some additional checking.

Banff and Jasper — Municipal Status

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to either the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. What steps has the Alberta government taken to make representation to the federal government on behalf of the citizens of Banff, in light of the land rental assessments that the federal government has laid upon those people?

MR. NOTLEY: Are you helping the Member for Rocky Mountain House?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, to advise the Assembly, the Department of Municipal Affairs commenced a study about a year ago on the municipal possibilities of extending the provincial laws of Alberta to the townsites of Banff and Jasper. It's my understanding that study is approximately 99 per cent complete. Hopefully, with that information we will be able to pursue with the citizens of Banff and Jasper the possibility of pursuing some form of autonomy within those two townsites.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister, perhaps to be a bit more specific. The question is specifically with regard to the horrendous increases that have been put off for one year, but that it now appears will be faced next year by residents of Banff in the equivalent to their property tax, some increasing as much as up to \$9,000 payment for a residential house. What steps has the Alberta government taken to draw that matter to the attention of the federal government?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, with respect, I don't know if this is the Assembly where that question should properly be addressed. While we do have a great deal of sympathy for the tax problem facing the residents in the national parks, Banff and Jasper, I think that is a decision of the federal government and properly should be pursued with them.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one further supplementary question to the minister. No one argues about its being a decision of the federal government, but it seems to me that this is an area where Alberta should lean as hard as it can on the federal government because of the problem it's putting on a large number of people in Banff, especially residential owners there. My question to the minister: has the Alberta government made any representation to the now federal government on the particular matter?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, before we made the representation, and perhaps we're working from a poor base of information — an indiscrete source of data, as the Minister of Education referred to — it was possible that we should have the study completed. We have now done that. I have had contact with the federal MP for the Yellowhead constituency, and will continue to pursue the interests of the people of Banff and Jasper in settling this dispute. So I can give the assurance that now that the study is complete and now that the member in particular is aware of the extreme concern, we will continue to press that problem.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary on this topic.

MR. NOTLEY: In addition to chatting with the federal member from the area — no doubt over the weekend — is it the intention of the government to make any formal representation on this matter to the appropriate federal minister responsible?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I expect that when the study is being presented, which is very soon, we will make that presentation. However, I have not been able to do so in the last few days.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation wishes to supplement some information previously requested.

Drilling Rigs — Safety Inspections

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to supplement an answer and clarify a statement I made on a question related to oil field inspections that I took as notice from the hon. Member for Bow Valley on April 2.

Two oil field specialists are assigned to the oil well drilling and servicing industry on a full-time basis. During the past three months, this has been supplemented by assistance from other occupational health and safety officers having rigs in their areas. A blitz program has been carried out to inspect as many of the rigs as possible before the spring break-up. As to the number, there were 322 oil well drilling rigs and 375 service rigs known to be in operation prior to the break-up, but the road bans are beginning to affect this number.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

6. Moved by Mr. Hyndman.

Be it resolved that this Assembly approve in general the fiscal policies of the government

[Adjourned debate April 11: Mr. Oman]

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to take part in the debate. As I sat and listened to the budget being read, I join with other colleagues of mine in commending the Provincial Treasurer on the compilation of the report and on the way it was delivered to this Assembly. I'm sure he has all our admiration in this.

The other thing I can't help but notice is that this is not the work of one man alone, as I'm sure the Treasurer himself will recognize. And today I want to pay tribute to the leadership of our party generally, all the ministers and all the departments, who I know have had to work and prepare budgets for months in advance to bring them to a whole such as we have. I am proud to be part of a government that has a finely tuned budget to meet today's needs in Alberta. It's unquestionably a privilege, and I don't think most of us in Alberta recognize how much of a privilege it is to live in this province. We are a people probably privileged above all others in the world.

I suppose there are some causes for concern. I want to

mention one just briefly before I go into other areas, because I think we need to recognize it as a people in this province. There's a little chart in there which indicates the percentage of our total budget raised by direct taxation. I believe it's something like 18.6 per cent, which is a very, very low figure. Most of the other provinces are raising about 60 per cent — in many cases over that — of their budgets by direct taxation. This is at once both good and bad. It is good in the sense that it spreads the benefits of Alberta's wealth to all its citizens, but it may also be a weakness in the sense that we think the services coming to all of us as citizens come cheaply. They do not. A lot of dollars are involved, and I think we ought to recognize this fact.

After the many fine speeches on the throne [speech] and on the budget, it's hard to come close to the end of debate in this area without being repetitive. I remember a time when I was asked to make a speech on a subject with which I was unfamiliar. I dug and scratched and got together some material which I thought was quite acceptable, went to the group, and delivered my speech. Afterwards a number of people came up and said very nice things about it. Then one young fellow came over, buttonholed me, and said, that was the most stupid, inane, disjointed speech I have ever heard in all my life. I guess someone else must have noticed the pained expression on my face. He came over and said, listen, don't pay any attention to what that fellow is saying; he's well known as the town 'stupe', and all he does is repeat what everybody else says. I shall not plan to be too repetitive.

I want to comment very briefly on the debate by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview on Friday. I think I can commend many things in his remarks. I appreciated, as I think all my colleagues did, his support of our stance with regard to the federal government's shuffling on matter of the financing for the Prince Rupert terminals. I'm glad he supports our position on that matter. He made a number of other statements which I think we can wisely take into consideration and shelve. However, I cannot let go by his statements and proposition for the extension of rent controls. I shall have to make a few comments here. There's an old saw, Mr. Speaker, which says something like: what you don't know won't hurt you. If that's the case, I suggest the member opposite is on safe ground in this case, because the very policy he advocates must certainly defeat the very point he wants to accomplish.

It's true that we have brought upon us in Alberta a number of pressure points which have made housing critical, particularly in our larger urban centres such as Calgary, Edmonton, Grande Prairie, and perhaps Red Deer. There is concern. But the solution to those problems is not rent control, and I have to say that with all the force I can put into it. I know from personal conversations, and I think from observation, that a lot of investment money has gone south of the border from this province, into areas such as Phoenix, Los Angeles, Seattle, and so on, because they felt the investment climate was better there for a number of reasons, not the least of which was the imposition of rent controls in this province. Many of them have said to me: I do not believe it's possible to take them out, once you have got into them. I think we have to prove it is. They're waiting to see if we're serious on this before they come back with their investment money and begin building again in Alberta.

Let me give a little lesson from history to back up what I'm saying. As most of you know, I was on the council in

Calgary for six years, and for a number of years was chairman of the finance committee there. It was during that period that the city of New York almost — in fact, it went bankrupt; a series of political manoeuvrings saved them only in name. There were many causes for that, but one was that rent controls were posed on the city in the period of the Second World War when housing was tight, and they were never lifted. The result — and it can be proven just by going and taking a look — was that finally the landlords literally abandoned their buildings, because they didn't have enough money to keep them up; there wasn't any incentive for the future. So they finally became literally uninhabitable. People deserted them. No funds flowed to the city. People fled from those areas. Today they are rat-infested. Where they are being lived in, they're crime-ridden.

Last Tuesday, I think it was, on educational cable from the States, there was a program which took the reporter on a tour. There were holes in the floor, and they showed where the rats were eating in the back yards — buildings that wouldn't be allowed in Alberta; I would hope the health department would shut them down. Furthermore, the price of decent rental housing in New York today is the highest in North America, if not in the world. That's what rent controls will do: short-term political gain, long-term disaster for the people we think we're trying to help.

That's not to say, Mr. Speaker, that our government should have no concern; we should. Undoubtedly we're in a tight situation, and this government does have concern about senior citizens who are facing 30, 40, 50, 75 per cent increases in their rent. But rent control is not the solution. Ultimately, it's only going to make it worse.

Let me sound a warning here for the industry itself. The landlord is king today. There have been times in our society when he has not been, when the tenant has been king. There is the opportunity to take advantage of this situation, and it's unfortunate that some people are determined to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. I don't think this government can stand to have a silent ear if there are those who will take advantage of this to the degree where they are actually destroying the system.

I was glad to hear that representatives of the Housing and Urban Development Association of Canada had urged restraint upon their members. I would suggest that perhaps they could go even further: if they don't want to feel the heavy hand of government regulation, perhaps they should set up their own policing system whereby appeals could be made to them, and they could put pressure on their own people where they are misusing the system.

However, there is concern in the short term. But if you look in this budget, you'll find that over \$0.5 billion is included for housing incentives in our province. I was interested to read just recently in one of our Calgary newspapers where it says Calgary needs rental units. Mr. James Nelson, president of Nelson Research, said:

The population [of Calgary] is expected to increase by [approximately] 25,000 people each year ... The majority of [these] people moving to Calgary will be young, single and childless, and will want to rent rather than buy. [More than] half of the 13,500 additional units needed in Calgary each year should be rental units.

In this budget considerable money is set aside to provide that sort of accommodation for people who are moving in Alberta and have the opportunity to have employment here.

That's just one of them; there are many others. I'm

sure, as indicated in the budget, the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works is generating additional programs which will help ease the situation, particularly for our senior citizens. I look forward to his bringing forward programs which I'm sure will be acceptable to our province.

I want to move now to a couple of areas — and I will put on my hat here as the chairman of Calgary caucus — and speak on some of the needs of the city of Calgary with regard to the budget, not only today but in the future, and sort of soften up the Assembly for what's coming.

AN HON. MEMBER: You hope.

AN HON. MEMBER: Good luck.

MR. OMAN: That's fair enough. Be prepared.

The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo rose in question period the other day and asked whether the southern recreation development association of Alberta had received a reply to its request for funding from the provincial government for needed field-house and recreational facilities. I'll say to the hon. member that, yes, those gentlemen — I think they were all gentlemen, but I'm sure ladies are involved — have had a reply from myself. The reply was something to the effect that until the committee set up by the mayor in Calgary, headed by a former member of this Assembly, Mr. Dickie, has made its reports to the city prioritizing the needs the city of Calgary has in recreational facilities — we wouldn't want to be telling the city what they should be building and where. So I don't think any final response to the city's needs will be coming until that report is made public.

Having said that, it is true that the city of Calgary does have some glaring needs in the area of recreational facilities. I think we looked forward with some envy; when the city of Edmonton, having received the Commonwealth Games a couple of years back, received provincial support for some very fine sports facilities. I'm very happy they got them, because I know they're being well used. But the city of Calgary does not have a coliseum that could support an NHL hockey team, or Olympic facilities. It doesn't have an Olympic-sized swimming pool; it does not have an indoor field house. And it needs them, because it's a very rapidly growing city.

As most of you know, the city of Calgary is making its bid for the Winter Olympics in 1988. It has already been awarded the '83 summer games, Mr. Minister, and I believe along with that has been the promise of money to develop swimming pool facilities. We will be glad and are thankful for that. However, we expect and would hope the government will support the city of Calgary in its bid for '88 Olympics, and it has already done so. Just a couple of weeks ago it was my privilege, with several MLAs, to present them a cheque of \$200,000 in order to facilitate their laying the groundwork to make a successful bid in '81 in Baden Baden, Germany. Nevertheless, they need to have some indication the government is behind them, and that they can have the facilities which are going to cost many millions of dollars. I know the government of Alberta will treat the city of Calgary with fairness, as it did the city of Edmonton. [interjection] All over the place, Mr. Minister.

I want to move on now to the area of transportation, one of the budget highlights. I could talk about hospitals and be thankful for what's happening in providing Cal-

gary with more hospital space, but I want to talk about transportation for a few minutes, because it's a real need of my city. Again, I want to say to my rural colleagues that I don't begrudge a bit the fact you're getting much-needed money for your secondary highways across the province. There's no question those of us who are in the city also benefit from that as we travel across our great province. So we don't begrudge that a bit. But again, I want to put in a claim for the future. The city of Calgary is a city I love. As I said, I invested six of my years on its council. It has some real needs in the area of transportation, mostly because of the fantastic growth that has taken place in that city. Much of what I have to say will also have bearing on the city of Edmonton.

A while ago I read to you a statement that the city is expected to grow by about approximately 25,000 people per year, and will reach a population of 1 million by the end of the century. That's one family every hour, 24 hours a day, for the next 20 years. That's a lot of people. The very prosperity of this province, and the economic activity that really pours money into our coffers as a provincial government, place enormous strains on some of our urban centres where infrastructure has to be provided for these thousands of people who are coming in every month. I want to bring that to our attention.

We have done very, very well by our municipalities. The matter of wiping out, for all practical purposes, the municipal debt last year was a great gift from this province, and I don't underestimate that a moment. Property taxes are lower in this province than any other province in Canada because the provincial government has been generous to its municipalities. But lest we pat ourselves too much on the back, I think we should recognize that the very action that pours more money into our coffers, stretches the financial capabilities of our larger metropolitan centres.

If you have driven in Calgary recently, particularly during rush hours, you recognize the traffic tie-ups there are terribly frustrating. In Calgary some years ago, we instituted what we call the Blue Arrow express system, which was to whisk people from the outer areas of the city to downtown in very short order. It was very popular and worked very well at the time it was instituted. But today, those buses are averaging only about 11 miles per hour during the rush hours. An \$85,000 bus is only able to make about two trips per day in rush hour, when it's most needed.

Last year in Calgary we had a record that most of you wouldn't envy: some 65 or 66 traffic fatalities and an all-time record as far as damage to vehicles and human life in traffic accidents. It's not that the drivers in Calgary are the best in the world. I think they have some things to learn. But I know the police department has some things to say about this. They think one of the reasons is that frustration simply boils over because of the inability to get from one point to the other. Therefore when they have the opportunity they dash off hither and yon, and oftentimes it ends in serious accidents, because of the tie-ups. Surely, with the opening of the southern leg of the LRT in 1981, and with the extension of the Deerfoot Trail, some of that pressure will be taken off the south side of our city.

But Calgary has a peculiar problem. When LRT was first proposed some years ago, I was very sceptical that Calgarians would forsake their cars for a public transportation system, regardless of what it would be. But the logistics of the situation persuaded me otherwise. I don't know if you know or not, but Calgary is primarily office-

centred. We take some pride that we are a head-office city, a financial centre. The third-largest computer industry in the world is centred in Calgary. That means that all those people are centred and working in the downtown core, because those industries want to interact with and be close to each other. Today, 73,000 people are working in downtown Calgary. In 10 years, that figure is projected to be 100,000 people, who you have move in and out of a relatively small area.

How are you going to do that? Can you do that by the car? It's absolutely impossible. So some form of rapid transit system is a necessity today, certainly in Calgary and I think Edmonton has said the same thing. But that's expensive. Public transportation is becoming more and more expensive, both in capital and operating costs. I'm told that in the next 10 years, the city of Calgary is going to have to spend \$1.5 billion in capital costs if it's going to handle the number of people projected to work in the downtown area. You can't build highways into there or freeways and expressways that would destroy the neighbourhoods around. It simply and inevitably would be more expensive in capital costs anyway.

I know the city of Calgary is trying to upgrade its system, and is going to be coming to the provincial government with a request of hundreds of millions of dollars in the next year to speed up its transportation problems. I hope my colleagues, and certainly the Minister of Transportation, will hear their request with sympathy, because they do have problems.

Let me close on a personal note, Mr. Speaker. I enjoyed a good deal the remarks of the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn the other day, when he gave a bit of a review of his own background and the history of the Ukrainians in the province. I'm not a native-born Albertan. I happen to be a Manitoban. My parents came from Sweden as very, very young children in the last decade of the last century. Their parents were pioneers in the little district in Manitoba known as Clanwilliam.

My father — not a big man, but very agile — was known as a man of great physical strength. His skill was shown with an axe. He literally carved out a place for himself, my mother, and our family on a half-section of land which gradually expanded. It turned out to be very good land. I don't know if that was more by accident than good planning.

I grew up in the Depression. I recall that my dad never had time to use his abilities in things like sports and baseball, which I love to do. He worked from morning to night. That's all I remember him doing. I recall one day when he took a wagonload of stove wood down to the town — that's what he did in the wintertime to make ends meet — and I went with him. I think it was a Saturday. I was only four, five, or six. We went back by a little Chinese café, the only place in town that had ice cream. I remember saying, dad, could I please have an ice cream cone? They cost only 5 cents in those days. My dad looked down at me for a moment, and I think he was going to say no, because a nickel meant an awful lot to us. Finally he said, sure, Bud. They called me Bud; that was my nickname in those days. He went in and bought me an ice cream cone. That ice cream cone has grown larger and larger as I've grown older, because I realize how much it meant to my dad to give that to his son. Then I come to a place like this, where we are dealing with billions of dollars, and I say, man, what a generation can change. How fortunate we are to be in the place we are today.

I'm proud to be part of this government. You know,

Mr. Speaker, it's been said that in politics particularly when all is said and done, more is said than done. [laughter]

AN HON. MEMBER: That's right.

MR. OMAN: Just a moment. You know, I'm kind of proud to be part of a government where what is said and what is done have somewhat equal opportunity.

Thank you, sir.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, with your permission and that of the House, could I revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**
(*reversion*)

MR. PAHL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and through you, and in fact on your behalf, a group of 75 handsome young Windsorites, members of the Windsor Concert Band, under the leadership of Mr. Don Harris, who are visiting the Jasper Place Composite high school in the constituency of Edmonton [Meadow-lark]. I ask the members of the concert band to rise, and the members of the Assembly to join me in providing a concert of traditional welcome, as is the custom of this Assembly.

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**
(*continued*)

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak today with some trepidation. Many of my colleagues have commented on the Lieutenant-Governor and his new role and on your continuing role as Speaker. While most of the time your job is made easy because of the good manners and decency of all members, we can count on you to keep a cool head when some of us become a little fractious. The reason for my concern in rising to speak today was amply shown by the previous member. Those of us who have been here for a while are going to have to look to our laurels if we are going to continue to make our contribution in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, today I don't want to dwell too specifically on the budget, but would like to express some concerns and thoughts I have about Canada and Alberta, and what we can do to ensure that we make our proper contribution to the future of both. Before I do this, though, I would like to add to [those of] other members my words of praise to our hon. Provincial Treasurer for the excellent way he delivered the budget.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, we must maintain our relations with the United States. It's rather interesting that we should have visitors here from Windsor, because I have some concerns about our loaning money to a large American company faced with bankruptcy. There was a program on CBC radio yesterday, and they were tossing around figures such as \$0.5 billion or \$750 million. They didn't seem too concerned about the size of it; they just felt it should go into this corporation. Now I would be one of the first to support it. But if it is going to fail, as

many Americans are suggesting, I think we should be very cautious before we make this investment.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

I'd like to touch first of all on some aspects of the American economy. The last 60 years of growth of the United States has been based on cheap fossil fuels. The primary business of 100 top companies in the United States is related to the use of petroleum-fuel vehicles. This includes automobile manufacturers, auto suppliers, highway builders, the motel industry, and even suburbia. All these parts of the American economy are going to be in for severe changes.

As energy costs rise, each of us in North America will pay more for energy, and the money for other goods and services will decline. As a result of this, naturally other businesses and agencies are going to suffer. In the United States, 100 companies employ 9 million people who produce 35 per cent of the gross national product. With their dependants, these companies make up 15 per cent of the US population. These people are our best customers. If their economy goes into a 10- to 20-year depression, as some are suggesting, you can imagine what's going to happen to our economy.

But now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to come back to Canada. Right now over 800,000 people in our nation are out of work, yet every industry in the country is calling for more trained people. Businesses everywhere are short of help. I notice the hon. Member for Edmonton White-mud has a petition to consider formally establishing an entrepreneurial profession that would allow discussion of this very important facet of our economy. I realize from the throne speech that our province will be doing its part to train or retrain people to make them more competent. However, our decline in business training at universities is matched by our decline in training of scientists and engineers. The national science and engineering council advises that research and development will be stunted unless we attract more students and provide the laboratories and equipment they require. As the President's Report, 1978-79, of Mount Royal College advised:

The Government of Alberta has based many of its hopes for the diversification of the Alberta economy on the expansion of the 'brain industry'. The Medical Research Foundation is the first step in this direction. But at the same time, the participation rate of young Albertans in Colleges and Universities has declined in the last five years. This may be partly explained by the high demand of the labour market. However, the fact remains that a research-oriented economy is dependent on highly developed human skills. Albertans will not participate directly in the benefits of [the] projects without a significantly expanded training base. An objective of a 30% participation rate by young Albertans in our Colleges and Universities is not extravagant in relation to the economic objectives of the province. [Yet] current indications point to a rate under 20%.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that computers are becoming more important to us every day. Yet we have a 10 per cent shortfall that will grow to 25 per cent if we don't do something in the next four years.

As you know, I come from an oil industry background. This industry is going to need a huge number of workers if we are to become self-sufficient for energy needs in Canada. Imagine the vast amount of training that is going to be necessary to man the rigs, particularly in the

frontier areas, to man the pipelines, to build and service the gas plants and refineries. The need is staggering. We have heard debates in the House about the need for athletic scholarships. I suggest that if we gave as much attention to creating an elite corps of engineers, managers, scientists, tradesmen, and other highly trained professionals as we give to building a growing pool of hockey stars, many of our economic problems would be solved.

Education is one item we must consider in the future development of Canada. But the second, Mr. Speaker, is investment. We save a lot of money in our nation. We are a nation of savers. But does it go to create more jobs? One of the most popular forms of saving in Canada is Canada Savings Bonds. I suggest to you that all this does is help the federal government continue its spending. If we are to build our nation, we need more business investment. And they can only do this if they have more money, more dollars after tax. Of course the other source is foreign investment. But again, Mr. Speaker, just think what a difference it would make to our balance of payments if some of the money that's sitting in our credit unions or in savings accounts in our banks were invested in such companies as Hydro Quebec or some of the multinational, integrated oil companies. Some economists project a capital need of \$200 billion for energy projects in the 1980s. If we, as Canadians, don't put money into Canadian companies, we have to stop complaining about foreign ownership.

Mr. Speaker, we hear much about new technology or frontier sciences, as has been mentioned in Alberta Research Council's long-range plan. But if we don't put some money into research and development, our living standard is going to drop substantially. If we talk to people in the university environment or people in international companies such as Northern Telecom, they advise us that unless we increase our research and development substantially, our living standards are going to fall behind the third world countries. I think this should be of concern to all of us.

Right now our trade deficit in high-technology products is declining. Our deficit in this area has grown fourfold since 1964. We have to expand our horizons and our technology in such ways as Foremost industries in Calgary, which is exporting oil well equipment to Russia; ATCO trailer company, which exports housing throughout the world; or the many products of Northern Telecom, which we hear a lot about.

This last weekend and quite frequently, Mr. Speaker, we hear much debate about small being beautiful, and small business being more concerned with people than large business. Coming from a company that is quite large, perhaps I am biased. But I suggest to hon. members that they should not forget that the two largest, strongest trading nations in the world today are Germany and Japan. Both these countries have conglomerates, particularly Japan, which has a symbiotic relationship between industry and government.

Let's take a look at some of the advantages of size, which I will deal with later. Let me tell you about a big Canadian company. I imagine a lot of you are familiar with this one; some of you may be its best customers. I'm talking about the Royal Bank. This is a multinational company operating in 45 countries around the world, with one-third of its earnings coming from abroad. As a multinational, it can serve our Canadian exporters when doing business worldwide. This is the kind of expert help our companies need.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned previously the dilemma fac-

ing the US as they continue to depend on fossil fuels from OPEC countries. There are those who suggest we're not running out of energy, and I'm inclined to agree. We know that worldwide oil production will peak in 25 to 30 years. However, the worldwide supply of coal is 640 billion tons of proven reserves, 27 per cent of which is in the United States. Our own province is in the fortunate position of having a very small population in relation to world population, yet we have 2 per cent of the world's proven coal reserves.

Another significant statistic, Mr. Speaker, is that North America has 40 per cent of the world's proven uranium reserves. I know hon. members are aware of British Columbia and their moratorium on uranium mining. But I would like to point out to them that Sweden just had a plebiscite, and they voted to continue using uranium for generation of power. I know many of you are thinking of the Three Mile Island disaster. But in the opinion of experts in the industry, it was an excellent example of bad engineering, poor technology and, worst of all, poor management.

I know some would suggest that rather than use uranium we could use coal. But I suggest to you that other uses for coal may be found in the future which would be much more beneficial and would eliminate the problems related to acid rain and to those who have to work in the industry.

I'd like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the amount of radioactive residue that has to be disposed of, that is a concern — the amount of energy one person would need in his lifetime would generate radioactive residue about the size of a hockey puck. If you put that in perspective, I think you'll realize the problem isn't as significant as some people suggest.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, I was fortunate to visit what is called the TRIUMF project, on behalf of the Research Council. Located on the campus of the University of British Columbia, it's a good example of new technology and government/university co-operation. To the credit of the Liberal government, in Ottawa — I know this is hard to say — back in 1968, the Atomic Energy Commission agreed to invest \$30 million in the University of British Columbia campus. One of the most unique joint ventures ever formed in Canada was made between the University of British Columbia, Simon Fraser, the University of Victoria, and our own University of Alberta. Together, these four universities put up \$6 million, which provided the building and the land for this facility.

This facility employs over 200 people, and 35 per cent of them are scientists, engineers, and computer experts. Eighty per cent of this facility was built in Canada, using Canadian funds and Canadian companies. This accelerator they have constructed produces a very intense beam of high-energy protons. When this beam is focused on, say, aluminum, the material breaks up and produces particles called mesons. In the language of alchemy, with which most of us are more familiar than with modern technology, by using this accelerator they can actually convert lead into gold. It's very expensive, and they're not doing it.

But more important, they are able to use some of the by-products. For example, many of my colleagues in the House are aware of the cobalt treatment of cancer. By using the system they have at UBC, they can have much better radiation with far less serious effects to the patient than the cobalt treatment. Another side effect of this work is that they have developed isotopes that, by analysing the blood of a newborn baby, can determine if it's

going to suffer from diabetes at an early age, one of the causes of early mental retardation. By doing this, within days of a baby's birth, they can commence medical treatment that will alleviate that.

These are the kinds of things that can be done. Today it's very topical to talk about spending money on research and development. You can hardly pick up a newspaper or magazine article that somebody isn't saying something about it. We know about the excellent success we have on fibre optics.

But coming back to the concern of the people in authority: if we don't encourage more students into the field of science and engineering, we are not going to have the development that follows the research. I know our federal government has suggested spending at the rate of 2.5 per cent of the GNP. But with our present ownership of industry being primarily multinational, there is little reason for them to do research here.

As I said earlier, research alone isn't enough. If the research carried out at the TRIUMF project in B.C. is not put to use other than as medical aids, in my view it's going to be hard to justify further expenditures on such projects. We have under consideration right now a similar project at the university in the city of Edmonton. The estimate for this one is \$75 million, with an ongoing budget between \$5 million to \$10 million. So you can see that unless these projects are going to have some concrete use, people are not going to support them.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to support to why I think we need research and development in Canada. Many members may not be aware of it, but there is a worldwide struggle to maintain or attain a high standard of living. Interest rates are high right now for only one reason: every industrialized country in the world that has an interest rate problem is keeping their rates in concert with others in a desperate hope that their country won't be the one where the final collapse comes. I believe we are only going to avoid the collapse coming in our country if we achieve more technology, improve our business approaches, waste less, consume less, and invest more.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the paranoia of our Liberal government against big business — and I understand from the Speech from the Throne in Ottawa that it's getting worse — we are only going to be able to maintain our position in this world by competing in the world league with a world team. There's no question that in the past small business has served local markets well. But farmers know they compete on world markets. Many of our Canadian manufacturers know, and now we have to convince the politicians.

Some members may not be aware that the Alberta Research Council sees its role as being mission oriented. That is why we have to help industry, whether it is farming, industrial, or government agencies, solve problems. As many of you may know, several decades ago the process of separating oil from oil sands was developed at the Research Council. Many years later the multibillion dollar Suncor and Syncrude projects are a reality based on that experiment and discovery made at the Research Council. At present we are working on a method to refine economically iron ore deposits found in the Clear Hills area of Alberta. If we are able to develop an economic process, with the support of the Department of Economic Development, we could be developing a major steel industry in our province.

Mr. Speaker, it is my view that in order to bring these kinds of ventures to market, we have to consider forming large companies. In Japan there is an agreement between

government and industry on the wisdom, size, and objective of their national economy. This may be another reason for our low expenditures on research and development. If we don't have companies that can use the research and development, why should they develop them? To offset this, perhaps we could establish some companies, somewhat along the line of the Alberta Energy Company, where the government and the public could put in money, but the objective of the company would be to loan large sums of money to companies which are just starting up with processes that may have some lean early years.

This is how multinational companies grow, by investing large amounts of money in long-term projects. The important thing is: they have the staying power of a management team that believes in ultimate success. We have all heard of Northern Telecom; it's a success internationally. Another company that doesn't have high technology, and perhaps some hon. members are not aware of it, is a Canadian company which has its head office in Toronto. It dominates the business form market. Sixty per cent of its products are sold in the United States. It has 123 plants located in 31 countries. Only eight of these plants are in Canada. This company is the Moore business form company. It's a successful, Canadian-controlled, multinational company. Think how successful it would have been if it had stayed in Ontario and just served the Canadian market.

Mr. Speaker, these are just some random thoughts on where we are going and what we should do. To sum up, I would like to suggest to you that we need, first of all, to define our objective as a nation; to educate and train more of our people; to work together as better stewards of our time, our money, and our natural resources; and we should start now.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to rise in this Assembly for the first time in 1980. I'd like to welcome my seatmate, the Member for Barrhead. Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to recognize and appreciate the guidance we have had over the past year under your tutorship. Also, I'd like to extend my best wishes to His Honour Frank Lynch-Staunton, our new Lieutenant-Governor.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud of the budget presented; proud of the fiscal responsibility shown, proud of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund concept, and especially proud of our Provincial Treasurer's presentation — dignified, reserved, and enthusiastic.

Last year was an extremely busy one; at times frustrating, at times rewarding. Thank heavens the rewards have been more numerous than the frustrations. It was a year when we tried to rationalize constituency needs with provincial needs, present local concerns, and balance province-wide growth. It was a year of learning, readjusting, re-evaluating, and of decisions. This weekend a constituent said: I suppose you know of all the answers. I said, no, but I sure know all the problems.

Election '79 began a totally new experience for 29 of us. As one of the six women in this Legislature, I have to say that our male colleagues have been tremendous, treating our opinions with respect and us as equals, yet showing us enough courtesy and deference to let us be feminine. I think I can say for all of us: thank you, gentlemen, it's been a pleasure. [applause]

Nineteen eighty is a new decade. New problems: Confederation; develop more oil from the tar sands; people learning to live in a hostile climate, cope with distance, winter, and loneliness. The problems of the '70s are still

with us: wage disputes, social problems, high interest, agricultural instability, and living beyond our means.

Since the opening of the Second Session of the 19th Legislature, this government has initiated programs designed to help the average Albertan maintain a high standard of living in the '80s. With increases in interest rates and escalating housing prices, purchasing a new home has become more difficult. The increased ceiling to \$31,000 gross income has made the Alberta family home purchase program — that's a mouthful — available to many more Albertans. With subsidies up to \$270 per month, depending upon the income level, it is a program to be proud of. I hope the new levels of lending will make it available in Drayton Valley, where housing is extremely expensive. Also, the core housing incentive program will help the rental situation in Drayton Valley.

Another 12 self-contained senior citizens' units were opened this winter. Senior citizens are extremely pleased to be able to move into these. Ten self-contained senior citizens' units will be constructed in Breton this summer. Previously there have been no special housing programs for senior citizens in the Breton area. I'd like to compliment the Breton community on their initiative and effort in achieving this.

Social Services has been under constant fire in the past year. Some days I think it's open season on the minister. It seems totally unfair to me to direct every hostility, for a department of 8,000 people, at one person. If mistake are made, the minister didn't make them; someone else made a judgment error. I have found the minister to be sympathetic, understanding, and locally orientated. It's a people program, so it's emotional. We all have a responsibility: family, friends, and neighbors. How many times have you heard: I think the situation is terrible, but I don't want to get involved. Then, when a specific crisis arises, we look for a scapegoat, someone to blame, to demonstrate against, to salvage somehow our own guilt complex. We can't legislate honesty, integrity, or responsibility. All we can do is react with empathy, integrity, and concern. I know the minister does that.

There are some excellent programs funded by the Department of Social Services and Community Health. The health units, home care programs, preventive social services, homemaker services, and aids to daily living programs, are designed to help people in their own communities. There must be parameters and constraints but flexibility has to be the key.

I'm reminded of a family of six children, where the parents couldn't cope. Eventually the children ended up as wards of the government. Since they were of various ages, they were separated and sent to homes according to their ages — a devastating experience for those children, who were a close-knit family. The one thing they wanted was to stay together. The children couldn't cope with separation. This led to emotional problems, dissatisfaction and, eventually, rebellion. The net result is that last year it cost \$122,000 to keep these six children in various homes, institutions, and group homes. That cost is nothing compared to the cost of the young lives we lost.

Our programs have to be flexible and preventive. If a homemaker program, along with counselling, could have been used when it became apparent that this family situation had reached a crisis level, maybe the total destruction of that family could have been avoided. An ounce of prevention here may have been worth two pounds of cure. Again, flexibility has to be the key.

In my constitution, I have a sheltered workshop, managed and operated by volunteers. The community is

small, so the residents of the group home and workshop are an integral part of the community. They are happy and well looked after, and are contributing to society through the workshop. I would hate to think the indiscretion of one volunteer board, unacceptable as it may have been, would reflect on the hundreds of others around the province. We have a vast resource and tremendous potential in volunteer workers all over Alberta. As a government, we must recognize this potential, co-operate with the volunteers, and assist them wherever possible.

The Social Services and Community Health budget is one of the largest. My concern is that the services are centred in the communities where they are needed, not centralized. People services, especially of a crisis nature, must be at the local level.

The escalation of interest rates is having repercussions throughout the province on homes, business, and agriculture. If money was borrowed prior to 1979, interest over 10 per cent was not a risk factor. It is catastrophic for Albertans working with borrowed money. Interest was supposedly an issue in the February 18 election. But the rates have jumped eight times since that election, and interest was totally ignored in this morning's federal Speech from the Throne. Totally ignored.

What can the provincial government do? One thing it can't do is control interest rates. The Provincial Treasurer has tried to reduce their effect on Albertans through the treasury branches, the Agricultural Development Corporation, and the Alberta Opportunity Company. I checked with a couple of banks this morning. The interest rate on farm loans is 18.5 per cent; small business, 18.5 per cent; 25-year mortgages — 5-year terms at one bank are 16.75 and at the other it's 17. And, by the way, they can't get 5-year terms at that one. That's 8 per cent over what could have been forecast over a year ago.

The agricultural sector of this province is facing another crunch. Prices received a drop in almost all commodities. Most noticeable at present is the hog industry, which has seen a drop of about 25 cents per 100. The overhead expense for buildings and plants in the pork industry is extremely high. So the price drop, along with the high interest rate, makes the producer's survival critical. The stop-loss and subsidy programs of competing provinces almost spell disaster for Alberta producers. Forty-five cent hogs in Alberta cannot possibly compete with 70 cent hogs in B.C. and Quebec.

Beef prices have dropped steadily since last November, at a time when we are supposedly below optimum production levels. They not only dropped, but they fluctuate from week to week, so that wise marketing decisions are almost impossible to make, and a \$60 to \$100 differential in total prices is commonplace. On a load of cattle, this difference is staggering. The cereal grain prices have also dropped substantially since last fall. The only consolation here is that you don't have to feed grain.

The beginning farmer loan will encourage young people to get into agriculture. By lending on a young man's own merits, it has opened the program to farmers' families and will enable a son to purchase the family farm. The 6 per cent interest rate for the first five years will give these young farmers a chance to get established. The preferred 9 per cent for direct loan and the special assistance at 12 per cent for people already farming, are much needed programs. I have no doubt that this is the last resort for many caught in the price squeeze.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

The purchase of 1,000 hopper cars, plus Alberta's commitment to the new Prince Rupert terminal, will help ensure efficient movement of grain and Canada's reliability in fulfilling contracts. One of the expenses the grain producer is forced to bear is demurrage charges on liners waiting to be loaded. Last year they cost prairie grain producers over \$10 million, and Alberta producers \$3,437,000 of that. This is an appalling expense. I hope the initiatives in grain movement by this government will alleviate some of that expense.

Marketing of agricultural products is the biggest problem in agriculture today. Prices fluctuate constantly. If this fluctuation was caused entirely by supply and demand, farmers could react. But it's influenced by world production, government interference through subsidy programs, importation of competing products, dumping of agricultural surpluses, and the use of agricultural products as a bargaining agent on import/export negotiations. How do we guarantee the farmers a constant fair price for their products, thus ensuring an adequate supply for the consumer, without imposing production controls to eliminate flooding the market? Personally, the area of fair return for agricultural products is where I feel most helpless as an MLA.

I'd like to look briefly at the effect of a viable agricultural industry on the small towns of Alberta. What would be the effect on towns like Wetaskiwin, Ponoka, Hanna, Oyen, or Rimbey if farmers stopped buying machinery, trucks, fertilizer, and chemicals for one year? The agricultural buying power and the multiplier effects keep these towns alive. An ill agricultural industry has a devastating effect on the economy of most small towns in Alberta.

I'm extremely pleased with the announcement of the new hospital building program by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Certainly the new hospital at Drayton Valley is awaited with growing agitation. Although the design drawings for the 50-bed active treatment and 50-bed extended care hospitals are being done, that step is not visible to the public.

Of course I support a children's hospital. But I don't know whether my support is for a monumental edifice to show the world, or for children's wards in the various hospitals, with research and support facilities to make Edmonton second to none in child care. I've been advocating a children's hospital since I was referred to sick kids' [hospital] in Toronto back in 1969. But let's be realistic. Toronto has a population equivalent to the total population of Alberta, and Ontario's population is almost 8.5 million. Can a province with a population of 2 million support two children's hospitals physically and medically, even if we can financially?

Edmonton will be the home of the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research, provided for by the \$300 million endowment fund. The Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research, introduced in the fall of 1979 by the Premier, is an example of wise and judicious use of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. For doctors, it's a chance to do research knowing that the research funds are stable and continuous. For me and you, and for others with someone terminally ill with an incurable, unknown disease, the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research is a foundation of hope.

The reflection, in the budget speech, of expanded initiatives in transportation is welcome. The increase in heavy truck traffic has been phenomenal in the past five years, creating a province-wide transportation problem, which has been recognized by this government. The 28 per cent increase in funding for construction and main-

tenance is certainly necessary and should not cause an overextension of the industry. Resource constituencies such as mine truly benefit from the resource road improvement program initiated last year. I am pleased that the Transportation maintenance building in Winfield is finally under construction after years of waiting.

Time limits constrain me from debating many other areas I would like to discuss extensively: taxation, the oil industry, small business, education, conservation, and water management. I'd just like to salute, though, the pioneers who were in Alberta at the presentation of the first budget. None could imagine the magnitude of today's budget, or the changes in Alberta.

Reflect for a moment on the roads of 1905: mud when it rained, and dust when it didn't. Health care facilities were few and far between. The budget was \$33,500. Today it's over \$1 billion. The first provincial building proposed was the normal school in Calgary, and school districts were being organized. It was debatable whether to construct the Legislature Building or to stay in rented premises. The largest agricultural expenditure was for creameries, almost non-existent today. Obtaining adequate clean water: then as now, supply was a major problem, except the source was dug wells and springs. I understand the Bow River presented no problem then.

The pioneers of 1905 and the ones who followed, your and my grandparents, were the builders of this great province. Toil, sweat, tears, imagination, ingenuity, and determination, were the building blocks. Our gratitude and respect to these elders, whom today we must cherish and honour on our diamond anniversary. It is our duty to ensure that they live in comfort, security, and dignity.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to close by thanking the ministers for the reception that I and, I'm sure, all the other new MLAs have received from them. They've always been concerned and receptive, and have considered our problems and suggestions fairly. Many programs in our constituencies and in the budget speech reflect the consideration of these representations. I'm proud to support the budget presented by the Provincial Treasurer and to support the programs outlined.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to be able to participate today in the budget speech. I'd like to congratulate you, sir, on the fine way you have exercised your office, with patience and diligence, and the way you've addressed the various points raised about the conduct of the question period. I'd like to congratulate you on your rulings, sir, and on the efforts you have made to make this Assembly without competition [among] legislatures in Canada. The decorum displayed in this Legislature is certainly supported by the people of Alberta, and I am sure that any changes to move to more raucous theatre, the sort of zoo which exists in Westminster and Ottawa, would not be appreciated by the people of Alberta.

Also at this time I would like to congratulate our Lieutenant-Governor, a very fine gentleman, who is a citizen of the constituency of Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, in the way he delivered the Speech from the Throne. I'd also like to welcome the new Member for Barrhead to the Assembly. I think he gave us an excellent overview of the province of Alberta, a very interesting travelogue. It has prompted me to rethink my summer vacation plans in terms of looking throughout the province for the various types of things we have here. Some of the things he mentioned are areas I intend to visit.

Specifically dealing with the budget which was delivered by our Provincial Treasurer, it certainly was an impressive document. The programs this province has started in health care — the \$1.25 billion hospital construction program, the hospital debt retirement program — are certainly worthy of note. I'd like to speak briefly on the present state of development of a new Pincher Creek hospital. An architect has been hired to draw up plans for that hospital, and I'm very confident we will see construction in the very near future. It certainly has been one of my priorities to see this new health care facility developed in the Pincher Creek area, and I will continue to press the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care to see that it has an early construction start.

Returning to the budget, the initiative in the housing area, \$0.5 billion from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund dedicated to increase housing stock and new apartments in the province, is quite an initiative. I was pleased to see the increase in library grants to increase the dispersal of knowledge in the province. I know a number of municipalities appreciate that move.

As a member of a rural constituency, the increase in the budget of the Department of Transportation is most pleasing. As rural members, we appreciate the need for more dollars being spent in that area, and are pleased to see the response of the province. In the area of agriculture, the initiatives of the minister relating to the new program for beginning farmers, the change in the interest rate structure which will allow individual farmers to be treated on their own without including the assets of their parents, and the fact that under that program the ADC will no longer be the lender of last resort, are most welcome. I'd also like to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture on the new range improvement program for Crown leases. That is most welcomed by a number of people throughout the province.

I'd like to comment briefly on the provision in the budget for a new Alberta incentive tax system, in which Alberta will move toward collecting its own corporate income tax. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important initiative, and I congratulate the Provincial Treasurer for bringing it to this point today. This new incentive tax system will be sensitive to our needs and objectives. It will encourage a climate of investor confidence in the province and will stimulate the expansion of small Alberta business. I note that the minister has asked for submissions from the Alberta business community with regard to how these incentives may work in the future, with regard to business expansion, diversification, upgrading and manufacturing of our resources, and the creation of new jobs in Alberta. The second stage of this new incentive tax system will be implemented in 1981-82, with specific tax incentives. The minister should be congratulated. It's very responsive to the needs of Alberta business.

Overall, Mr. Speaker, the budget is responsive to Alberta needs, it extols sound fiscal management, it exercises fiscal responsibility, and all this without any tax increases. There's no gasoline tax in Alberta, there's no sales tax, and we enjoy the lowest personal income tax of any province in the country. The Provincial Treasurer should be thoroughly congratulated for this excellent budget document which he has presented to the people of Alberta. I believe they are most appreciative of that budget.

Mr. Speaker, I'd now like to turn to some matters dealing with the constituency of Pincher Creek-Crowsnest and some of the very serious problems which face that

area in the future. But before I get into the serious problems which face that constituency, I'd like to give the Legislature my annual status report on the Crowsnest Pass Symphony Orchestra.

I'd like to advise members that the members are still playing very enthusiastically and this year were awarded a mark of 92 in the Crowsnest Pass music festival. It was the highest mark awarded in the festival. This excellent group continues to perform in the area with dedication and deliberation, and is one of the finer symphony orchestras in the province, particularly given the size of the community in which they play, and it being a volunteer orchestra. I continue to congratulate the Minister responsible for Culture for the grants she provides to that orchestra, which are important to it. I don't know if the orchestra would be able to survive the way it has without these grants. This orchestra also charges its members to play, which I believe is unique in the symphony orchestra structure in the province. I'd like to encourage the minister to continue the grants and perhaps look at upgrading them slightly so the orchestra will enjoy perhaps a few more dollars to purchase some very needed instruments.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like now to deal with a very serious problem in the constituency of Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. Coleman Collieries, one of the major industries in the area, will be closing down this year. It will have very serious implications for the economy of the Crowsnest Pass, because approximately 400 people are employed by Coleman Collieries. There is quite a bit of activity in coal on the B.C. side of the border, and a number of those employees may be able to be employed there. The real concern is for the older employees, about 100 in number, and where they will find future employment. It's a very serious problem for the Crowsnest Pass.

One of the major things we have to do in that area is look toward economic diversification. The Minister of Tourism and Small Business is conducting a study on tourism destination areas for southwestern Alberta. I know that report has been completed, and I'd like to urge the minister to table it as early as he can so planning for tourism alternatives can take place in that area.

Along with the question of economic diversification, I think there is a need to upgrade the historic resources in the area, and the province certainly has a major role to play there. The Crowsnest area was one of the early industrializations in the province, with coal mines, coking ovens, brick plants, a plan for a steel foundry, and a number of other things. In fact an iron ore and zinc smelter was actually constructed at Frank in the early 1900s and operated for a brief period.

With regard to industrial land banking, I know the province has plans to proceed with that, and I'd like to encourage them to complete those plans as quickly as possible so there will be alternative industrial land available in the area if new industries choose to locate there.

We also have recreational resources, the Castle and Allison Creek basins, which deserve development and are also addressed in the tourism study conducted by the Minister of Tourism and Small Business.

Briefly alluded to by the Member for Calgary McKnight, the chairman of the Alberta Research Council, are the iron ore deposits in the province. I'd like to ask that the Research Council direct some of their efforts in that regard to the iron ore deposits located in the Livingstone Range in the constituency of Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. This may provide one area of alternative employment for people in the Crowsnest Pass facing these very serious closures.

I'd like to thank the Minister of Economic Development for his co-operation and the understanding he has displayed of the problems facing people in the Crowsnest Pass, and thank him particularly for the attention he has paid to the problems of the area. I know he's actively working on a number of areas to see if he can't encourage alternate industry to locate in the area.

I'd like to talk briefly about two other areas in the constituency — Highway 22, which runs north from Lundbreck to Whitecourt. I'd like to encourage the Minister of Transportation to look seriously at continuing his program to upgrade that road as quickly as possible. There has been talk in southern Alberta of twinning Highway 2 from Nanton south to Fort Macleod, but I believe the development of the grid system should take place prior to the twinning of Highway 2 south to Macleod. I believe that if we were to develop Highway [22] to a much better standard from Lundbreck to Calgary, it would provide one alternative to the heavy traffic which uses 2. Also, if Highway 23 from Monarch north through Vulcan to Calgary was developed, that would provide another route for traffic from Calgary. It would increase the road system in southern Alberta and provide those alternatives. It would also cut down the number of miles from Calgary to areas like Lethbridge to the Crowsnest Pass. In the long run, it would provide us with an energy saving in terms of the number of miles travelled and the fuel used to travel those miles.

Later this spring I hope to be able to address the question of water management in the Oldman River basin and the response by the province of Alberta. Earlier today I asked questions on the pine bark beetle infestation which is overtaking the Castle River area of my constituency. I know it's quite a problem, and I hope we are able to come up with solutions which will stop this infestation, and act quickly on the problems of reclamation and reforestation of those areas. It will certainly have an effect on the recreational resource of the area, but I believe we must salvage that timber. If we reclaim and reforest quickly, we'll take care of some of the problems of aesthetics, which will occur from that infestation. Obviously it's beyond the control of man to date that this infestation has got into the area.

I'd like to congratulate the government on a number of areas and initiatives taking place in the constituency. I see the Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife will be proceeding with the brood stock rearing station at Allison Creek, and that new provincial buildings are planned for Pincher Creek and the Crowsnest Pass, and are provided for in the budget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to deal further with the question of the future of coal in Canada and Alberta. I've alluded to the fact that in my constituency Coleman Collieries will shortly be shutting down. This is really due to the quality of the metallurgical coal there and the price the company is receiving for that coal. We had two underground mines operating in Alberta: the McIntyre one and the one at Coleman. The one in Coleman is shut down. This is basically for metallurgical coal, which is shipped to Japan for the production of steel. With the current state of the world economy, there is not quite that high demand for metallurgical coal, and the problems of lower quality and the price being paid have necessitated the shut-down in Coleman.

In his remarks today, the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight alluded to the importance of coal in the future energy requirements of Canada, and I'd just like to expand on that for a moment, if I may. Forty-four per

cent of Alberta's energy reserves are in the form of coal, and that's quite a significant figure. Further to that, Alberta's coal makes up 51 per cent of Canada's total coal reserves and in addition provides for 27 per cent of the total Canadian energy supply. Those are significant figures as to the role that coal will play in Canada and in Alberta in the future.

Presently, the people of Ontario, through Ontario Hydro, receive the greatest portion of their coal requirements from the United States. They import approximately 7 million tons of thermal coal from the United States for the generation of electricity. They import 7 to 8 million tons of metallurgical coal, none of it from Alberta, although we have high quality metallurgical coal reserves here. They import about 1 million tons for other purposes. These are the present requirements of Ontario Hydro and the steel industry. From western Canada they are presently importing about 1 million tons of lignite coal, 2 million tons of high-quality thermal coal from Luscar Sterco, and an additional 700,000 tons of thermal coal from Byron Creek Collieries in southeastern British Columbia, just over the border from the Crowsnest Pass.

Ontario Hydro has been developing a program of importing coal from western Canada. They're paying a premium for it, and their intentions are to purchase this coal to assure supply. Recently they have announced that they do not intend to import any further thermal coal from Alberta, and that they will continue to import thermal coal from other sources, the United States in particular. I think the people of Ontario have to look at the very serious implications of that, if they're looking for assured supply in the future, given the overview I've given of Alberta coal in terms of total Canadian reserves.

In Ontario there's been quite an expression of concern at the problems of acid rain. I've alluded to Ontario presently importing thermal coal from the United States. That coal is part of the problem they have with acid rain, because it has somewhere in the area of 5 per cent sulphur content. It's very high sulphur content coal, and it creates the problems they have with acid rain. Alberta and B.C. coals have less than 0.5 per cent sulphur content. It would be to the tremendous advantage of Ontario and the Ontario environment to use lower sulphur content coals in their thermal electric-generating plants and steel manufacturing industry.

Ontario must address the environmental costs of buying high sulphur content coal. They're going to have to invest in electronic precipitators — a significant investment if they're going to continue to use high sulphur content coals — or suffer the consequences on their environment. I believe an alternative is to purchase low sulphur content western Canadian coal. It would improve the coal industry in western Canada, and benefit Ontario directly in terms of environmental consequences. Furthermore, it would assist Canada in its balance of trade deficit payment position.

Another problem which faces the coal industry in the province of Alberta is the freight rate disparities they must put up with. Presently Alberta coal, shipped to Vancouver for export to Japan for metallurgical coal purposes, faces a \$13 to \$14 a ton freight rate to the port. This is a significant cost when you look at the markets we must compete with, particularly Australia, where their coal mines are right on the coast and they don't have to pay that high freight rate component. That's what we have to face in Alberta and western Canada in terms of export of coal.

When we look at the other direction, and I've talked

about sending coal to Ontario, we're faced with an \$18 to \$20 a ton freight component in the cost of that coal. That's a very significant deterrent to using Alberta coal in Ontario. One of the solutions we may look at is increased efficiency in the use of unit trains. Before we're really able to break into the Ontario market, I think we have to address that freight rate component, which presently offers that disadvantage. I'm going to look at one of the solutions to the freight rate problem, as I continue with my remarks.

If we were to look into the future in terms of energy requirements after the production of our conventional oil declines, I think we're going to have to look very seriously at coal gasification and coal liquefaction. The current world price of oil is the biggest deterrent right now. But as the price of oil rises, the cost of conversion of coal to gas or liquids, as an alternative, narrows. I submit that in the very near future the cost of coal conversion threshold, with relation to the price of oil, will be reached. At that point the conversion of coal to gas or liquids will become economical. Because of our extensive supplies of coal, I think Alberta will be in an enviable position to take advantage of this cost breakthrough.

If we are to be in a position to take advantage of this breakthrough in the cost of conversion of coal to gas, I think Alberta should be encouraging investment in coal gasification and coal liquefaction technology, and demonstration plants. After we've got this coal gasification process and the coal liquefaction plants in place, I think we will be able to ship Alberta coal, or the product of Alberta coal, to Ontario. At that point we have our pipeline system set up, which is transporting oil and natural gas to eastern Canadian markets; we have the coal gasification and coal liquefaction plants in place; we can use the present pipeline infrastructure to send those products to eastern Canada.

The really important point for going into coal gasification and liquefaction is that they will provide an alternative feedstock for the burgeoning petrochemical industry in Alberta. It certainly would be my preference that the products of coal and gas liquefaction plants provide feedstock to the petrochemical industry in Alberta, to provide jobs here in Alberta for future generations of Albertans.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that in the Speech from the Throne from Ottawa today, the federal government has stated that generally they're abandoning the goal of energy self-sufficiency, and in its place are putting in a goal of sufficiency of energy. In my mind that means they're going to continue to import coal and oil, and not look at the things they can do to create energy self-sufficiency in Canada. I think it would be a very serious error on their part, not to look at the oil sands plants alternative and the opportunities I have just put forward in terms of coal, which will provide for Canada to meet its future energy requirements.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

Bill 11

The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act, 1980

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 11, The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act, 1980.

Briefly, as all hon. members know, the purpose of this corporation is to continue to provide very significant benefits to hundreds of thousands of Alberta taxpayers, by enabling local municipal authorities — cities, towns, school districts, and the like — with very favored and very preferred rates and opportunities to borrow money.

Essentially, this Act has two objectives: first, it gives school boards, for the first time, representation on the board of the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation. They are not represented now. At the moment they are melded with the definition of municipalities. This amendment would in effect give them their own directors. So approximately 111 school districts in the province would be represented by their own director on the board of the AMFC.

The amendment is in response to a resolution of the Alberta School Trustees' Association, which stated in the last number of years:

The Association shall urge the Government to create another class of shares for the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation to be reserved for the direction of school boards.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment does just that. It is, therefore, responsive to the ASTA and also, in my view, reflects a desirable move towards greater equality between school divisions and municipal administrations. That's an approach I initiated in my years as Minister of Education, and I feel it's important to continue ensuring that school districts and those involved in education have equality with respect to the powers under the law of those in municipal administration, both of them having equally important responsibilities.

The second objective, Mr. Speaker, is very simply to increase the borrowing limit of the corporation from its present limit of \$2.8 billion to \$3.2 billion. It's important to note that those borrowing limits are cumulative, so the effect is to increase by \$400 million for the next succeeding fiscal year the total amount that could be borrowed by the various entities. The \$3.2 billion is the estimate, and again, the statutory ceiling is up \$400 million from the present amount, that will be applied for — that's an estimate, of course, every year — by borrowers in the '81-82 fiscal year. We are expecting to get very close to the \$2.8 billion in the present statute in the '80-81 fiscal year ending next March 31.

The other amendments, Mr. Speaker, are consequential to these two and, as well, relate to and improve the general efficiency of the Act.

[Motion carried; Bill 11 read a second time]

Bill 18

The Hospitals and Medical Care Statutes Amendment Act, 1980

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 18, The Hospitals and Medical Care Statutes Amendment Act, 1980.

A very simple explanation for this Bill, Mr. Speaker. Earlier in the session we dealt with amendments to The University of Alberta Hospital Act and received from that board requests for the modernization of their administrative procedures and for legislation that would reflect that the medical health sciences centre was under construction. One anomaly in their existing Act had been the \$20 per day limit of payment to their trustees, which certainly is out of step for that kind of responsibility, and not line with The Alberta Hospitals Act, which provides that at all hospitals throughout Alberta, the trustees are able to set fees which are more realistic. So we decided to respond to the requests of the University of Alberta Hospital Board.

I then had a check done on the other provincial hospitals to see if similar legislation was embodied in those Acts, and it was. We've decided to change them all at the same time, so that payment for trustees for all hospitals throughout Alberta, provincial and non-provincial, will now be brought up to the same sort of level by way of this amendment. This deals with the two boards: the Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board and The Provincial General Hospitals Act, which deals with the two remaining provincial hospitals.

[Motion carried; Bill 18 read a second time]

Bill 30

The Hospital Debt Retirement Act

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to have Bill 30, The Hospital Debt Retirement Act, read a second time.

The principle involved in this Act is rather a major one, in that it's a very important part of two programs: one, our major hospital facilities construction program; and two, our ongoing program of government generally to improve the financial situation and the financial administration of different programs throughout government. In essence, with this big construction program facing us and many hospital boards throughout the province, we want to wipe out all their past outstanding debenture obligations by way of the financial transfers outlined in this Act. With the adoption of the estimates in front of the Legislative Assembly at the present time, that will permit us to go to a new system of paying for construction as it's built, on a pay-as-you-go basis, similar to many other capital projects by other departments of government. We look upon it as a major change in procedure.

Just to refresh to memories of hon. members, the procedure until now has been to approve building projects requested by certain hospital boards, leave the administrative work to the boards to raise the necessary debentures, which are generally issued by the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation, and then in the global budget of that particular hospital board we would include an amount by way of a grant to pay off the annual principal and interest payment for that debenture. It's really a rather unnecessary and slightly unwieldy method of paying for these capital projects. We could see no reason administratively and, with the financial position of the province being what it is, no reason there either for carrying on with that semi-cumbersome procedure.

I'm very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to put this Bill forward to the Legislature today and ask for support, because I think it is a major and important thrust in the financing of hospital capital projects.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, speaking on second reading of Bill 30, The Hospital Debt Retirement Act, I think it's very important for members of the Assembly to recognize the great significance of what the government is in the process of doing. Here we are, spending \$340 million to pay off the past indebtedness of facilities that have been constructed for the use of all Albertans. Many jurisdictions in Canada would dearly love to be able to initiate a construction program of this magnitude, let alone pay off past debt. The minister has explained the rationale for it, in that we're paying for it anyway, and we do have funds in the form of surplus to pay that off.

I submit that undoubtedly when we get into his estimates, we'll be dealing with such matters as where we are headed in health care, particularly in regard to the operating costs of facilities. No doubt, as we see in education, the matter of local citizens having not only the opportunity of utilizing facilities but perhaps the responsibility, in a fiscal way, of paying for them will come up. So I won't speak to that at this point. I'm sure it's going to come up.

The question I would raise in the debate on principle is that we see in the Act that this includes not only hospital debentures, but nursing home debentures. My understanding is that nursing homes in Alberta are both public and private. The public nursing homes, I believe, are all run in conjunction with a hospital board or district. I would like to mention, and perhaps the minister can respond when he closes debate, that the retirement of nursing home debentures, which I assume only to be under Section 6(1) of the Act, would be applicable to nursing homes in the public sector; that is, nursing homes presently under aegis of a hospital district or board. It bothers me a little bit, and I'd like the minister in closing debate to clarify the position of private nursing homes. We have in Alberta a tremendous number of private nursing homes doing an excellent job now, and their fees are in some ways adjusted to account for the debt retirement they have to allow for in their rates.

So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly applaud the government for taking the initiative in paying off this debt. I think it's a great move forward and would encourage members to support the Bill.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the second reading of Bill 30, my colleagues and I plan to support the Bill. But I'd like the minister, hopefully at the conclusion of second reading, to explain to the House exactly the effect this will have on hospital boards. I'm not, on this occasion, trying to belittle the significance of the move. But as I understand the situation accurately — and if I'm wrong, I'm sure the minister would want to straighten the record — what will happen is that in the global budget which hospital boards get from the minister's department, there will not be included in the calculations an amount for debt retirement or interest. In fact, with the approval of this Bill, once the session is concluded, once the debentures of a hospital board are approved or certified by the minister under, I believe, Section 2 of the Act, then the money will be paid out and those debentures will cease to be on the books as far as the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation is concerned.

Mr. Minister, the salient point I'd like to find out is: once these are paid off, will there be more money in hospital boards for their disposal as a result of this move? Or will it simply — not simply: I don't want to underplay the amount of payment here, some \$340 million according to the Member for Lethbridge West — will an

amount for debentures and interest not appear in the global budgets? From that point of view, if that is the case, it becomes a book transfer. That's the point I'd like to have cleared up.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. RUSSELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to deal very quickly with the points raised by the previous speakers, first of all the points raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. He's quite correct in his interpretation of the effect on hospital boards financially. It will not mean an automatic increase in available operating dollars, because we're withdrawing the principal and interest payments. The budget would be reduced by that amount, and any increase in operating funds would be made on a set of criteria that would have nothing to do with this debt retirement program. Furthermore, I think all hon. members realize that these debentures are held by the AMFC, which in turn is an investment of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. So you can see the ripple effect of the transfers being made here.

I think the benefits of the program are twofold. Number one, it does give the department better financial control over capital projects, because we will be paying for them on a pay-as-you-go basis. Now, we are really not paying for them until one year elapses because of the dating of the debentures. A project is under way and a year old before we're responsible for the first payment for it by way of debenture payment. That has worried us, particularly in these rather inflationary days in the construction industry.

The other thing is a fairly significant administrative benefit to a variety of hospital boards, who have indicated they will be very pleased to be relieved of this unnecessary administrative accounting for their capital projects — applying for the debenture, getting it, paying the bill, making the request to the department, and accounting for the dollars once they come back. That will be eliminated, and I think it's a significant administrative benefit to them.

With respect to nursing homes, the hon. Member for Lethbridge West indicated an anomaly between private and non-private nursing homes. They're all under the jurisdiction of the appropriate local hospital board, but I think the payments now are rather unfair. This Bill will not change that existing unfairness. They all get the same *per diem* rate for operations, but the non-private nursing homes have traditionally been getting additional grants to pay their debenture payments that are included in this Bill, whereas the private operator has not received those and has to look after his own debenture payments. Those are his own responsibilities.

This is something we have been discussing at some length with private nursing home operators to see if we can't get a more fair and equitable way of treating the two different kinds of nursing homes because, as we know, private nursing homes do play a valuable field in providing excellent care for many of our senior citizens. So with the response clearing up those two items, I move conclusion of the debate.

[Motion carried; Bill 30 read a second time]

Bill 20

The Libraries Amendment Act, 1980

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 20, The Libraries Amendment Act, 1980.

The primary purpose of this Bill is to allow improvement districts and special areas to participate, through the Minister of Municipal Affairs, in financing and operation of the co-operative library systems in the same way as all other municipalities. In this way, residents of these areas will be able to receive improved library service, and provincial financial assistance can be channelled to the library systems on their behalf. Previous to this, school jurisdictions were the only local authorities in these areas which were able to join our library system.

In addition, the Act will be amended to remove the requirement that the accounts of a municipal library must be audited by the same accountants who audit the books of a municipality. Library boards will thus have a greater freedom of choice of accountants, provided the municipal council approves that choice.

Finally, there are two housekeeping amendments, Mr. Speaker. These will repeal parts of the Act respecting special constables and rental of premises for library purposes. The former provision is now adequately covered by The Police Act, and the latter clause refers to a part of the Act repealed in 1977.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just a very brief question with regard to the minister's comment concerning accountants. Unfortunately I do not have copy of the Bill in front of me but, from my notes on it, if I understand the principle the minister has outlined, this would allow library boards to designate their own accountant, and not necessarily take the accountant the town recommends to them. But if a board were to suggest a certain accountant, and the town council refused him, in fact the board would not have that kind of flexibility. Is that the interpretation of the Act, Madam Minister?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what is meant. That has been brought to us on the municipal libraries. The smaller libraries have been having a great deal of difficulty in the financing of some of their accounts. Sometimes it is a very small bill, or a very small account, and charges have been rather high.

[Motion carried; Bill 20 read a second time]

Bill 22

The Marketing of Agricultural Products Amendment Act, 1980

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 22, The Marketing of Agricultural Products Amendment Act, 1980.

As previously mentioned, the purpose of the Bill is to enable the egg and poultry marketing board to establish a program to collect a levy from its producers for the purpose of disposing of surplus eggs. On January 19, 1978, the Supreme Court of Canada brought down its decision relative to the egg marketing reference, and ruled that its existing power was beyond its legal authority. This had several implications, Mr. Speaker. The boards that were using Section 2(2)(a) of the Agricultural Products Marketing Act of Canada, relative to the collection of these levies, must now have their own legislation. The

universal levy collected by the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency was now invalid.

Under federal legislation, the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency can collect levies only on eggs produced for interprovincial and export trade. The collection of the levies on eggs produced for intraprovincial trade was within provincial jurisdiction. So the striking down of the universality applied to the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency surplus removal program had major implications for the Alberta egg industry. In order for CEMA to operate a surplus removal program as before, it was required that the provinces legislate surplus removal programs of intraprovincial extent and delegate this power to CEMA.

As a result of the Supreme Court decision that the national egg surplus removal programs could only be proceeded with by the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency as the agent of the province's concern, and through the powers and provisions contained in provincial legislation, amendments to The Agricultural Products Marketing Act are required if Alberta is to continue to take part in a national egg marketing plan.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge members of the Assembly to support second reading of this Bill.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a question to either the minister or the sponsor of the Bill. Were the amendments discussed with the Alberta egg marketing people before, and do they carry the approval of the Alberta egg marketing board before they were presented to the House?

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Speaker, the Alberta egg and fowl marketing board requested this through the Alberta Agricultural Products Marketing Council.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I gather that was answering a question as opposed to closing debate. I'd like to add my support ...

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might just make this point: I think the custom of turning second reading into an occasion on which the sponsor of the Bill is also going to be answering questions is not good form. It's something we have recently got into without much intent or deliberation on the part of hon. members. I surely have no objection to hearing the hon. member speak, and will shortly conclude in order that he can. But I just wanted to say that in subsequent cases my view will be that when the minister, or in this case the sponsor of the Bill, rises because of a point that has already been made by an hon. member of the opposition, if no other person signifies an intention to speak when the hon. member rises and responds, then I would argue at that time that it's closing debate.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the hon. Government House Leader, it would seem to me that it would be a matter of whether the question related to detail in the Bill or to the principle of the Bill. If it related to the principle of the Bill, then it would seem to me that it should be in order, as such questions usually are, if the member to whom they are addressed wishes to accept them.

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't intend to ask any questions during the course of this. I just want to indicate that I support the principles contained within Bill 22. What we have, of course, is a national system that, whether members like to admit it or not, is based on

supply management theories. Some members of the House find that rather offensive when it comes to other types of agricultural production, Mr. Speaker, but it's certainly worth noting that the people in the egg industry have benefited substantially as a result of initiatives they've taken in developing orderly marketing.

I support this particular piece of legislation because it is necessary in order to allow Alberta to participate in the surplus removal program. But I think hon. members should be very clear that what we are doing is strongly supporting a principle of supply management, a principle of orderly marketing. What we're talking about here is removing surplus commodities from the market place, and I just happen to philosophically support that particular concept. So I am happy to endorse the Bill today, Mr. Speaker, and in so doing, I am pleased to see members of the government side following the sage recommendations of the egg marketing board on this question.

[Motion carried; Bill 22 read a second time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, if I might just interject, because the sign language I was using is probably not adequate to the occasion, I was going to suggest that in view of the hour and the fact that Your Honour will shortly be instructing us to return in Committee of Supply this evening, that the next Bill I gave to the Clerk not be called and we terminate the afternoon now.

MR. SPEAKER: I think I should say, with respect, that perhaps the signals were adequate but the reception wasn't that good.

Does the Assembly agree to adjourn, and when the members reconvene at 8 o'clock they will be in Committee of Supply?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The House recessed at 5:29 p.m.]

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

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

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

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

Department of Education

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the minister care to make some brief opening statements?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Brief.

MR. KING: Do they have to be brief, Mr. Chairman? [laughter]

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some introductory comments. In large measure they will be a restatement of some things I have said to interested individuals and groups outside the House. But given the fact that I have now had the privilege to be minister of this department

for 13 months, and in view of the fact that some of these things have not been said for the record in the Legislative Assembly, I would like to restate some previous comments.

The first, of course, is to say that I feel a deep sense of humility in view of the responsibility which the Premier asked me 13 months ago to take on. I want everyone to know and certainly hope they do know that I consider education to be a critically important social task. I consider my responsibilities to be significant because I consider the activities in which my department is engaged to be very significant not only for educators, not only for the students, although they are obviously very important in our consideration, but for the whole of the province. Education is a very important task.

The responsibility of the system is to teach, hopefully, students who are willing to learn. But it is much more than a task of instruction; it is much more than a pedagogical activity. Education is a cultural activity. That is why it is important not simply to the students and to the educators but to the community as a whole. It is by the process of education that we teach communication, that we teach knowledge about the tools of our community that we hold to be important, and it is by education that we are involved in a major way in the socialization of our children. For all those reasons education is important to every single member of the community.

Because that is the case, Mr. Chairman, the educational institution belongs to the community as a whole. It is not the property of the operators. The educational institution does not belong to the administrators and it does not belong to the teachers, although their role in the institution is very, very important. Similarly, education does not belong to the politicians, whether they are trustees or the hon. members of this House. It is important for us all as politicians, local or provincial, to remember that we are the trustees of education, not the proprietors of the system. If the politicians must remember that, so too must the teachers and the administrators.

Mr. Chairman, when considering education, the community should be primarily concerned with ends and not means. When we consider education all of us have been preoccupied with considering the means of education, and too little attention has been given to the end toward which education is or should be directed. We have fallen into the trap of accepting as primarily important, questions about means which, in my view, are of only secondary importance. It is time to reconsider what we are doing and why we are doing it, and to make that reconsideration in terms of the goals of the community, not simply of the institution. I have said — I repeat here, because I believe it — that it is time for us to have a discussion in this province, in this community, about what we want to achieve and why we want to achieve it. Toward what end is this activity directed?

Mr. Chairman, that debate cannot be conducted by a small group of people. It cannot be limited to me, to the president of the Alberta Teachers' Association, the president of the Alberta School Trustees' Association, a few interested trustees, the president of the Alberta home and school federation, and others. It cannot be limited to a few representatives of the so-called stakeholder groups in the province. The debate I hope we will foster will be accessible to every citizen. It will be ongoing, intensive, extensive, constructive, imaginative, and informed.

I believe this kind of debate has to take place because of the change which faces our community generally and education particularly. Education is implicated in change

in two ways. First of all, like everyone else, individually and in our organization we are affected by the change going on in the community. We sometimes respond well to that change when it faces us; we sometimes respond poorly to that change when it faces us. We are affected by change. Secondly, though, and in a way that is almost unique in the community, education is also blamed for change. When people are assaulted by change they do not understand, when they perceive change occurring in their children that they don't understand or appreciate, in a way that is almost unique in the community education gets the blame for change. Therefore, we are doubly held to respond to change in the community.

Mr. Chairman, change is going to occur in education arising from three characteristic trends. The first, of course, will be changes in the demography of the province; we're educating fewer children. That trend will change in a year or two, and will change for a relatively short period of time, after which it may or may not suffer another change. But the population of the province is changing, and that's going to have a major impact on education. Technology is changing, and that will have a major impact on education. Social attitudes are changing, and that will have a major impact on education. Demographics, technology, and social attitudes are all imposing change on the system that we must be prepared to respond to.

In order to engage in a debate which will enable us to respond to change, the debate must be structured, focused, and informed. To conduct an informed debate means that we must do many things to extend information to interested citizens and, where we don't have information, to gather it and make it available to interested citizens. I would cite as an example the major study we have launched with respect to educational finance in this province in all its aspects, including — and I would only note one — the financing of transportation.

During the course of these spring sittings of the Legislature, I hope to make some announcements about activity that will lend structure and focus to the debate on education in the province. In the meantime we have taken, and will take, additional steps to ensure that such a debate, as it is conducted, is conducted in an informed way.

Debate itself is not sufficient to our concern, Mr. Chairman; action is required. The system operates even while we talk. Even as the debate is carried on, we have to develop and implement programs and activities within the educational system that will demonstrate to the public our intentions for education in the province. Without describing them, I would just like to list a few for the information of members and, hopefully, to trigger some discussion during the estimates.

A statement on the community school was promised in the throne speech debate and will be forthcoming during the spring sittings of the Legislature. The review of The Teaching Profession Act, designed first to modernize it and, second, to make it consistent with the professions and occupations policy of the provincial government has been announced, is under way, and is involving the major stakeholder groups, particularly the Alberta Teachers' Association. As a result of the presentation of the report of the Minister's Advisory Committee on Student Achievement last May, we have received from Dr. Mowat his report on the public response to the recommendations of the MACOSA report.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay public tribute to Dr. Mowat on this occasion. I regret very much that at

the time I tabled his report last week in the Legislature, I did not take a moment to say something which very much required to be said; that was that Dr. Mowat, in the performance of his duties, did an even-handed and comprehensive job, as I think members who have had a chance to read his report will acknowledge, and by the performance of his job made a substantial contribution toward the development of a policy which will be workable, equitable, and acceptable to the people of the province. I want to thank Dr. Mowat for the work he did on my behalf in that regard.

We are increasing significantly our financial support to the Alberta Federation of Home & School Associations, Mr. Chairman. I hope hon. members will realize that that expresses not only financial support but other indirect and intangible kinds of support that we intend to extend to the federation as representative of parents throughout the province. There is a substantial increase in the amount of money available under the supplementary requisition equalization grant and that, as well as the corporate assessment grant, is meant to reflect our determination to provide fiscal equity to smaller and less wealthy boards throughout the province. There is a significant extension of language services, as well as an extension of the educational exchange program in the budget. I hope they will express to the people of the province our concern for language development opportunities in this province, and the development among our students and our teachers of a greater awareness about the nature of our nation.

Mr. Chairman, I don't believe in the autonomy of school boards. The boards and Alberta Education do not operate independently of each other, or autonomous one from the other. We interact. If I may use a biological term, our relationship is symbiotic. The main thing is that there is a relationship. The Department of Education cannot operate without local school boards, and local school boards cannot and would not want to operate without the Department of Education. What is conducive to understanding in this situation is not to suggest that we should hive off one from the other, not to suggest one is autonomous of the other. What is conducive to performance, in terms of the relationship that exists between boards and the provincial Department of Education, is to understand what is appropriately done at the local level and what is appropriately done at the provincial level.

What is appropriate, Mr. Chairman, is not fixed in stone. Our understanding of the appropriate division of responsibility is going to change from time to time. It is going to change as social and economic circumstances in the province change; it is going to change as attitudes change; and it is going to change with changes in the capacity of the boards on the one hand and the Department of Education on the other.

One thing that will reduce the involvement of the Department of Education or the Minister of Education in the activities of local school boards is going to be the development by local school boards of stated policies, reduced to paper, policies which are fair and equitable in their nature and in their application. Mr. Chairman, if boards have policies, and if they can demonstrate that those policies are fair and equitable and that they have applied them in a fair and equitable way in circumstances, they will not have to be concerned about either the department or the minister looking over their shoulders. Given those conditions, I believe decision-making should be exercised as closely as possible to those who are affected by the decision.

I'd like to conclude, Mr. Chairman, with four points about my stewardship of this department. I believe strongly that what we require now is much more imagination rather than money. What is required is much more good faith rather than defensiveness. What is required is much more concern for the child rather than concern for the system. And what is required is much more control over circumstances rather than circumstances exercising their control over us. During this fiscal year and in future, Mr. Chairman, I hope those four characteristics will be hallmarks of the activity of Alberta Education and, in partnership with boards and teachers, hallmarks of the educational endeavor in this province.

Thank you.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, in responding to the remarks by the Minister of Education, I was sitting in my place trying to think what I would think of those remarks if I were a school trustee reading them in *Hansard*. Or if I were a parent or a student, what would I think of those remarks? Mr. Minister, it wouldn't be difficult at all for trustees, parents, or students to consider those remarks, telling school boards, parents, and teachers that we're going to have a great debate in this province on education — frankly I thought we had quite a debate in this Assembly in 1978. We're being told here this evening that what we need is imagination rather than money. But it seems to me that's saying to school trustees, teachers, taxpayers, students, and parents — whichever of those situations you come into — yes, regardless of the fact that you've told us there's going to be a study of educational finance in Alberta, Mr. Minister, we're going to have to use our imagination and really shouldn't be counting on any more money.

Mr. Minister, you can use all the imagination in the world. But the fact is that in this province about three-quarters of the cost of education now comes from the foundation program and one-quarter comes from the taxpayers of the province. When you compare that to the period of time the Provincial Treasurer was minister, we don't need imagination; we need some very sizable changes in the educational finance situation in this province. All your imagination, sir, all the consultants you want to hire and everyone else, aren't going to change that.

With the greatest of respect, Mr. Minister, might I say that we talk about the debate — I think you used the term focused, informed, and structured. In light of the remarks we've had this evening, it would behoove you, sir, to indicate not only to members of the Assembly but on a far broader front what this debate we're going to have is. I say to you that when the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs was the Minister of Education, we spent a considerable amount of time in this Assembly — I think worth while too — talking about the aims, objectives, and goals of education. Frankly, I don't think we need another period of time looking at that area. School boards, teachers, trustees, and parents tell me today that what they want now is some education leadership. All sorts of consultant reports have poured in over the past several years. It seems to me, Mr. Minister, that what we need now is some bold definitive action by you, sir, as a result of the large number of reports, consultation, and things that have come along.

I go back to this question of dollars and cents, and imagination. With the greatest of respect, all the imagination in the world isn't going to change the fact that . . . I've discussed with you, Mr. Minister, with regard to my

own constituency, but I know there are other systems that have real problems when it comes to financing educational programs for non-academic students in junior high schools. It's great to tell them they should go and work out an arrangement with the adjacent school boards. That may work in some cases, but I've had a chance to meet with a number of school boards across the province. We sat down with the school trustees from our area of the province one Saturday morning. If you don't want to take my word, ask some of the other MLAs who were there. One of the matters raised was this question of educational opportunities for junior high school students who are not academically oriented. I'm not saying it was the only issue; it wasn't. But it was certainly one of the issues raised, and not just by the particular area I have the privilege to represent.

Mr. Minister, a second portion of the remarks you made this evening, if I copied them down correctly, was that you didn't believe in autonomy, that it was a matter of a changing relationship between school boards and the department, that the department couldn't exist without school boards and school boards couldn't exist without the department. That's not a new revelation. But if we're going to have changes, Mr. Minister, the place for the changes in The School Act is here in this Legislative Assembly. If there are going to be major changes, the kind that I interpreted from the remarks you made about this question of autonomy and the role of Alberta Education and the school boards, the place to make those kinds of basic changes in The School Act is here in the Legislative Assembly. It isn't out meeting with some school boards and suggesting to them that best they do this and best they do that, despite The School Act.

Thirdly, Mr. Minister, I'd be less than disappointed if in the course of the estimates — this evening we're being asked to approve more than \$1 billion for education, 1 to 12 system — you didn't indicate to the committee what plans the minister has in mind for community schools, at least if you could go as far as officials of your department did with the Alberta home and school association last Friday.

Secondly, Mr. Minister, in light of the remark you made this evening, I think it would be extremely helpful to find out what you have in mind for this review of educational finance in the province. If I copied down the statement correctly, there's going to be an educational finance study, with the first area being transportation. If my memory is accurate, it seems to me we had school buildings studied not very long ago, but just before that we had transportation. The department has had studies on transportation coming and going for the last I don't know how many years. Mr. Minister, before we can expect the committee to approve over \$1 billion, there is certainly a need for us to have some indication as to what's happening in that area.

Mr. Minister, I appreciated the remarks with regard to Dr. Mowat and the work he did. But, once again, we've got all sorts of studies in. What are we going to do? Or is this to be part of the great debate to follow? Are we going to take another extended period of time? I think, Mr. Minister, that's an area that would certainly be warranted.

In concluding my remarks, I think it is appropriate that The Teaching Profession Act be scrutinized in light of the general professions legislation that is coming in. I'll wait with interest for what happens there. But it's only appropriate that The Teaching Profession Act would be part of that look at all professions legislation in the province.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to make some remarks to the minister prior to getting to the actual votes. First of all an observation: the minister has been in the portfolio for about a year. In my perception of the Minister of Education I can speak from several points of view: one, the experience I've had with regard to the minister's physical presence in my constituency. He's been there on numerous occasions, not because he was running away from Edmonton, I believe. He was there seriously, wanting to talk and listen to people concerned with education in southern Alberta. By means of the media, I have seen where he has been through other parts of the province. I'm very encouraged and enthused by the attitude displayed by the minister in seeking out new ideas throughout the province, albeit some of them tend to end up as somewhat controversial public statements. I think we have been very fortunate. I think of the minister's predecessor, the last term we debated the goals and objectives of education, and the time before that when the present Treasurer was the minister. I think we have been very fortunate.

Mr. Chairman, some of the comments I want to make relative to the minister tie in a little with what the hon. Member for Bonnyville has done, both last fall and this spring, in trying to awaken members of the Assembly to some of the real concerns perceived in his constituency. If one reads the debate that went on, I suggest they're concerns not limited to his constituency; they are applicable to the province. The first one, I think, is when we get to definitions of education. I think of that debate we had two years ago. I believe we came to the conclusion that education was not all academic. In fact, education is much more than academic. If one attempts to define the role of education, there are so many ways of looking at it.

We had a report tabled today by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I suggest that many of the people mentioned in this booklet are either one, two, or three years out of school. They're primarily young people. The rate of bankruptcies has tripled in Canada, and Alberta is no different. Surely part of the educational process is to enable our young people to become better Albertans through ways other than simply academics, and to prepare our youth for, let's say, a good citizen type of role where they would hopefully marry, have children, be better citizens of the community. To do that they must have jobs; they must have employment. Surely that's not all academically oriented. We have housing problems and financial problems. I suspect very strongly that we cannot divorce the concept of education from other types of education.

I know that virtually by statute we function in this province about 190 days a year, based on some — well, I probably shouldn't say it, but historically we didn't have air conditioning so we locked the schools in the summer. We now continue to lock them and keep people away from libraries. But we're into the 190-day year, and it seems to me — perhaps this is the role of the community school that the minister's so keen on — that part of that should be absorbed in that area.

I heard the minister say, and I can't help but comment, that education is not the end but only the means, and we must be very careful how we approach it. Who should have the say? Should it be president of the largest union in this province, 28,000 strong? Should it be president of the ASTA? Should it be president of the home and school? Who should have the say? Well, I thought that was why we were here in this Assembly. When I read the estimates, I understand that the authority of the minister

is under The School Act, an Act of this Legislature. I think all members here represent the collective views of the people who sent them here, as was proven, I submit, in the goals and objectives debate a couple of years ago. In keeping on mentioning that, I don't mean to be unkind to my new colleagues who weren't here at that time. But I felt the goals and objectives debate was extremely helpful to the then Minister of Education. I'm pleased to see reflected in some of the votes some of the thrusts that were debated in the House at that time.

Frankly, one thing that has always puzzled me is that we have 10 provinces in Canada and every province has the best system. With the average Canadian now moving once every five years, I am somewhat puzzled. I look at Manitoba with mandatory kindergarten, Alberta with its ECS optional program, other provinces with various programs, and Ontario with grade 13. I sometimes have a great deal of empathy for the young people in Canada in the 1980s who are going to be mobile and try to plug into the various systems. So I would hope, Mr. Minister, that there is a fair degree of rapport with your colleagues across the nation in matters of education.

When dealing with education, one can't help but consider the cost factor. It has tripled in the last 10 years. Salary components are fully three-quarters at least, not to mention the built-in pension liabilities. So it's an extremely, costly program. With respect, Mr. Minister, I don't think that for one minute we can look at the \$0.75 billion in the estimates, plus the local requisition, and not believe it is, perhaps next to hospitals, the biggest business we have in this province. We have to pay very close attention to it.

Mr. Minister, you made reference to local school boards. I don't really like the word "local". I would like to think of them as people school boards, because that's really what education is all about: the citizens of this province deciding how they want their youngsters educated and electing trustees every three years to ensure that is done. We use the Curriculum Policies Board and other areas to try to consolidate on a province-wide basis some commonality of interest.

My history is not that good. The former Member for Innisfail is no longer here, so we can't talk about 1910 the way we used to. But I somehow suspect that back then school boards indeed could function reasonably well without the department. I would like to see if we would weight them, so if they're not a true balance at least the balance should be in favor of the local school boards or the citizen-elected school boards.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to mention something that I'm very proud of as a member of this Assembly and a member of the government: the private school sector in this province. It concerns me somewhat when I see the increasing growth of private schools. It tends to bother me from this point of view: why would citizens in increasing numbers seek to pay perhaps up to \$1,000 to \$1,500 a year into private schools, in addition to the taxes they now pay for the school system? I'm confident the reason they do is they've tended to lose faith with the public school system. In Alberta we have 38 out of 1,450 schools, but over 6,000 students are in private schools. They're there for a reason. We as a government have seen fit to pay 45 to 50 per cent of the costs of those schools. That's 65 per cent of the per pupil instructional grant, but as everybody knows that's only part of the cost of a school system. In terms of support for private schools in Canada, we're only exceeded by Quebec. But, Mr. Chairman, to the minister, it bothers me when I see the

increasing numbers who are seeking out private school as a means of having their children educated. It's a little like the price of gold: gold isn't high; it's just that the value of money is less. I somehow suspect that people are losing confidence in the public school system.

Let me close by saying I know many people in the department, particularly in the area offices. I've been impressed with their dedication and their helpfulness to the people in my community who are involved in the business of educating and running the school system. Mr. Minister, I think you can be very proud of the type of staff you have in your area offices around Alberta. It goes without saying — the official Leader of the Opposition, who spoke previously, made comments, and I agree with many of those. I think Alberta education, by and large — and we're very fortunate. It's the nature of the governments we've had in the province over the years that has contributed in a major way toward that.

Thanks very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed with the next member wishing to participate in the debate, I would remind all hon. members that the same rules of address apply in committee as in the general Assembly, and that it's not proper to address a minister in the first person. All remarks should be directed through the Chair. I would ask all members to remember that particular part of our rules in future.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the Member for Calgary Forest Lawn.

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps I could begin by offering a couple of comments on the private school question. The hon. Member for Lethbridge West raised this issue.

Frankly, in terms of my own position, I think there is a difference between private schools based on religious conviction and private schools that are simply private operations set up basically to educate people. In other parts of the world, we see the children of the elite going to private schools. In Britain they call them public schools, but basically they're the private schools. I think there's a difference between those kinds of private schools and private schools that are essentially extensions of freedom of religion. For example, I think there is an important role to play for schools such as Canadian Union College at Lacombe. While I am not a member of the Seventh Day Adventist faith, I can understand people who hold that faith feeling quite strongly that they should be able to send their children to that kind of private church school.

Mr. Chairman, as long as we are sure that the curriculum is well thought out and is being taught by qualified teachers, then I for one don't have a great deal of concern about increasing funding to institutions such as Canadian Union College or others that can be cited. Where I have had problems over the last several years, and continue to have problems, is in the category four schools, where there is still some uncertainty about the qualifications of the people doing the instructing. However sincere these people may be, and however strongly the members of that particular religious group feel about religious liberty, I think there is the final question that must be dealt with by the government: are the standards adequate? Is the quality of instruction proper? Is that quality of instruction one which allows those children to go through that school and receive an education which will permit them to cope with a very difficult, ever more challenging society?

The minister didn't really talk too much about the question of private schools, particularly with respect to category four private schools. When he concludes the general debate, Mr. Chairman, I would hope he would take some time to outline where things presently stand with respect to the operation of category four schools, and what the objective of the government is in terms of the final strategy for private school funding. The Member for Lethbridge West indicates that it's 65 per cent of the public and separate school funding. Is the objective 85 per cent and does the government intend to phase this in over a period of three or four years? Is the objective 100 per cent of funding? What is the long-term goal of the government with respect to the issue of funding of private schools? In the case of category four schools, they receive no funding from the province, but I'm talking about certified private schools that follow the curriculum set by the department with teachers who are qualified to teach in this province.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move from there, if I may, to deal with two or three items that one can't really argue with too much. Education belongs to the community as a whole; it doesn't belong to the teachers or politicians. I don't think that's a statement of such great import. Frankly, I would say that's self-evident, and I would suspect all the stakeholders in the education system would agree with it. When the minister goes to speak either to school trustees or the ATA, I really doubt, Mr. Minister and Mr. Chairman, that there are going to be too many people arguing with that particular point.

The minister also makes a valid point when he suggests that education is blamed for change which parents and people in society don't understand. I suppose that has always been the case. It strikes me, Mr. Chairman, that if we go back 50 or 60 years and read some of the comments about how the education system in the 1920s was sort of leading people to wicked ways, we could find the same concern. I suspect it will always be the case; that's just one of the givens we're going to have to live with.

Again, I don't have any quarrel with the concept of community schools. We've discussed that particular subject in previous estimates discussions, as well as in the House.

I want to take the bulk of my remarks, though, to deal with some of those areas in the minister's initial observations that trouble me a little. First of all, Mr. Chairman, the minister argues that the community should be concerned with the ends and not the means. I really wonder about that statement, Mr. Minister, because it seems to me that one of the real moral dilemmas in society is that we often divorce ends from means. I think the two really go inextricably hand in hand.

The minister attempts to make a case a few minutes later in his introductory remarks about how the school boards have to work with the Department of Education, how there is a symbiotic relationship. With great respect, Mr. Chairman, I think we as a community are not able to analyse the ends accurately unless we are concerned about the means at the same time. If we're going to have an informed debate — and this is the sort of thing the minister is saying he would like to see in Alberta — surely we have to be concerned about the means as well as the ends. We can't have an informed debate about some sort of vague, abstract, hypothetical objective and forget the concern about the means.

One of the most controversial issues at the moment, Mr. Minister, is whether we should have some form of

testing system. That's not an end; a testing system is not an end. That's a means of adjudicating whether students have met a certain level of achievement. That is the kind of issue which people are concerned about when they review the educational system. So, with great respect, I just don't agree that we should be sweeping aside discussion of the means as well as the ends. I think the two have to blend together.

The minister also talked about the debate, which must be structured, focussed, and informed, and indicated there's going to be a major study into educational finance, which I'm sure we all support. I would say to you, Mr. Minister, when I look at the budget that has been presented to this Legislature and that as minister you are asking the committee to approve, we still have some distance to go in meeting this problem of the lack of educational opportunity in Alberta. In every set of estimates since I've been a member of the Legislature, I've talked about the problems faced especially by rural school boards. I recognize that there are increases: in the supplementary requisition equalization grants, approximately \$2.6 million; in the small jurisdiction grants, only \$88,000; in the small school assistance grants, \$530,000; and in the declining enrolment grants, only \$192,000. Admittedly, that will be of some help. But, Mr. Chairman, to the minister: it still is not going to solve the kind of problem that almost every rural M.L.A., if that member has met with local school trustees . . . They come to you and say, look, it costs us more in the rural areas, our costs are going up. We've got to try to balance the budget, and balancing the budget inevitably means reducing the quality of education.

Now I can advise the minister of school divisions I know that have improved their financial position tremendously. But they have done that not as a result of maintaining the program they had in place; they have done that because they've had to lay off staff, because they've got multiple-grade classrooms, and because they haven't been able to provide the quality of instruction they could in the past. The minister can cite the increase in the budget, but I say to the minister and to the government, Mr. Chairman, that that still isn't going to do the job. We're still going to see especially our rural school boards squeezed for funds. Rural members are going to be meeting delegations of trustees in either the winter or the fall, and the cry will be basically the same as it was five years ago: costs are higher.

Similarly, Mr. Chairman, we now have changes in the school transportation grant system. That will be helpful. But again I say to the government that presuming there will be some settlement between Ottawa and Alberta over energy pricing, we are going to see a very substantial increase in the cost of energy, which is going to make it more difficult to operate our school bus systems. Beyond that, in growth areas where you've got tremendous pressure — you've got oil plays in some areas of the province — one doesn't need to be any great magician to know what happens to the costs of fixing school buses. The maintenance costs shoot up. Yet, Mr. Chairman, there really still isn't the kind of allowance in our grant structure to make it possible for some of these divisions that have to put school buses over roads that the Minister of Transportation is going to have to spend a little more time on . . . With higher costs of fuel, higher costs of maintenance, those extra costs — and I'm not just talking about the situation in the last few months, but as we look into the future — increasingly are going to skyrocket. I would suspect, Mr. Chairman, that at least some of that

increase is going to have to come either from local taxpayers through increased supplementary requisition or, alternatively, from other areas of the school budget.

I just want to make one additional comment. I too was a little concerned about the minister's statement that he doesn't believe in the autonomy of school boards. I must confess that when he went on to explain what he meant, he was a little more reassuring. But I say, Mr. Minister and Mr. Chairman, that nothing is going to lead to a more clear-cut confrontation — you know, this is the red flag in front of the bull — than using the statement that the minister doesn't believe in the autonomy of school boards. I think you can still have all sorts of autonomy, but at the same time a working relationship with Alberta Education. Mr. Chairman, I would argue that if what the minister is saying about people getting involved, having an informed public debate, and local school boards being closer to people making decisions — if all that is true, then we're going to have to see our provincial Department of Education take a recessive enough role that we as legislators can honestly say that we believe in the autonomy of local school boards, and that they can and should make these decisions to the extent that is reasonably possible within a provincial educational system.

Obviously there is going to have to be a certain amount of interdependence. No one argues that. But there is a great difference between interdependence, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, and "I don't believe in the autonomy of school boards". I think you should believe in the autonomy of school boards, and I think the members of this Assembly should believe in the autonomy of school boards. If you don't, how can we possibly have any kind of coherent public involvement?

DR. BUCK: He was misquoted.

MR. NOTLEY: The Member for Clover Bar says that the minister was misquoted. Perhaps the minister was misquoted, because at the beginning of his remarks he certainly did say that education belongs to the community as a whole, it doesn't belong to the teachers or the politicians, or to the bureaucrats in Alberta Education, however able the vast majority of them may be. It belongs to the community as a whole, and inevitably that's going to have to involve a very high degree of local autonomy. I would hope that in closing debate the minister would take the opportunity to qualify those remarks. At least take the file out, Mr. Minister, and hone down the edge a bit. It's a little cutting at this stage, and it's going to get the government into trouble. Far be it from me to want to see this government in any trouble.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to put one final point to the minister. With perhaps a little teasing last time, I'll be totally serious for a moment. It seems to me that one of the trickiest issues the Minister of Education is going to have to handle is the question of how we deal with second-language education, in particular with instruction in French and rapidly stepped-up teaching of the French language in this province. I say this because if there is any hope of keeping the country together, the rest of the country is going to have to take a very close look at Claude Ryan's constitutional proposals. I have an awfully difficult time swallowing certain aspects of Mr. Ryan's constitutional proposals which the majority of members in this House would be very happy with. One aspect I'm not so sure all the members are going to be happy with is a very clear commitment to definite constitutionally entrenched language rights.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Education is going to have to deal with that issue. The way in which a province like Alberta deals with it I think will have rather profound effects on how our role is perceived in the future of Quebec vis-a-vis the rest of the country. I would welcome the minister to be perhaps a little more definitive in his comments on how he sees his department fulfilling not just the jurisdictional educational responsibility in Alberta, but the implications of a possible constitutional amendment which would entrench certain basic rights which would go beyond education under Section 92 of the BNA Act.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Chairman, I enter this debate on the estimates of the Department of Education with, first of all, a commendation of the minister. This member was very pleased with his statements with respect to the trustee role of government with regard to education. I think that statement is so much in tune with the general philosophy of this government, which sees itself in that posture not as a government in power but as a government which has been granted the responsibility and the privilege to act on behalf of the people of this province. I was pleased to hear the minister viewing his responsibilities in that same vein.

Secondly, I wish to commend the minister on his comment, referred to by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, that in fact education does belong to the community as a whole. I share that view. I must say, Mr. Chairman, I disagree with the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview when he suggests that the statement "education belongs to the community as a whole" is not a statement of great import. He went on to qualify it, but I must take issue with that. I happen to think it of vital importance that this government make it clear to the people of this province how it views its responsibilities in the field of education. I think the minister adopts the proper approach and view by making that very clear.

Having tossed those accolades to the minister, I'd like to respond very briefly to the comments with respect to the need to be more concerned with the ends than the means. Again, this was alluded to by the previous speaker. I think the minister perhaps was suggesting to the Assembly that we've got to be very attuned to the results of our educational system. In that regard, I heartily agree.

That gets us into this whole area of standards. When I say "standards", I'm not talking about standardization; I'm talking about being concerned with the quality of education. That, of course, is one of the ends we pursue in this field. I think the minister was being too modest, and his statement was perhaps misinterpreted by the previous speaker. I think the minister's actions have made it entirely clear that he is very conscious of the means we are adopting to achieve the ends of education.

I'd like to relate those preliminary comments to one area of the field of education that I feel truly embodies the concept of education belonging to the community, that addresses the matter of the means as well as the ends. That, of course, is the field of community-sponsored early childhood services in this province. This member must admit to a certain acute interest in the area, being a member representing one of the constituencies in Calgary. In fact, the city of Calgary has the largest proportion of community-sponsored early childhood services programs in the entire province.

Through you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to address some comments in this particular field to the minister. In the first instance, I think the ECS programming embodies

in so many ways the goals of this government in terms of the community use of schools: In the community-sponsored aspect of early childhood services, we have the community, through various organizations within it, coming together, putting forward a program they feel is of educational significance and in tune with community values, and providing it to the young people in their particular locale.

With regard to the overall situation of community-sponsored early childhood services in the province, in particular in Calgary, I think there is a great deal of unease at the present time. I think the minister has gone a large way toward allaying that unease and the concern that exists, with the meetings he's held with community-sponsored ECS representatives and the reassuring statements he's made to them. However, the fact remains that in Calgary in particular, Mr. Chairman, many of the community-sponsored ECS people have the conviction that perhaps their time on the educational horizon is limited. They feel that by virtue of the very nature of the formalized educational system, the board of education in Calgary has an interest, albeit perhaps a subconscious one, in seeing ECS programs in the city of Calgary brought under their total umbrella. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a sad day if that occurred. That is in no way an adverse reflection upon the quality of work handled by the board of education, but simply a statement of my conviction of the importance of the community-sponsored aspect of early childhood services. I think that is a fair statement of the attitude and the state of mind of community-sponsored ECS in Calgary, and perhaps throughout this province.

More specifically, their dilemma is in large measure a financial one. I suppose that's no great surprise. In many ways finances are a focal point for all areas of government concern. That doesn't mean to say that we can solve all our problems by tossing dollars towards them, but certainly community-sponsored ECS finds itself in a real dilemma, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the minister, inasmuch as their funding comes exclusively from government support and parental support. They find themselves in the position where that funding is at such a level that it is difficult for them to meet the growing expenses they experience. In particular, I would refer to their requests for a new formula for funding, where they say to this Assembly and this government that in addition to the per capita funding that has been made available to them, if we really wish to ensure the continued viability of the smaller programs where there is even more attention to be devoted to each student, each young child, we have to make available to them a base grant and an administrative grant, so that the smaller programs can continue. I'm talking here about programs that have the support of the community, but in instances where the community has only limited financial means to support them and wishes to see them continue.

Mr. Chairman, you may recall earlier comments in this House with regard to the new assessments that have been levied on community-sponsored ECS programs, effective September 1, by not only the Calgary board of education for the use of classrooms, but in fact by the Department of Education for the use of mobiles for classroom facilities. Certainly, if they are going to be expected to bear those costs and to carry on with their very worth-while programs, this government has to ensure that they have adequate finances to meet their minimum financial needs.

As I mentioned earlier, I think the very serious concern of community-sponsored ECS administrators in this

province has been allayed by the supportive comments of the minister. But, with respect, Mr. Chairman, we're now at that juncture where we have to have the dollars funded so that these people can carry on. At this exact moment they find themselves in the position of establishing programs for the fall, negotiating with their teachers to carry on with programs, and being asked to do that in an atmosphere where they have no idea what their financial means will be. No person can be expected to operate under that kind of atmosphere. No businessman can properly plan expenditures when he doesn't know what his revenues are going to be, or at least have some reasonable forecast of them.

So through you, Mr. Chairman, to the minister, I would implore this government to move quickly in coming forward in the Assembly with some precise statements of funding for community-sponsored ECS, so that we can ensure that one of the really effective and truly community-oriented aspects of education in this province is able not only to continue but to thrive. I pass those comments on to the minister in the belief that he is sincere in his commitment to community-sponsored early childhood services.

My only concluding remark would be that we are at the point now where all the words have been spoken, and it's time for action.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NOTLEY: No more imagination. Money.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I'm extremely pleased the minister has stressed the end achievement of educational funding. Budgetary consideration of educational funding, at both the provincial and local levels, has too often been with the view of balancing the budget, not with the educational result of that budgeting. It's time for a review of educational funding. Teachers and parents want to be able to talk about the curriculum and the needs in their own communities. In too many communities the ratepayers feel that their concerns are ignored in the education of their children. The last headline in the local newspaper said ratepayers wish to have a plebiscite to examine the election of school board members.

The funding for high school students has traditionally been higher than for primary and elementary students, yet it's the primary and elementary students who need special help and constant supervision, especially in reading. It's time we had a maximum on the number of students in the primary and elementary grades, rather than trying to balance the budget by increasing the pupil/teacher ratio.

I'd also like the minister to consider special funding for teacher aides in the primary grades. We have programs for the learning disabled, but we don't compensate for the immature or slower students who are capable of achieving an average level but certainly need extra help in getting a firm foundation. We lose the slower students from grades 1 to 4 because they get behind, and then we lose the brilliant students from grades 4 to 9 because they're disenchanted with school and lose interest.

The books provided through heritage learning resources have been well accepted; finally, some Alberta content. I'm extremely pleased with the ministerial statement that makes it mandatory for geography, history, and citizenship with Canadian and Alberta content to be taught in the social studies courses. I'd like to bring to the members' attention a 1978 Canadian social studies book which has current Canadian content. My daughter had it,

and I looked it over thoroughly. It's an excellent book. In fact there are two new books out in grade 10 social studies courses which are just excellent. I'd like to commend the department for its use of them.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I would briefly like to refer to two points with regard to the Department of Education. The first one relates to some information I require as to the means of funding presently in place between the department and what I believe to be the vehicle of the Calgary Public School Board with regard to a very favorable program, one worthy of great support, which takes place at the Baker Centre in Calgary. Perhaps the educational component is covered under the estimates for Social Services and Community Health. So I need some clarification there from the minister, if he would please.

I was in that facility in the last month, and I know a radical departure has taken place in terms of the previous care of the residents within that facility. In the last while a concerted effort has been made by the Department of Education, at least through the Calgary school board, with regard to trying to give some very, very basic education to some of these people who are mentally handicapped. I would like to hand out some plaudits to whichever department is responsible.

I would like to refer to the educational opportunity fund as listed within the estimates of the Department of Education. It is my understanding that a tremendous number of projects have been supported through this particular fund, primarily within the inner cities or the less affluent portions of the larger cities in the province, whereby a number of children have been given additional instructional opportunity. This has been most beneficial as well.

The question I have for the minister is with regard to the expansion of the educational opportunity fund, with particular emphasis on our native Indian children within the province, especially those who are residents within the major metropolitan areas, and the difficulty of the Department of Education in trying to get into communication with our federal counterparts with a view to obtaining additional funding to help support areas of education which legitimately should be carried by the federal government. However, I applaud the minister and the department for the fact that they are willing to work with native people, especially those who are treaty Indians, and not wait for the additional funding agreements with the federal government to be in place.

I would hope, Mr. Minister, that it is through the educational opportunity fund that you will see your way clear to give expanded dollars, because this is one area that does need additional dollars to help fund such alternative schools as the Plains Indian Cultural Survival School in Calgary, and the fine program operated by the Awasis society in Edmonton. I don't know if it would fall under the EOF but, hopefully, very serious consideration would be given to the whole matter of the transportation funding difficulties which the Awasis school in particular has encountered and which, hopefully, will be solved in the not too distant future.

So as I add my commendation to the minister for his willingness to examine the whole delicate, sensitive, and important issue of the education of Indian people within our urban areas, I do hope that under this particular funding project additional funds will be in place fairly soon. I would go one step further and say to the minister

that I hope within the department there can be some necessary speeding up of how the EOF grants get into place, and that the payments are made to the school boards; whether they be separate or public, so that one can get on with the whole planning process with regard to those particular schools, such as the Awasis type or the Plains type, and that by delaying payments we are not adding to the frustration of our native people and those people working on their behalf.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make several short remarks of a general nature. Before the session I went on a presessional tour and met with members of the teaching profession in my community, students' union executive members, and parent/teacher groups. Several points seemed to come from that. There is concern that with the job markets and the economy being as they are, a great number of students who are leaving school early are not being adequately provided with the technical skills which give them a practical education that will provide them with skills in the market place. I suppose that is the view of a group of students and their parents who are looking at a non-academic program, but certainly there is a feeling among the students that they lack something to go out with, that school is little more than something to be endured or a process to go through. That concerns me.

The other side of the coin is that there are some students out there who do want an academic education. Their feeling is that academic excellence is not being well supported. In support of that I was shown, for example, a lack of materials in the social studies curriculum. Given recent curriculum changes, it was almost impossible for teachers to provide background materials to their students that supported the curriculum changes the department had mandated. In fact, a teacher the minister is familiar with is using some of his Italian textbooks, translating them from materials he used in the 1950s, and running that off on the school xerox machine as the curriculum supply for grades 10 and 11 social studies courses on European history. Mr. Chairman, there's a lack of support materials for teachers who are encountering rapid changes in curriculum that the department is mandating but not providing the support material for.

Finally, I think there is a concern about special education. For me special education means people who have particular handicaps or learning disabilities, or a particular ability to absorb a great amount of information relatively easily. In the case of children with learning disabilities who are slow learners, I am told that not enough attention is being paid at the primary grade level to diagnose, if you would, students who have those disabilities. If they're sensory disabilities or attitudinal problems, those students aren't being identified in their early years of the educational process. As a result they go through and have handicaps or impediments to their learning process.

The other side of that coin, Mr. Chairman, is that students with particular gifts are becoming bored, disinterested in the educational process, and we're losing the attention of that group of people who should be our future leaders.

I think the challenge is there for the minister to make school something more than a process to be endured for students who do not seek an academic education but want a practical education and, for those who do choose an academic education, to make it challenging and exciting, to provide the resource materials for them to enrich their experience — and that's not being done entirely —

or to diagnose students who have particular problems and need extra assistance. One has only to look at the budget differences between elementary, junior high, and senior high education and see that far more money per student is being put in the senior high level than at the elementary level. That is a source of concern.

I hope the minister would take those remarks into consideration as he sums up the general section of the debate on the estimates.

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks. The first relates to the question I posed to the minister earlier today. When bringing forth a program such as the announced K to 12 social studies program, I would like the department to give consideration to front-ending such a program, be it social studies or any other program, so that school boards can effectively launch a program outside their normal operating expenditures. This would greatly assist them in providing the adequate resource materials, be it print or non-print, and in providing additional program development, be it with the curriculum or with staff. I think it's a matter of orderly development that we consider such funding, no matter what the revision is and what the program would be.

The second point I would like to raise is that a number of schools and school boards are expressing concern about the relevance of business education programs due to using outmoded and worn-out equipment and attracting staff who have current business experience. If we look at vocational programs, there are conditional grants which allow school boards systematically to provide for equipment replacement. If we look at the business education program, which is also endowed with equipment — and it's very necessary in the program — often boards will not be able to set it as a priority due to financial constraints existing with other programs. Thereby, many of the programs suffer as a result of inadequate and outmoded equipment.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the minister and the department review this whole area so we can respond to providing equal opportunity. Many of our young men by their very nature get involved in vocational programs such as automotives, welding, and whatever, and many of our young ladies often opt for a business type of program. It would be nice to have them experience the opportunity of dealing with relevant and modern equipment.

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to see the increase in ECS funding. ECS in our area has had trouble in the past, and I'm hoping the extra funding will assist them. Busing grants were also increased some. I am pleased to see that, because in a high growth area where you have the amount of resource work going on and the conditions of some of the roads, the cost of busing and busing maintenance is horrendous. So I think the extra busing grants will help some, but probably there will have to be consideration for more funding, especially in these high growth areas.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I see that the Grande Prairie Learning Assistance Centre is mentioned. I would ask the minister if he might mention in his closing comments what is in that program.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to bring one concern to the minister that was mentioned at the ASTA meeting we had with zone six.

That had to do with regional offices. Their concern seems to be that the people in the local regional offices at least do not seem to have the same kind of experience in administration of school boards. They're young people who are brought into these offices, and they don't seem to be able to cope with some of the problems of the administration of school boards down in that area. Would the minister please comment on this when he sums up tonight?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make a few comments with respect to the estimates on education. I would have to say that I'm pleased with the budget. I'm pleased with the hon. minister's reference to the community school concept, and look forward to receiving more in that area.

I would like to expand a bit on bilingual education opportunities and French immersion programs in this province, which have been mentioned. This is an area of high concern in my constituency. During the last few years we've seen substantial growth in this area, both in the bilingual programs and in the French immersion programs. I don't think the problems facing these programs at this point in time are as much a lack of funding as a lack of resource material and of properly prepared teachers. Those are long-term solutions we have to work on.

I have a concern which keeps coming back to me and which came back to me a number of times in listening tonight; that is, that we keep trying to solve problems by playing an additive function. We hear calls for more funding, as if this is going to solve problems. We've played the additive function in additional courses, particularly in our secondary school programs. I think the things I appreciate most about the hon. minister's attitude toward education and his comments are the questions he attempts to raise. I would suggest that if we address ourselves to an assessment of how and where we are spending our money, with a little more imagination and a little more productivity we would probably bring about more improvements in the system than by just saying more money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If no other members wish to participate, perhaps the hon. minister would like respond now.

MR. KING: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It is proving to be a job for me to keep track of all the comments that have been made by my hon. colleagues. I do appreciate the contribution made by all of them.

I suppose I should begin by attempting to deal with the group of comments made by my two colleagues who are members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. With respect, I thought that some of the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition indicated a pretty static view of the world, and perhaps indicated why he is the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition rather than the Leader of Her Majesty's Government.

No study has been done that has led to perfection in the area under study. That's as true in education as in any other area of human endeavor. We have done studies. Some have been excellent studies, given the circumstances of the day. The Department of Education has acted upon recommendations administratively and the government, for its part, politically, in accordance with its best judgment of the circumstances of the day. Nevertheless, circumstances change and people's judgment about what is acceptable changes. That requires that you continue to

reconsider even those decisions which you have made and acted upon. I'll be quite frank with the hon. member opposite. For as long as I am the Minister of Education I intend to continue studying some questions, because I believe now, and I expect always to believe, that some questions will merit study, sometimes because local boards have asked for reconsideration and sometimes because we in our own judgment have decided that reconsideration is necessary.

Would the hon. leader like to suggest that because a study was done on transportation three years ago, we should not accede to the requests of local school boards and study the transportation program again? Would he like to suggest that because a study of education financing was done in 1961 or in the early '70s, it is not necessary to reconsider the way in which we provide educational financing? We have studied and will continue to study the questions we believe merit consideration.

But it is equally important to remember that I said, and repeat now, that we are not going to hide inactivity behind studies. At the same time we debate and at the same time we study, we are also prepared to take remedial action. Two examples of that are SREG and the 17 per cent increase in SREG this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: What's SREG?

MR. KING: Sorry, supplementary requisition equalization grant. That is designed to remediate certain problems that have been drawn to our attention and that we recognize. But we are not going to solve problems in educational finance simply by juicing up one program or another *ad infinitum*, without ever reconsidering the whole context. The hon. leader offered that we would be much better off to act on the recommendations of consultants who have already reported, rather than initiating new studies. With the exception of the Finnestad report, which has only just been received and on which action is indicated in the Speech from the Throne, and with the exception of the report of the Minister's Advisory Committee on Student Achievement, on which I have indicated both publicly and before this House that a decision will be made by the government before September 1, I would invite the hon. leader to identify the particular consultant studies which he says have been concluded and lie dormant in the Department of Education without our attention.

Mr. Chairman, I said we needed imagination more than we needed money, but I did not say that we did not need any additional money or that we could not access additional money. I believe this budget demonstrates quite conclusively that money is available and available generously, more generously in this province than in any other province in Canada for education.

The question is, Mr. Chairman, what will more money buy us? How much more money do we need to buy our vision of perfection? Depending on where the money comes from, who's going to control the endeavor? One set of statistics — and it's only one — indicates that we provide \$50 per capita less for education than does the province of Quebec. Does any member care to rise and argue that because we are second per capita the quality of our education is second to Quebec's? Alternatively, if the Treasury Board will give me \$65 per capita more next year, so that by that graph we're in first place on a per capita basis, is anyone then going to argue that because we spend more per capita we have the best educational system per capita? I would suggest to you that argument

cannot be made seriously on either side. The measure of quality in education is quality. It is not money. That's the only point I wanted to make in that regard, Mr. Chairman.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

Someone has said we had a good debate in this Assembly on May 15, 1978, and that that was really all the debate education required, that we had done our duty by the Legislative Assembly and should go on to something else. I don't accept that. That was an excellent debate; I recall it very well. It did something for the members of this Legislative Assembly, and it did something for the members of the public who are interested in and concerned about education. But I still maintain, notwithstanding the quality or the outcome of that debate, that this province today requires discussion about education as much as it did in May 1978. I hope that will continue to be the case.

I had intended to respond to my hon. colleague from Lethbridge West as to the nature of that debate. I think the point was very well made by my colleague from Calgary Forest Lawn.

Comment was made about private schools. I'd like to make a detailed reply to that very briefly. The government has said on a number of occasions that barring exceptional circumstances, it will be our intention to increase the annual per capita grant to type one private schools at the rate of 5 per cent per year against the corresponding School Foundation Program Fund per capita grant. The level was 60 per cent last year, and is 65 per cent this year. As I say, barring unforeseen circumstances I would expect it to increase by 5 per cent increments until we reach 80 per cent. The government has also said that when we reach 80 per cent per pupil, as against the comparable School Foundation Program Fund grant, we will plateau at that point pending a complete examination of the place, role, and activity of class one private schools in the province. Future funding beyond 80 per cent will depend upon policy decisions made by the government of the day when that review of private schools is completed. So our intention is to go up by 5 per cent annual increments, to plateau at 80 per cent, to do a complete review of the place of private schools in the province at that time, and to make policy decisions after that review is done.

It is also very important to point out, Mr. Chairman, that type one private schools are only accessing a portion of one grant and have no access to any other grants provided by the Department of Education. In reality, they're getting from us on an annual basis about 45 per cent of what it costs to educate a pupil. The balance, in the order of 55 per cent, is made up by tuition, a variety of fund-raising activities, and whatever other sources of revenue they can access. If you think of it in terms of 45 per cent rather than 65 per cent, I don't think anyone could argue that we are supporting private schools to the extent that they constitute a threat to the future well-being of the system of public education that exists in the province.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview said that it was a truism to say that the schools belong to the community rather than to the professionals or administrators. That may be how he views it, stated in the general sense, but I think it's equally important to know from him how he views particular situations that flow from that general statement. If he agrees that the schools

belong to the community, does he also agree that parents have a right of access to the classroom during instructional periods, because I think it flows from the first statement. Does he also believe that parents have a right to participate in the curriculum-building process in the school, which right they would share with the professionals and the administrators? I'd welcome his thoughts on either or both of those concrete situations which flow from the preceding general statement.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

If I suggested, Mr. Chairman, that I thought the public should concern itself with ends to the exclusion of any consideration of means, that was certainly not my intention, and I would like to correct that impression. I meant to suggest that I think the primarily important questions are questions of ends, and that you cannot thoughtfully address yourself to questions of means until you have first of all agreed upon ends. An important but not exclusive consideration of ends should be the consideration of the professional. But the general public must still be concerned with the questions of means, insofar as they reflect upon the spirit of the policy that exists in the community. It is certainly true that the way in which you do something can be as much a statement of policy as your expressed reason for doing one thing or another.

So I'm not arguing that we should be unconcerned with means, but rather that they are a major and proper concern of the professional, that our concern with means should flow from our understanding of the ends toward which this activity is directed, and that our participation should be less decisive.

One of the questions which must be constantly addressed and resolved again and again with respect to different programs is whether or not you are going to fund on a global basis — that is, particularly via the School Foundation Program Fund grant — or on a program fund basis. Global funding supports what the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has identified as a concept of autonomy. I refuse to share his terminology, although I will use it in order that he can understand the point I would like to make now. Program funding operates on an assumption that the local authority is either unconcerned or incompetent and therefore must be adjured, provided with the incentive, or coerced into addressing a problem that he would otherwise not address or address it in a particular way. I think it is a semantic error and becomes a fallacy in the discussion to use the term "autonomy". We are interactive, and we are interrelated. No man is an island, and no school board is an island.

The most devastating attack on whatever idea of autonomy existed in this community has been mounted for 40 years by the CCF and the NDP. I say that with respect; it's a very significant point. If you are truly concerned about local autonomy, I don't think anything has done more damage to it than the philosophy which gave rise to national medicare because provinces couldn't be relied upon to look after that problem themselves, or a national energy policy because Alberta cannot be relied upon to have a national as well as a provincial interest. I would suggest that the list goes on and on and on. There is a philosophy that believes in the right or even the obligation of the totality to impose its will on anyone or everyone. If anything has attacked the idea of local self-control, it is that philosophy expressed over 40 years in this country.

If the member believes in local autonomy, I would ask him if he also believes in individual autonomy. If he believes in individual autonomy, I would ask him what he believes of the argument of some people that they should be entitled to send their children to church rather than to school.

A question was raised about early childhood services. I would like to suggest again, Mr. Chairman, that I support community participation in our ECS program. Secondly, I think early childhood services is something more than education and should involve other resources of the provincial government as well as of the local community. Thirdly, I would like to express my recognition of the fact that some funding inequities exist with respect to community schools. I hope to be able to address those in a concrete way before people consider their fall budget.

I will address some other specific points very quickly, and remind hon. members that with respect to anything that follows, there's another opportunity to ask questions when we get into the votes themselves. Special education is going to be handled with respect to the responsibility of the Department of Social Services and Community Health on the one hand, and Education on the other hand, in this way: we will accept, either directly or with the school boards, responsibility for the education of students and the costs associated with education; the Department of Social Services and Community Health will continue to accept responsibility for the personal services required by children, even though those services may be delivered in the context of the educational environment. So we are taking on responsibilities for education in some cases where previously we have not had them. Social Services and Community Health will continue to accept responsibility for what we call personal services, even if those are provided in the context of the educational setting.

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican made a powerful plea for something in which I know he has a particular interest. He's also aware of my own predisposition. I think he was making his plea to the Legislative Assembly as a whole, rather than to the minister. We do expect to be able to provide funding, and in fact are doing it now on an interim basis, for programs educating native students in the urban environment where there has been a demonstration that support for that program is essential to the educational success of the students.

With respect to assessment and diagnosis, at the present time the most serious shortage we face is actually in terms of skilled and experienced personnel, rather than in terms of money. It will be indicated in the budget — members may ask questions about it during the course of the estimates — that in some programs the money has not been taken up, because although they might like to take it up, boards cannot hire the skilled, experienced personnel necessary for the operation of the program. So admittedly we have a problem there. The problem, though, is in attracting the personnel to Alberta or, alternatively, in preparing the necessary personnel in our own system here in Alberta. In that regard, of course, the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower made an announcement last fall which will have significance.

I can only repeat that we released only today the study on in-service costs. In light of the release of that study and particularly in light of the announcement I made last Thursday, I certainly would be prepared to consider the proposal advocated by the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar. I was also pleased to hear the admonition that

we should provide proportionately greater funding for elementary education, and I would only remind all my colleagues on the Treasury Board of that next fall. So those of you who are on the Treasury Board will please remember this evening.

The LAC, Learning Assistance Centre, in Grande Prairie is the only one operating in the province. In all other regions the programs offered by the LAC have been taken over by consortia of local school boards, but in the Grande Prairie area we ourselves operate the Learning Assistance Centre. It provides speech therapy, diagnosis, and assessment of handicapped children to the boards in that area. We have five staff. Two consultants and three educational psychologists provide services to the boards in the area.

With respect to the regional offices, I can only say that we are proud of the staff we have in the offices. We have a problem with the personnel office of the provincial government, because the staff in the regional offices are required to be generalists. Sometimes they perform an administrative function, telling school boards what should be done or how it should be done, and sometimes they perform a consultative function or an advisory function. It's very difficult for us to work out with the Personnel Administration office — I'm sorry that my hon. colleague is not here — an adequate job description and, I might say, an adequate salary range reflecting the responsibilities of the consultants in the regional office. I'll send a transcript of these remarks to the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration.

With respect to language and the policy of the Department of Education, I might say we have a more particular responsibility than does the government as a whole in formulating policy. We view our responsibility as being in support of the more general policy position of the government. That policy was reflected by my predecessor and by the Premier in February 1978. Basically, it is that where numbers warrant, we will provide access to language education, French language education in that particular case.

The two key phrases are interpreted very subjectively. Your understanding of sufficient numbers will vary from time to time and place to place. So we are trying simply to create an attitude or atmosphere throughout the school system generally which is conducive to the provision of French language education — to which I might also add Ukrainian, because it's significant in this province, as well as the opportunity for other language instruction.

In January of this year I visited the province of Quebec and had meetings for three days with *le Ministre de l'Éducation du Québec*, taking advantage of my very painfully and imperfectly acquired French.

MR. COOK: Encore, encore.

MR. KING: There were four general areas of discussion between officials of that department and me, and between the minister of that department and me. At this point it would be appropriate to add that I very much appreciate the hospitality extended to me by M. Jean-Yvan Morin and all the officials of the Department of Education of Quebec. I found the discussions to be fruitful, and I hope the outcome of those discussions will be equally fruitful.

We discussed ways in which we could attract teachers from Quebec to this province in order to make up the shortfall we are experiencing in the short term in our requirement for skilled bilingual teachers. We also discussed short-term assistance from the Department of

Education in Quebec for the conduct of summer school education in this province, in order that teachers native to Alberta could improve their qualifications and their capacity to provide bilingual or immersion instruction. We also discussed ways in which the two departments of education might co-operate in the development and production of curricular material and resources in order to achieve some cost economies by associating ourselves with those activities in Quebec. Finally, we discussed extending the student exchange and adding the teacher exchange component to it. The exchange of administrators is also under consideration.

In summary, we are trying to foster a positive attitude toward language instruction on the part of the school boards in the province. In order to do that, we are trying to provide very concrete assistance in terms of professional staff, teachers; in terms of curricular resources; and in terms of an exchange which will foster a more informed opinion about how our ends might be achieved.

I would like to conclude my remarks, Mr. Chairman, simply by pointing out the presence in the gallery of a limited number of the officials of the Department of Education. I would like to say to all Members of the Legislative Assembly and to them that I have very much appreciated their support during the last 13 months. I look forward in the next fiscal year, and indeed in the two beyond that, to a continued cordial, working relationship. We have a very skilled, very competent Department of Education in this province. The same is true of local school boards and of the teaching profession. I might say that every professional associated with education in this province is a professional of whom we can be proud.

Agreed to:

1.01 — Minister's Office	\$116,970
1.02 — Deputy Minister's Office	\$334,700
1.03 — Finance, Statistics and Legislation	\$1,232,400
1.04 — Educational Grants to Individuals, Organizations and Agencies	\$400,000
1.05 — School Buildings	\$715,600

1.06 — Planning and Research

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, not to go through the list of, I think, some 56 research projects the department had under way or completed last year, and another group this year, but I would like to ask, Mr. Minister, about the departmental listing, Report No. 22, Disadvantaged Learners, the Nature of the Problem and Some Potential Solutions. I relate once again to the problem I raised last year, Mr. Minister. You've met with the school officials from my own particular school system. I won't make the point here again today, but I simply ask what's happened in the course of the year? Are there any developments as far as the department's concerned in that particular area as a result of this study or other studies?

MR. KING: I'm not familiar with the particular report to which you are referring. Does the question relate to programs for junior high school students as per the situation in your own county?

MR. R. CLARK: The department has several studies on it.

MR. KING: Yes, the department has done. As the hon. member is aware, I met with representatives of the county board of education.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, might I say to the minister, I'm not asking him to drag in the county of Mountain View situation here. I'm asking what's happened in the course of last year across the province, whether in the county of Mountain View or other jurisdictions. If the minister wants to use Mountain View, fair ball. But I didn't want him to zero in on just the Mountain View situation, because several other rural jurisdictions have a similar problem.

MR. KING: The suggestion was made, Mr. Chairman, that in rural situations, the problem being primarily one of a sufficient student population to sustain a concerted program, jurisdictions should co-operate in the development of programs, it being a fact that where they co-operate they can share a sufficient population base to sustain the program. The reply made in that particular case was that co-operation was not possible, or at least not feasible for reasons that, it was argued, were unique to that region. It may be they were unique, because in another situation I can think of, when the suggestion was made that boards should co-operate they went away and that is apparently what they are doing, co-operating to develop a single program that would be accessed by a number of different boards.

So the question is whether or not we should treat as unique the local school boards which are unable to work co-operatively, for whatever reason. The answer is that we have not agreed whether or not that's appropriate in the circumstances. The answer is that in that particular case, we don't have an alternative to our suggestion of co-operation at the moment.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Minister, if I could just, and I won't take ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. Leader of the Opposition please address the Chair.

MR. R. CLARK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister. Mr. Minister, I'm not suggesting that a particular exception be made in the county of Mountain View. But let me use that as an example. The school jurisdiction to the south, neighboring the city of Calgary, already has an excellent program that's bulging at the seams — the Dr. Collett school in the Rocky View division. In the division to the east, Three Hills, it simply isn't possible for them to move ahead at this particular time. There are also some sizable distance problems. Obviously the county of Red Deer may very well have an interest with the city of Red Deer itself, because it now has an exchange in that particular situation.

It seems to me, Mr. Minister, through the Chairman, that for lack of a better solution it becomes a matter of perhaps arranging through finances for three or four teachers who are highly skilled in the area of working with junior high students. I know if that's done in every situation across the province, it becomes very, very expensive. But, Mr. Minister, through the Chair, the minister knows as well as anyone in this Assembly, and better than most, the costs if those students simply — if I can use the regrettable term — linger in junior high school and opt out when they get to be 16 years of age. All too often we end up finding those kinds of statistics coming

up through the Minister of Social Services and Community Health.

The reason I raise the matter again this year, Mr. Minister, is that I had what I consider to be a very sobering experience at a local advisory committee meeting at one of those schools, when this particular matter was to be discussed that evening. A number of parents were present who have youngsters who simply have not been successful for academic reasons in junior high school. We went around the situation. The school principal, for good reason, said, well, how come more couldn't be done; they have to cut back next year. The county representative made the argument that they couldn't do anything more. I suppose it becomes an easy thing for everybody to say, write the minister. But that's what happens on many occasions. Let me give the minister an example of one of the situations.

Parents of one boy who were able to afford special assistance went outside and got a tutor. I believe the tutor works with the student two hours two or three nights a week. That family is footing the cost themselves, and that young lad's accomplishment this year has been really amazing. Those parents have met with the minister. Mr. Minister, I'm not advocating individual tutoring for every youngster; that's impossible. But I would suspect in that jurisdiction there are from 50 to 75 youngsters who would fit that situation across the county. I know in other rural systems there are likely comparable numbers of students, if the total numbers of students in the system are comparable.

I make the plea again, Mr. Minister, that even if it comes to a matter where somehow we have to fund directly for these kinds of situations, not just in my own constituency but in several others, it's a wise investment, unless we can come up with a better solution. I'm not married to the idea of getting a teacher ratio with those students that are a rather low number in junior high school. The only reason I think that has some potential is that I know of no other suggestion that seems to have worked.

Mr. Minister, through the Chairman, if the department or the minister has some other suggestions, I'd be tickled to death to hear them sometime. But I make the case again that it is a pretty sobering experience when you see those parents go through that kind of exercise and end up at the end of the evening saying, well, everybody write the minister and their M.L.A. The results aren't that positive.

MR. KING: I can appreciate what the hon. leader is saying, because I have had the meeting with the county board of education, and because there has been a subsequent exchange of correspondence — I regret that I don't have that correspondence with me this evening — also because I did have a meeting with the parents of the young man alluded to and have some familiarity with that situation. What is being asked for is funding considerably beyond what is available via the EOF program, junior high school component, for a project that professional people in the Department of Education have serious reservations about, in part because it suggests an incidence of problematic behavior far in excess of what should be experienced in any jurisdiction.

I indicated willingness to meet with the county board of education, which in part is why there has been a subsequent exchange of information. In fact, I have told the chairman of the county board of education that I will go to Olds for such a meeting. That has been communicated to the county board of education. I'm certainly

prepared to have that meeting, and I am certainly prepared to consider experimental approaches to a problem. I do not have the conviction that what is being advocated as a program by the county board of education is the right answer to the problem. So I think they and we must work co-operatively to find an alternative. That's what we're trying to do.

Agreed to:

10.6 — Planning and Research	\$1,436,200
10.7 — Personnel Office	\$191,600
10.8 — Student Evaluation & Data Processing	\$1,593,100
10.9 — Communications	\$73,700
10.10 — Alberta Education Communications Authority	\$126,300
10.11 — Field Administration Services	\$380,600
10.12 — Library Services	\$191,900
10.13 — Educational Exchange and Special Projects	\$124,100

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, before we call the final vote. Mr. Minister, I notice in the details of budgetary estimates ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. Leader of the Opposition please use the proper form of address.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I notice in the details of budgetary estimates that there is a 24.6 per cent increase in Professional, Technical and Labour Services. Generally speaking, Mr. Minister, that's research: contracts, consultants, and so on. Mr. Minister, what does the department have in mind in that particular area this year to justify a 24 per cent increase?

MR. KING: I apologize to the member. Could he repeat that question or the background?

MR. R. CLARK: Yes. According to the details of the Department of Education budgetary estimates, Departmental Support Services, under Code 430, Professional, Technical and Labour Services, there is a 24.6 per cent increase in the appropriation, Mr. Minister. I'd like to know the justification for that kind of increase in Professional, Technical and Labour Services, which basically are consultants and research contracts?

MR. KING: The one that comes immediately to mind is the major review of education finance in the province. I can't think of any particular one other than that, although I would be pleased to get details for the hon. leader and report them to him directly by letter.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Minister, through the Chairman, are we to assume that this education finance study will be of sufficient grandeur that it will pick up about \$170,000? Will that be the cost?

MR. KING: I'm so busy shuffling paper here that I'm having problems following the hon. leader. Which particular element of the estimates are you referring to?

MR. R. CLARK: I'm referring to the various codes of expenditures. In the summary of elements, one of the detailed breakdowns is Professional, Technical and Labour Services, Mr. Minister. I got the information for all departments from the Provincial Treasurer, and I'm par-

ticularly interested in that area because that's where every department under each program puts its consultants and research work to be done during the year. So this is a breakdown under Code 430, to be precise, Mr. Minister, a 24.6 per cent increase. I want to know what the justification is for the 24.6 per cent increase?

MR. KING: If the hon. member would like detail, it will have to be held until tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure what the hon. minister's statement was.

MR. NOTLEY: He will hold it until tomorrow, Mr. Chairman. He will bring it back tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh. Do you wish to proceed then with the total vote?

MR. R. CLARK: Not without the information.

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, could I suggest that we do whatever part of Vote 2 might be done, holding the total on Vote 1? I may be able to respond to the hon. leader in just a few moments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Agreed to:

2.1 — Grants to Schools	\$635,157,000
2.2 — Grants to Private Schools	\$4,776,000
2.3 — Early Childhood Services	\$25,793,000
2.4 — Educational Opportunity Fund	\$13,920,000
2.5 — Special Assistance to School Boards	\$30,530,000
2.6 — Learning Disability Fund	\$2,476,000
Total Vote 2 — Financial Assistance to Schools	\$712,652,000
Vote 3 — Regular Education Services	\$8,324,700

Vote 4 — Special Education Services

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before we agree to that, I have one question with respect to a news release dated January 23 concerning the sensory multihandicapped program planning project report. My understanding is that that report contained recommendations for resource centres in Edmonton and Calgary, which, as well as looking after the two jurisdictions, would assist some of the local school boards in the more distant areas to provide an Outreach service for multihandicapped children. Is the minister in a position during this particular vote to bring us up to date on where things now stand on that report, particularly with respect to the resource centres?

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, the Speech from the Throne indicated that it was our expectation that educational services for the sensory multihandicapped would be available in September this year. That is the date we are moving toward, generally pursuant to the recommendations of what I might refer to as the Finnestad report on services for the sensory multihandicapped. I don't know what detail the member would like, other than to say that

as per the throne speech that is the end we are moving toward.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just to follow that up. My question to the minister relates particularly to the Outreach aspect of the program. Will the government be in a position to provide this kind of service not only in the Edmonton and Calgary areas, but will the Outreach aspect be in place in school divisions where children who have multihandicaps can take advantage of the program? Is planning sufficiently advanced for that Outreach aspect to be in place?

MR. KING: I'm not sure it is sufficiently advanced for the entire program to be operational by September 1, which is a function of a number of different circumstances or constraints on time. It continues to be my hope that the major elements will be operational on September 1. But that is nothing more than a hope at this moment, except with respect to educational services themselves.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just one brief comment. I would hope we would move as quickly as we could with respect to the Outreach aspect of this particular program. When the announcement was made on January 23, I felt the government was moving in the right direction and I applauded the move, especially because in my view the Outreach concept was consistent with our objectives of trying to provide a quality of educational opportunity for children throughout the province, whatever their handicaps. If I may just underscore what I consider to be the importance of moving as fast as we can with the Outreach aspect of it, because in my view it is, or certainly should be, basic to the principle of the program.

MR. KING: I think that's an accurate restatement of the government's concern.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, if I could follow along from there. Mr. Minister, with regard to the same program announced on January 23, in the course of my budget remarks I made some comments about the need for some longer range planning and some fairly clear stating of objectives and looking at the financial implications, not meaning to unnecessarily burden this particular program — I think it's an excellent program. But here we have a situation announced January 23 which is going to come into effect in September. Mr. Minister, what kind of dollars are we looking at? How many youngsters across the province does the department expect will take advantage of the program in this initial year? Even more important than that, what objectives do we have for the program for five years down the road, and for the financial implications? I appreciate that information may not be available tonight, Mr. Minister, but it's the kind of information that, hopefully, we could have available to have a look at the program.

MR. KING: I believe, recalling the figures, that we are talking about 400 students throughout the province. That is the result of a very comprehensive sampling that was done of interested and interest groups. Nevertheless, given social circumstances it's hard to identify numbers with precision in advance of the operation of a program because, I regret to say, some of these children are, in a sense, being hidden or have been hidden. Our best estimate, and the estimate which was used in preparing the report, was that there were about 400 of these students

throughout the province. So we're talking about a very low incidence problem. We estimate further that about 300 of these reside in either the Edmonton or Calgary metropolitan areas, which is why the suggestion is made that two programs, one in each metropolitan area, would immediately reach the great number of the affected students, and that by oversizing those two programs, if I may use that term, you would provide space for the balance.

It's important to remember that while we are encouraging the oversizing of these two programs, which we hope will be operated respectively by the Calgary board of education and the Edmonton Public School Board, it will not be in the nature of the program to preclude local school boards from providing an educational service for these students if they wish. Programming will also be available for that.

With respect to the future, there is nothing that would preclude the development of additional centres patterned along the lines of the Edmonton or Calgary centre at, let us say speculatively, Lethbridge or Grande Prairie. Grande Prairie might be a good example to cite, since they have historically demonstrated considerable concern for special education activities. That's only speculative at the moment, but there is nothing in the program that would preclude that.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Mr. Minister, I appreciate the information as far as the numbers are concerned. Now, what are we looking at, as far as the budget is concerned?

MR. KING: That's going to be negotiated with the two school boards delivering the service. The only thing I can say at the moment is that both the boards and we are interested in funding the program at the level that is necessary to provide a realistic and comprehensive program. I cannot be specific as to details because there has been no agreement between us and the boards. In fact, the discussions that have taken place have not yet touched upon that in any particular sense. There's been discussion about a breakdown on a percentage of cost basis, but not on a dollar amount basis.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Minister, then, through the Chair once again. Mr. Minister, what amount have we included in this budget for the program? Have we included \$1 million? Have we included \$500,000? Are we looking to a special warrant come September when the arrangements are worked out?

MR. KING: I didn't understand the question. I'm sorry. No money is included in this budget for that program. It will have to be specially funded during its first year of operation, because the report and recommendations were not received by the government until after the budget had been set. Notwithstanding the fact that money is not included in this budget, the commitment is contained in the throne speech.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, then, what's the magnitude of that commitment from a dollar point of view? I would assume that before the government included an announcement like this — and I remake the point I made earlier; I commend the government for the program. But I want to use it as an example. Obviously before that would be approved by Treasury Board, I would suspect that Treasury Board would want to know the costs, at

least ballpark figures, over the first year and the third or fifth year down the road. What I'm trying to get a handle on, Mr. Minister, is: what costs are we looking at for a very desirable program?

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, I'd be quite prepared to agree that when we announce a final understanding between us and the school boards, we would report to the Assembly on the costs involved. But I would prefer not to, and consequently will not, suggest to the Assembly tonight the dollar figures that would be involved in such a program. I would rather have the negotiations between the two boards behind me before I banded those kinds of figures around the Assembly.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, then to the minister. Mr. Minister, if that's the state of relations between the school boards and the department in a program like this, albeit I doubt whether they are, but if that's the situation . . . But, Mr. Minister, certainly someplace in the department there must be some projections as to what costs we're looking at for this desirable program three or five years down the road, if we don't want to get involved into giving any figures away right now as far as negotiations this year are concerned. What I want to understand and grasp is what the cost will be three or five years down the road. That figure would have to be available, or I would be very disappointed that the Provincial Treasurer and Treasury Board were prepared to agree to any program without having some kind of financial handle on it. If not for the first year, fair ball, but a three- or five-year projection, Mr. Minister?

MR. KING: I'd be willing to provide that to the hon. member. I may have misunderstood his question. I'd be willing to provide that to you, yes. I'll provide the hon. member with a copy of the report.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 4 — Special Education Services \$8,112,900

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPELBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is proposed that the House sit tomorrow evening and continue at that time with the consideration of estimates in Committee of Supply, in the order of departments which I have already indicated to hon. members.

[At 10:30 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]

