

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Friday, May 4, 1973

[The House met at 1:00 o'clock.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 55 The Public Lands Amendment Act, 1973

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Public Lands Amendment Act, 1973. The principle of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is simple yet important. The principle of the bill is to prohibit the sale of Crown land to anyone other than Canadians.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 55 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 56
The Financial Administration Amendment Act, 1973

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Financial Administration Amendment Act, 1973. Mr. Speaker, I can best describe the principle of this bill by briefly saying that it recognizes the savings that accrue to Albertans through utilization of efficient and modern financial management techniques. By so doing, it eliminates a minimum loss of approximately \$15 million to Albertans by old, unclear statutory provisions, by making it clear that funds that do not have a true trust interest may be consolidated. It modernizes the investment provisions in the Act to recognize the very changed and secure investment options available to provide maximum return with minimum risk to the province.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 56 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 21 The Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1973

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1973. In this bill there are three major amendments of essence.

The first of these are amendments provided in the area of child neglect and abuse. This bill will require that all reports of child abuse be made to the Director of Child Welfare assisted through a Zenith number, and that failure to report would be subject to conviction and a maximum fine of \$500. To assist in this procedure, a central registry will ensure that all situations of repeated abuse would be brought to light and dealt with.

A second significant amendment would require a weekly court review of public confinement of juveniles by committal order. It has been felt that undue confinement could occur through past efforts of treatment rehabilitation and this amendment assures that the child's legal rights and liberties are protected through the Act. In fact, the court could require, if treatment is not being presented properly, that the committal order itself could be left out.

The final significant issue here is that handicapped children provisions are now integrated under Section 35 allowing financial assistance under the

Canadian Assistance Plan. This amendment would result in approximate saving to the province of about \$1 million.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 21 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of the Environment, that Bill No. 21, The Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1973 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was carried.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, on your behalf, I would like to introduce to the members of this Assembly 50 Grade 6 students from James Gibbons School in your constituency of Edmonton Meadowlark. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Gordon Oswald. They are seated in the public gallery and I would ask them to please rise and be recognized.

MR. SPEAKER:

It would appear that they are in the hon. Attorney General's constituency.

[Laughter]

AN HON. MEMBER:

They weren't here.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker on behalf of the Member for Edmonton Ottewell, Mr. Ashton, who is unavoidably absent at this time, I would like to introduce 94 Grade 6 students from the Pine Street School in Sherwood Park in the Edmonton Ottewell constituency. They are accompanied by three teachers, Mr. Alexandruk, Mrs. Sprague, Mr. Rispler, and two drivers, Mr. Spitzer and Mr. Williams. They are in both galleries and I'd ask them now to rise and be recognized.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Life Insurance Companies

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address this question to the hon. Attorney General. By way of explanation to the hon. minister, in view of the fact that two out of the five life insurance companies registered in the province are either in liquidation or under government supervision, can the hon. Attorney General advise the Legislature whether the government is giving any consideration to the appointment of a royal commission to examine the operation of life insurance companies in the province?

MR. LEITCH:

No, Mr. Speaker. We aren't giving any consideration to that at the moment.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. Can the hon. Attorney General advise the House whether it is true that Seaboard Life Insurance Company operated with impaired capital exceeding \$100,000 contrary to section --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. Order, please. The hon. member's preceding question was of doubtful propriety and I didn't intervene at the time. But these ancillary matters can be classed only as irregular debate, which is not permitted in the question period. Would the hon. member ask his question directly?

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, if I could put the question to the hon. Attorney General. Can the Attorney General advise the House whether or not Seaboard Life Insurance Company operated in 1971 according to the provisions of The Alberta Insurance Act, including Section 54?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, that deals with a time period which was substantially if not entirely prior to our coming to office and I don't have any personal knowledge of that at the moment. I'd be pleased to make inquiries on that point and answer the question at a later date, or alternatively suggest that the hon. member put it on the Order Paper.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, if I could ask a further supplementary question. If the hon. Attorney General is prepared to review this matter, could he also look into the operation of the company under this section, both in 1972 as well as their current operations?

MR. LEITCH:

I would, Mr. Speaker, but I suggest again that the hon. member put the matter on the Order Paper.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Attorney General. Is there another large company or a conglomerate of companies presently being investigated as well, either by the Attorney General's department or under Section K of the Fraud Division of the RCMP at the present time in Alberta, either a large company, a conglomerate of companies, all the associates?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it would be quite improper for me to answer in the Oral Question Period questions of that nature, namely whether there is any company or individual under investigation for possible breaches of the federal or provincial laws at a time when they are under way.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, further to my supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General. The other day in the House -- I think it was 27 companies that were being investigated or had been turned over to the Fraud Division of the RCMP for investigation, so maybe my question will make it simpler. Of that 27, is there one of them that you or I would consider a major company?

MR. SPEAKER:

It's quite a matter of opinion as to whether they're major or minor, and if the hon. member wishes to put the question in a different form or on the Order Paper on another occasion, perhaps he might do so.

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Sheep Processing Plant

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Have the sheep growers decided on a site for their processing plant and will the government be assisting them with either a loan or a grant?

DR. HORNER:

No finalization has been made in that area, Mr. Speaker, on either point.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

Bankruptcy List

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Does he receive notice of any companies which are declared bankrupt in this province?

MR. PEACOCK:

Not directly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUDWIG:

Then if the minister receives notice of companies going bankrupt indirectly, has he a compiled list of bankrupt companies in this province?

MR. SPEAKER:

I understand the difference between the first question and the second one is "directly" and "indirectly". I believe the hon. member can make his supplementary a little clearer.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the answer was somewhat vague, I will reword the question so that the minister might know what I am after.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is not entitled, as he knows well, under the rules to comment on the adequacy or inadequacy or absence of an answer.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the reply that I received from the hon. minister, I would like to ask him whether he would be prepared to table a list of companies that have gone bankrupt in this province in the last year?

MR. PEACOCK:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

Western Economic Opportunities Conference

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Premier, and ask the Premier if the open sessions of the prairie economic opportunity conference will be televised?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. member is referring to the Western Economic Opportunities Conference?

MR. CLARK:

Yes.

MR. LOUGHEED:

As of now I'm presuming the full participation by the government of the Province of British Columbia in that important meeting. That really is in relation to the answer I gave to the House yesterday, Mr. Speaker.

I think the first question is whether or not the conference will be open, and then if the decision is made that the conference would be open, I would hazard the opinion that there would probably be sufficient interest to have it televised, but we haven't yet reached the stage of the acceptance of our suggestion that the Western Economic Opportunities Conference would be an open meeting. We would prefer it that way.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Premier if it is true that the former Secretary of State, Mr. Mahoney, is the federal coordinator for the Western Economic Opportunities Conference?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that he would not be the coordinator because as the --

MR. CLARK:

As far as the federal government is concerned --

MR. LOUGHEED:

Oh, as far as the federal government is concerned, I understand he isn't involved. Perhaps I could refer that question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, in representing the federal government, we have had and will continue to have contacts with the hon. Otto Lang, whom the Prime Minister has designated as his official representative at the ministerial level, and a Mr. Shoyama as official representative at the official level. It may be that they have additional involvement of the gentleman mentioned, Mr. Mahoney, and we have heard some rumours or information to that effect, but it has not in any way been as official coordinator to our knowledge.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, one more supplementary question. I would like to ask if it is true that the premiers from eastern Canada who have requested an opportunity to attend the conference will be permitted to attend both the open and the closed sessions?

MR. GETTY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can recall one answer to that question. It is that the western premiers would be very magnanimous and allow them to attend the open portion of the meetings. But actually it all depends on what finally develops as to open and closed portions. I know opinions have been expressed on both sides as to whether or not provinces other than the western provinces may be allowed to attend the meeting. Some strongly feel that they should not be allowed inasmuch as they have many meetings with the federal government themselves which the western provinces do not attend. Then there are other thoughts, that it might be interesting for them to hear some of the problems and some of the solutions that are proposed. But it has not been developed because there is still the question as to whether or not there will open or closed portions and how much of each.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. What is the position of the Government of Alberta on the question of premiers from Ontario east sitting in on the closed portion of the conference?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, we would like to hear their arguments as to why they should be included.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Alberta Land Use Forum

MR. COOPER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the hon. Deputy Premier. Would the hon. Deputy Premier advise the House of the state of organization of the Alberta Land Use Forum?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, it is in the process of formation. It is moving along quite nicely.

MR. COOPER:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Deputy Premier advise on the approximate number of briefs, if any, submitted to the Alberta Land Use Forum thus far?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if there are any briefs as such. We certainly have had some correspondence from a variety of people across Alberta giving us the benefit of their views as to how the forum might operate and also regarding the regulation of land use. But I would expect that the forum itself would set the guidelines as to how the briefs might be approached and the questioning at some future date.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the hon. Deputy Premier advise the Assembly when we can anticipate the announcement as to the personnel of the Land Use Forum?

DR. HORNER:

I would think it wouldn't be in the too distant future, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow, followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Steel Shortage

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Can the minister advise if his department is investigating complaints from some of Alberta's manufacturing companies about a shortage of steel for production requirements that has resulted in a quota system and which may result in loss of business and eventual layoffs?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that our department is, and I would be glad to check into it. I would have to check into it.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister also advise if eastern Canadian manufactured steel production originally designated for Alberta is being diverted to the United States?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that is a difficult question even under investigation to determine but I will attempt to.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar, followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

Cabinet Changes

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Premier. Mr. Premier, I would like to know if you can inform the House if you anticipate making any cabinet changes or shuffles at the completion of the spring session?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to answer that question. I'm delighted with the performance, the capacity and the intelligence of the members of the Executive Council.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Premier. In view of your delight with the --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please address his question in the third person?

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Premier's delight with the performance of the cabinet ministers would he like to inquire on this side what we think of some of them?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff, followed by the hon. Member for Taber-Warner.

Soft Drink Containers

MR. WYSE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Is the hon. minister aware of the massive changeover from bottles to cans in the soft drink industry in Alberta because of the price differential in deposits?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that there is a massive changeover.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question. Is the minister or the government considering raising the can deposit so it would be on equal terms with the bottles?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I have the matter under continuous scrutiny and examination but I have no intention of requiring a higher deposit on cans at this time.

MR. WYSE:

One more supplementary question. Would the government be supporting a massive changeover to cans?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question must be hypothetical in view of the fact that the hon. minister isn't aware of the changeover.

The hon. Member for Taber-Warner, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Employment Programs

MR. D. MILLER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Is it the minister's intention to expand job opportunities for those people on social assistance?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the government's overall program in regard to expanding job opportunities does not relate directly to the Department of Health and Social Development, but is related to the Department of Manpower and Labour as well as the Department of Advanced Education and the STEP and PEP programs and, of course, the Department of Health and Social Development.

In particular the department is satisfied with the performance of the Employment Opportunity Program which is handled within the Department of Health and Social Development. My own feeling is that the greatest hope for expansion of job opportunities does lie in the job creation categories rather than job placement types of programs. In job creation we are referring to areas such as the PEP and STEP programs.

MR. D. MILLER:

One supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the hon. minister take under consideration and recommend this program to hospital boards for their consideration and cooperation for non-professional staff?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am not entirely clear on the meaning of the question and would ask the hon. member to maybe state what relationship he sees between the job creation activities and hospital boards in particular. Does he mean the PEP and STEP programs in relation to hospital boards?

MR. D. MILLER:

If I may, Mr. Speaker, because of the duplication of husband and wife filling jobs in all the hospitals of the province I was wondering if this could be looked into in this regard and replacements for the non-professional staff for consideration?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any particular significance to the reference to job duplication involving husbands and wives who are perhaps employed by the same boards. But it's a matter I would be glad to look into, to see if there is anything that should be investigated.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona.

Recommendations On Election Act

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. Does the government intend to introduce legislation at either the spring or the fall session to implement recommendations 16 and 17 of the Special Legislative Committee on The Election Act? To refresh the hon. Premier's memory, recommendation 16 relates to the registration of political parties and recommendation 17 relates to the disclosure of expenditures by political parties, as well as candidates, during an election campaign.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we have no present intentions with regard to those matters. Frankly, we have not had an opportunity to fully consider the aspects of the Legislative Committee report at this time.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the government going to give any consideration to going a little beyond the Legislative Committee report and examining the question of putting a limit on the expenditure --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Surely, in view of the previous answer, the hon. member can't go on as if the question had been answered.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona, followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

Edmonton Reassessment

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the minister been able to develop any solution for the problem in which the City of Edmonton finds itself as a result of the recent reassessment which the city has gone through, and particularly by reason of the high escalating land values in the city?

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's the way to slam.

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have. Later today I will be making an announcement which will be of interest to all Albertans, but certainly the impact of that announcement specifically on the City of Edmonton will be very substantial, not only for the city as a whole but specifically for senior citizens who have been affected by reassessment.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Veterinary Program at NAIT

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Advanced Education, and ask the Minister of Advanced Education the reason for the veterinary and animal science program being assigned to NAIT as opposed to one of the agricultural and vocational colleges.

MR. FOSTER:

Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I had some notice of this before. The program to which the hon. member refers is one that was approved following discussions with officials in the department in the agricultural area, and also discussions with the agricultural colleges themselves. The program specifically, Mr. Speaker, is a joint venture between NAIT and Vermilion College. It's an option under the biological sciences division. It's a one year program at NAIT.

One of the reasons for it being located at NAIT is that it requires rather specialized facilities found at that particular institution. I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that in the selection of this program at NAIT in cooperation with Vermilion College, it was done on the basis of full consultation by the institutes of technology and the agricultural colleges. Our hope is that it will be successful.

I appreciate the member's interest in Olds College because obviously Olds is a very special institution. On the face of it it may appear that this particular course might best be offered in a college other than an institute of technology, but there is that relationship.

One further comment, Mr. Speaker, is that the program relates to small animals and not cattle or anything with which the Olds College is involved.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, would it not have been possible to have Vermilion, or Olds or Fairview, as far as that goes --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member's question clearly involves debate. There was some misgiving on the part of the Chair concerning the previous question and the answer reconfirmed those suspicions.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, on a firmer basis then, I trust. Mr. Speaker, will students taking this program be eligible for manpower training allowances?

MR. FOSTER:

There is nothing peculiar about this program that would otherwise make students eligible, Mr. Speaker. If a student is eligible as a student in NAIT or institutions -- and I think the hon. member understands me -- he would not be precluded because of this program.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, then to the minister. Mr. Speaker, if the program were based outside Edmonton or Calgary, would the students still be eligible for manpower training allowances?

MR. FOSTER:

I'm just not sure. I don't know that a student would be precluded from eligibility because a program is offered in, for example, Vermilion as opposed to NAIT. You are specifically talking about manpower training allowances -- you may mean the training allowances provided by the Department of Advanced Education. If you're not, then I'm somewhat confused.

MR. CLARK:

A last supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, was there a directive from the Department of Manpower and Labour saying they would not pay manpower training allowances if the program were based outside Edmonton?

MR. FOSTER:

I'd have to check, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Public Disclosure of Interests

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question today is directed to the hon. Premier and it is regarding his announcement the other day regarding the declaration of interest by members of the Executive Council. I was wondering from what date these assets would be declared, the date of filing or an earlier date? -- the property held say from September 10, 1971 or January 1, 1972, or would it be the actual date of the filing of the report?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, it would be the date of filing of the report or very close thereto.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller, followed by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray.

Hospital Salaries in Alberta

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. How do the new salary rates at the Royal Alex compare with the salaries of similiar hospitals elsewhere in the province?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I would really have to examine that. I've become very familiar with the salary rates in Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. But I will make the compariscn over the weekend. I know in general terms but in this instance I think it would be safe to be specific.

While I'm on my feet I would like to confirm what is clearly happy and obvious knowledge. That is the fact that with respect to the dispute between the hospital board and the registered nurses of the Royal Alexandra Hospital, a memorandum of agreement was signed and executed and we have been advised by both parties that they have ratified it. I know that we are all much impressed with the excellent way both principals to the dispute used the process of free collective bargaining to reach this agreement.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary to the hon. minister. Will the hon. minister make that information available to the House in due course?

DR. HOHOL:

Yes, I will, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

In view of the hon. minister having made an announcement in the question period in the nature of a ministerial announcement, possibly the House would allow the hon. Leader of the Opposition, if he so wished, to comment on the announcement during Orders of the Day.

The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Soft Drink Containers (Cont.)

DR. BOUVIER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of the Environment. I wonder if he could confirm whether or not the contractor who has the ultimate contract for collecting of cans -- and I can't remember their name exactly -- whether they are paid on the basis of the number of cans that go out filled, or whether they are paid on the basis of the cans that they actually collect.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, if I understand the question correctly, the company's name is Contain-A-Way. Contain-A-Way was established not by the government, but by the manufacturers of soft drinks in Alberta. They have established the company through a fund which is contributed to proportionately by the manufacturer on the amount of containers basically sold. When the containers are received back the operators of the depots pay out a refund; then Contain-A-Way reimburses the operators of the depots for the refund that the depot has paid on the can, plus one cent handling charge.

I hope that clarifies what the hon. member is asking.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Public Disclosure of Interests (Cont.)

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Premier, and it's with relation to an announcement he made recently in the House with regard to the disclosure of interest of ministers in his government.

Would this information that the ministers are to table in the House include any road allowances and location of road allowances which ministers may have on their land, Mr. Speaker?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would listen, he would be very appreciative of the fact that the statement said that the document would be made available to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that answer, but it avoided my question. Will the road allowances of ministers -- included on land of the minister and his cabinet -- be included in the answer which the minister is supposed to table?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is scarcely entitled to indicate his discontent with the answer by repeating the question.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. Would the Premier advise why information concerning road allowances appears to be considered confidential by the government?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I suggest the hon. member peruse the documents, as I'm sure he will, that are tabled with the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly in due course of time.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, from that answer I --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please.

Calgary Landfill Site

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, may I answer a question put to me yesterday by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow? The 13.36 acres he asked for information on have already been graded and were inspected as recently as last Monday by staff of the Department of Public Works in Calgary and were found to be in a tidy condition and as tidy as the surrounding land.

The natural ground cover which has developed is kept under control by the Department of Public Works. As this land constitutes a portion of land lying alongside a highway cloverleaf complex, the department is at the moment discussing with the Department of Highways whether they will make a joint effort in grassing it. At the moment, there is no plan on the part of the Department of Public Works to actually seed it, but we are discussing with the Department of Highways whether we will put grass seed in this and develop it as a roadside area.

I might point out that there is an area just north of this where the city is putting in a pipeline and as yet there has been no proper backfill on this area. I wondered if by any chance there is confusion on the part of the member or the public that this is also Department of Public Works land. It isn't.

In answer to a supplementary question, the letter received from the commissioner was passed to the department and the department was in continuous

conference with the commissicner's department in Calgary. Therefore an actual written reply was not given to the letter but it was given to him verbally.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, can the hon. minister advise if he would accept thanks for such a fast, prompt and detailed answer?

Numbering of Bills

MR. HENDERSON:

I wonder before we leave this part of the agenda whether I could bring up a point of order relating to a bill that was tabled today.

On Votes and Proceedings of March 28 -- this was brought to my attention by the member from Calgary responding to a question -- there was notice given of leave to introduce Bill No. 21, which is The Highway Traffic Amendment Act. Today we have a Bill No. 21 introduced which is The Child Welfare Amendment Act. I just bring it to the attention of the Speaker as to whether there is some change in the numbering system of which we are not aware or whether there is an error in the matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly we could look into it and inform the House later this afternoon.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Alberta Property Tax Reduction Plan

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, during the question period today in answering a question I indicated I had an announcement I would like to make later in the day. I would like to make that announcement now.

Mr. Speaker, since the announcement early this year of the Alberta Property Tax Reduction Plan, the government has been carefully considering various improvements that may be desirable in order to assure that Alberta citizens receive equitable benefits in this first and very important year of the plan.

Very recently, there has been firm indication of an improved prospect for revenues accruing to the province from the petroleum industry for the coming year. As a result, today the government is extremely pleased to confirm the following substantial amendments to the program of property tax reduction. There are four very important amendments:

1. The School Foundation Program Fund: The established mill rate is being reduced from the present level of 30 mills to 28 mills. This will result in a further 1973 property tax saving to all Alberta property taxpayers of \$8,430,000.
2. Senior Citizens Receiving the Guaranteed Income Supplement: The minimum level of benefit of property tax relief for senior citizens who receive the Guaranteed Income Supplement will be raised to \$200 (or the total property tax, whichever is the less) from its present level of \$150.

DR. BUCK:

When's the by-election?

MR. RUSSELL:

The estimated value of additional assistance to Alberta senior citizens under this amendment is close to \$1,000,000.

3. Reassessed Municipalities: This year in Alberta there are 50 municipalities that have undergone property re-assessment. There will be significantly increased requisitions by the School Foundation Program Fund as a result of the developed increased equalization assessments. The government will assist a municipality, if it chooses -- that is, the municipality -- to achieve its new level of requisition by the School

Foundation Program Fund over a period of three years, rather than all in the current year. If this phasing-in process of achieving the new level of requisition is used by a municipality, the calculated shortage will be paid by the provincial government. For this year, this represents an estimated total benefit to those 50 municipalities of \$4,410,000.

4. Assistance to Municipal Governments: The traditional form of municipal assistance has experienced major increases and major changes this year, Mr. Speaker. In achieving this new approach, the government has always been concerned that municipal governments should not be in a worse position, regarding level of assistance this year as compared to last year. Therefore careful attention has been paid to municipal government budgets as they have been developed this year. Today we can confirm that some municipalities deserve some additional assistance on the merit of their relative positions to last year. Those municipalities will receive additional funds necessary to bring them up to the 1972 level of assistance. Also, funds are being provided for summer villages in an amount equal to their estimated Municipal Incentive Grants. The estimated total cost of these items to the province is \$539,300.

The total estimated value of the additional benefits announced today is \$14,379,300 for 1973. These benefits will be paid from the general revenues of the province and the effective date of the improvements to the program is January 1, 1973. I have some copies to table, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the taxpayers of Alberta are going to be generally pleased by the announcement just forthcoming from the minister. I'm also pleased to see that he has taken notice of the comments made from this side of the House during the discussion of his estimates. He seems to have resolved some of the problems brought forth at that time.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the report of the Task Force on Provincial-Municipal Finance received in December 1972, contained an extensive range of recommendations relating to a very broad range of subjects. As part one of our response to the report, the government, on a priority basis, has specifically dealt with items resulting in property tax reduction.

The government announcement of the Property Tax Reduction Plan in January of this year concluded by making specific reference to some of those subject matters requiring ongoing review and stated that the reviews would be carried on in consultation with municipal governments.

Since that time, meetings with the municipal, rural and urban government associations have occurred. Specifically, the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association, in letters to members of the Executive Council and the Legislature, outlined its proposal for the establishment of a provincial-municipal finance council.

Today, I am pleased to indicate the government's concurrence with the concept of such a council. Our Alberta municipal governments may, therefore, expect to be involved in the establishment of ongoing activities of the council. The government proposes that the necessary initial arrangements should occur as soon as is reasonable following the adjournment of the current spring session of the Legislature. The Alberta Urban Municipalities Association has proposed an initial concept which will be considered during the organizational discussions relating to the formation of the council.

It is apparent that all parties involved agree that priority items of attention for the council will be the matters of municipal taxation and assessment procedures, including the concept and purpose of assessment equalization.

This statement today, therefore Mr. Speaker, indicates very clearly to our municipal governments that we agree to proceed with a review of the foregoing items at the earliest reasonable date, and also that the review will occur in consultation with municipal governments, using the structure of the proposed provincial-municipal finance council.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and this Assembly resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to study certain bills of the Order Paper.

[The motion was carried.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Diachuk took the Chair.]

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of the Whole Assembly will come to order. Bill No. 8.

MR. HYNDMAN:

We begin this phase of the Legislature's business on committee consideration of bills.

Perhaps for the benefit of the Assembly, I should review briefly the change to sub-rule 4, which was implemented by this Assembly last fall pursuant to a debate on November 21, 1972. Members will recall that at that time there were amendments proposed with regard to the manner in which the estimates would be considered and we've been following that this year; regarding the manner in which the budget debate would proceed, and we've been following that this spring.

At that time there was a proposed amendment regarding the rules affecting committee consideration of bills, and that motion was amended by Mr. Henderson on November 21. The amendment was passed by the House and reads as follows -- this is a new sub-rule relating to the manner which this committee handles bills in committee:

Sub-rule No. 4. Where the Chairman receives an indication that comments, questions, or amendments will be offered with respect to the Bill, the committee shall consider every section in the Bill, in its proper order with the title and preamble to be considered last.

What this, I suggest, means to us in the committee is that we will consider bills on a section by section basis, but not calling sub-sections and not calling clauses and sub-clauses; however, allowing each and every member of the committee who wishes to bring up clauses or sub-clauses, to stand up and say that he would like to offer comments regarding that. So I would suggest that is the way we proceed. There may well be some sorting out to do over the next day or two while we get this new rule operational, but I think that would be the feeling -- that the impact of the hon. Mr. Henderson's amendment last year did. If he has any comments, I would be happy to hear them.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, if I might just make one further suggestion that might move things along a little further -- as long as the Government House Leader doesn't think it deviates from the basic intent of the motion last year -- if instead of the Chair calling every section and waiting for the "agreed", he just calls the section and if there is no response to it he moves on to the next one so we just don't go through a chanting operation of "number" and "agreed" and "number" and "agreed". I think it would be far simpler if it is agreeable to the House, that he simply call a number, pause for a minute, give members an opportunity to consider it, and if there isn't anything just call the next one and just keep going. Is this agreeable?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I think this would be an ideal way to do it, Mr. Chairman, and I think then that this would mean that you, sir, would not be initialing each clause after the House says "agreed". Anything that came up at the end under title and preamble could relate back.

MR. HENDERSON:

We are assuming still, of course, that the other procedure would still apply in dealing with amendments and committee and so forth.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, this is on another subject, but while the Government House Leader is enlarging on procedure, I wonder, if it is the government's intention to continue the debate under Motion No. 1 regarding the fiscal policy and budget debate?

MR. HYNDMAN:

No decision has been made on that, Mr. Chairman. I would think there is a pretty good possibility of the debate continuing on that motion although it has been called a number of times. I would think that it will probably be called once more at least, but the timing is difficult to suggest at this time. Whether or not it will get to the stage of being brought to a vote we wouldn't be able to determine. As members know, in other provinces this motion sometimes is not voted on by the end of the session. I would think it would be called, probably once again.

MR. DIXON:

What I was just trying to clarify, Mr. Chairman, to the minister, was that some of us have not had the opportunity to speak yet on the motion. So we will probably still have another chance to speak. It is not going to be dropped.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It's not essential to dispose of it --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Any other questions or comments before we proceed with study on the bills?

Bill No. 8

The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act, 1973

MR. DIXON:

Yes, I wonder, Mr. Chairman, to the minister, what is the rate now being charged to the municipalities from the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation?

MR. MINIELY:

It is the exact same rate, Mr. Chairman, that the federal government charges us and Canada Pension Plan funds. I might be a quarter of a per cent off; it is either 7.25 or 7.5 per cent, I believe. To get it exactly I would have to check and bring it back to you.

MR. DIXON:

Well, that is close enough, Mr. Minister through the Chair; it is not over eight per cent anyway; it is between seven and eight.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the Provincial Treasurer had an opportunity to check into something I raised about a year ago. It was with respect to a request by one community in this province that wanted to acquire ownership of its natural gas facilities and they had attempted to borrow under the Municipal Financing Corporation. They were told that it wasn't possible for them to borrow for the purposes of acquiring a privately owned utility. I am wondering if there has been any consideration to perhaps making changes so that the Municipal Financing Corporation could facilitate a move such as this if a community on their own, after reviewing the situation carefully, chose to take that kind of step?

MR. MINIELY:

The whole matter of the allocation of funds to municipalities by MFC has been under consideration by myself and my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, as well as the Executive Council.

I think I have indicated to members in the House before that the funds utilized are those provided by the Canada Pension Plan and that is to ensure that the money we loan to the municipalities, we can loan at a fairly low rate of interest because we are getting it from the federal government at a fairly low rate of interest. The difficulty is in developing the priorities of where that money is utilized by the municipalities. It's not that one municipality may wish to purchase a utility, it's a matter that there are so many dollars available at the low interest rate. Therefore there isn't sufficient to cover everything a municipality may wish to do. So guidelines are necessary to determine what the biggest priorities are, for example, sewer projects, environmental projects and basic capital costs of the municipality.

These needs have taken up the entire allotment available from the federal government and in turn to the municipalities. Up until now these priorities have been used in determining the allocation of the funds. So basically we are considering broadening this or perhaps providing more flexibility to it. But in doing so we have to be aware that the main purpose of loaning it to the municipalities is to provide them with low interest loans for general municipal purposes. These municipal purposes are things such as capital projects necessary to the existence of the municipality.

So it's under review and as of yet we have not made a definite decision on it.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. How much money is made available annually under the Canada Pension Plan funds? What do we have to divvy up each year? We are increasing the maximum by \$100,000,000 but what do we normally receive each year?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member would see in the Act it's approximately \$100,000,000 that comes from the federal government and that is the reason that each year we have to amend the Act because the Act is worded in an aggregate amount owing to the federal government. So the province has approximately \$100,000,000. Then the municipalities needs are assessed to see if up to the \$100,000,000 can be allotted based on the municipalities' applications for funds for their capital projects.

[All sections of the bill, the title and preamble were agreed to.]

Bill No. 9 The Alberta Loan Act, 1973

[All sections of the bill, the title and preamble were agreed to without debate.]

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 8 and Bill No. 9 be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 17 The Department of Advanced Education Amendment Act, 1973

MR. CLARK:

I would like to ask the minister to comment with regard to Section 2(h) because this deals with the question of coordination. Several times we have been around this question and I think we on this side have expressed our views rather strongly on the question of the Department of Advanced Education taking the role of the universities and colleges commission.

However, in this particular section not only is the Department of Education becoming involved in coordination at the levels I have indicated but now they are also becoming involved in coordination in the field of continuing lifelong education programs as they affect school systems across the province.

Herein, Mr. Chairman, I think lies the problem we pointed out a year ago in really having two departments of education. We have, in fact, the Department of Education Number One looking after the foundation program and the general curriculum and those areas. Now we have the Department of Advanced Education being involved in the area of coordination as far as continuing and lifelong education is concerned.

At the same time school boards and local governments sometimes operate these continuing education programs. They have the Department of Youth, Culture and Recreation and you can add to that I suppose the Department of Manpower and Labour and the work it's doing in the area of manpower projection. So we have at least three government departments involved in this question of continuing and lifelong education. Frankly, I think it is one of the reasons why this area is moving along on a very, if I could use the term, unorganized and cloudy approach.

So it is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that I would like the minister to comment on this question of coordination especially in the area of continuing and lifelong education, how they are going to work with school boards and also what kind of coordination there is within the government itself.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Chairman, first of all the coordination referred to does not provide the department with the authority, nor should it, to cancel or determine any program of studies authorized and offered by a university or college. It only provides for the coordination of this program which the hon. member, I think, agrees and understands.

I think I can best demonstrate the effectiveness of this section by an example. I will use, for want of a better case, the City of Lethbridge where we have a university, a college and a public school system. I could use any other city but that happens to be a good example, where each institution, and I include the public school system in that, is in the business, if I may put it in that phrase, of offering continuing education programs. The intent of this section is that we would establish a working arrangement in that community as we have elsewhere in the province, a number of committees, to voluntarily coordinate, at the local level, the continuing education programs and ensure there is no unnecessary overlap or duplication at that level.

I will give you an example. I was impressed, shortly after coming into office, on picking up a newspaper from my community and finding therein advertisements from four or five different educational institutions all offering similar programs, sometimes the same programs, sometimes in the same community at the same time. And I wasn't impressed that there was not, in fact, the necessary degree of coordination and cooperation.

We have moved, through our Continuing Education Division, to establish, as we have, coordinating committees in each area to do this work. I think it is highly desirable. Our intent is not to reduce the scope or role of any institution or school board but to ensure that there is effective coordination and a wise use of taxpayers' dollars.

In terms of in-government coordination there is a very close contact between my colleague, the Minister of Education and myself. We are fully aware that one of the problems of any government is the proliferation of educational programs in other departments. The member has identified Health and Social Development; Culture, Youth and Recreation as well as Education. That is true. There is a working committee of senior officials involving these departments whose specific function is to provide for close cooperation between the departments avoiding any overlap, duplication and, in fact, trying to coordinate government activity at this level.

It may be that the educational programs offered by other departments of government, other than Advanced Education, may change in time as a result of this committee. This has come into being only in the last little while and I am very optimistic that it will be effective.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the rather general comments the minister has made, but let's become more specific and let's use Red Deer -- continuing education programs put on by the Red Deer public and Red Deer separate school boards, programs by Don Moore's Red Deer recreation board, programs of the college there. You say you have no opportunity or no authority to do any forced coordination. We all have great hopes for committees, but we all know how they sometimes work too, with the greatest respect to the people involved.

My concern, and it is a concern that I had to live with when I had some of the responsibilities too, is that we are really not doing anything substantive to come to grips with the coordination at the local level, because the Department of Education is involved in vocational educational programs which can make quite a contribution in the area of continuing and lifelong education.

We have the college at Red Deer which is involved in that kind of work, certainly city parks and recreation are. We could also throw into the bag preventative welfare as far as that goes.

I guess what I'm asking is, what are you going to do in terms of coordination other than having a committee sit down? With the greatest respect, the people on the committee will not be considered to be doing a good job by their own people if they don't look after their own interests there.

Ultimately it gets to the question of who is going to fund these programs. The whole area of continuing and lifelong education is just starting to blossom and unless something is done right now, meaning in the immediate future, we're going to have problems we did not realize were possible unless you come to grips with some of these loose ends now.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is suggesting there is a third authority involved and this is the municipal government, its recreation boards and its other agencies. I think implicit in his statement, in fact explicit, is the suggestion that perhaps this authority might also include municipal governments.

I would like to assess how effectively we're able to have the community groups work in terms of coordination before making some decision as to whether or not we should include any sort of legislative authority over local government in that sense.

Our hope is that this will work at the local level by groups cooperating among themselves and with representatives of the various educational agencies. This section of the department act, however, does provide us with the authority to in fact say what the final decision will be if it cannot be worked out voluntarily among the college, the university and the public school system.

I recognize the merit of the comment with respect to local government. It may very well be that that would be a very useful amendment to this or, in some other way, down the road a piece. I'd like to see how these coordinating committees function, if they do -- I think they will; and the extent to which, if at all, the kind of authority the hon. member refers to should be included in legislation.

MR. CLARK:

I would refer the minister to continuing education programs done in the city of Calgary under Mr. Campbell who is now in the minister's department. They were started as a result of this question of the overlap of what is going on. If my view of the thing is anywhere near accurate, that overlap hasn't decreased as a result of this study and supposedly groups getting together. It in fact has been complicated, and the Red Deer example we could complicate, of course, even more if we get the university of Red Deer going at some time.

MR. FOSTER:

Well, I doubt the final complication will arise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CLARK:

I'll...[Inaudible]... tell the people of Red Deer you said that.

MR. LEE:

Just a comment. I think the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury should be aware of the nature of continuing education programming and the effect that forced coordination would really have on it.

I agree with the minister at this point. The establishment of the committee system is probably the best way to do it because you are looking at two kinds of continuing education programming within the communities.

The first kind is set up by the school boards, by community colleges within the area. It would be well to note in regard to a subsidization for these programs that the only ones subsidized by government -- I'm talking about the non-credit short courses -- are the ones offered by the school boards. Now the vast majority of programming, however, is that kind of programming which is completely subsidized by fees.

I contend it is not against the public interest to have a certain amount of duplication because a business administration program, for instance, offered by the university would be greatly different, although the description may look the same in the article, from one offered by SAIT. I don't think duplication in this sense is harmful in any way.

The one point that I think might result from a duplication is not so much from a funding point of view, but from the fact that we may end up with gaps. If too many energies are expended on duplicating kinds of activities, we may end up with gaps in programming for certain groups like the aged and so on where, because they can't afford to pay a fee, they don't end up getting the program. I really feel that committees and councils through their coordinating kinds of activities do eliminate these gaps.

Now if we were to move down the line into the funding or subsidizing of non-credit programs by community colleges, technical institutes, then I can see your point, because then you would have duplication of funds and there would be expenditures involved. I might note also at this point when we move into vocational kinds of continuing education programming like PEP, the funding for those kinds of, say 25 hours per week programming is directed by the department and it works on a contracting basis. So contracts are established with each of the institutions and a program is cleared by the department in that sense, so duplication doesn't occur.

But once again, the whole thing works, I think, because this coordinating council is advisory rather than directive.

I was fortunate to attend the Continuing Education Association Conference in Banff on Monday and Tuesday of this week and I got the feeling from the people there that the kind of thing they felt could really be made to work is the establishment of a council, but not a forced kind of coordination at this point. They say give us a chance to get the councils going, all the shareholders who are involved in programming and receiving these continuing education services involved in the council or committee. Give us a chance to do this before we get some kind of enforced coordination. I certainly support this kind of initiative.

MR. CLARK:

I appreciate the comments the hon. member has made, but at a conference like that you wouldn't expect people to be asking for anything other than all the freedom and flexibility they have. If you and I were taking part, we'd likely be asking for the same kind of freedom and flexibility.

But I think the hon. member does raise two other good points. One deals with this question of fees. It isn't going to be very far down the road that we are going to have to face the problem of those people who can't afford the fees or don't know the programs are available. Really, in the long run those are likely the people who can benefit the most from a number of things that can be done in the field of continuing education. As in most other cases, they are the ones who will be aware of them last, and I'm not being critical of anyone. That seems to be the way society operates, unfortunately.

It is at that level that likely the preventive welfare program and the equivalent to manpower training allowances, which are in the Department of Advanced Education, along with hopefully increased grants to recreation boards, all three provincially funded, are really going out in three different directions without coordination. I would at least give lip-service to this idea of all sorts of flexibility and whatever people want to do locally.

But if we are going to come to grips with making opportunities available to people who can gain the most from them, we can't sit back and say we're going to do it by a committee system, we hope everybody will get along. Because there is a particular bunch of people, sincere, genuine people, who will do a good job in that area, but the people who really need it the most won't have the opportunities unless we are going to be involved and are prepared to make rather sizable amounts of provincial funds available.

If we are going to do that, it has to be done on a coordinated basis. I am saying to you I think the time to get coordination in there is now when we start, rather than waiting three, four, five years because by then the empires are built, or are being built, and it's much more difficult, as the minister well knows, to deal with established empires.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Chairman, one brief comment on this. I think the hon. member does bring up a good point that there are groups that may not get programming and the reason is they can't afford the fees for the particular courses. But I am not so sure that we definitely have to go to extensive subsidization.

It is my feeling that if there were to be a small change in the nature in which our educational jurisdictions handle their budgets, we could get an awful lot of programming for this disadvantaged population. It is simply in this manner: most continuing education departments are able to, through their programming, make a profit on the courses they offer. I really feel that the Robin Hood principle can also apply to education. I am impressed by a number of people in the continuing education jurisdiction and the entrepreneurship they have been able to show in the past.

Let's say a particular department were to put on a conference for a group of chartered accountants. It would seem to me that these people are well prepared to pay a higher fee for this kind of conference than some other groups.

I think it is proper that the Continuing Education Division be able to put on such a conference, incur a profit and with this profit subsidize that kind of programming which should be made for disadvantaged populations.

But the manner in which we deal with our budgets at present makes this impossible because this profit immediately goes back into the general revenues of the whole institution, or at the end of the year it goes back into general revenue. Consequently, we can't take that profit and subsidize because it doesn't belong to that particular jurisdiction. I feel by a change in the way we deal with budgets so that budgets could remain within a division, maybe at least on a three year basis so that this kind of programming could be facilitated, I'm not so sure that we are really going to have to subsidize as heavily as we seem to think for disadvantaged populations.

I still go back to what I said before, that if we do decide to subsidize we can do it in a contract kind of basis similar to the way we did with PEP. The coordination is simply by contract by the department with particular jurisdictions.

Let's say there is a group of women on welfare in a particular community. It is determined that they could benefit from a particular course, and let's say Olds Agricultural College was the nearest one. Then the department could contract with them to put on this course in coordination with the preventive social service. I'm not so sure it's going to cost that much money for your department.

MR. CLARK:

Can we move from there to, I think, an area that is a rather living example of where we are going to need this coordination soon and where we have the problems of poverty, the problems of Native people and Metis people and so on. I'd like to ask the minister what kind of mechanism we have for coordination now in Fort McMurray?

MR. FOSTER:

The community of Fort McMurray, Mr. Chairman, is served by the vocational centre in an institution. I'm not sure whether or not my Director of Continuing Education, Dr. Staples, has established a coordinating committee in that community between the AVC and the public school system. I could inquire into that. I'm not sure, either, whether you wish to get into the whole question of coordination, educational opportunity, employment training programs, industry-based programs, government operated programs, special group operated programs. For example the Indian Association of Alberta wants, as you know, to offer programs on an industry-based basis funded by the federal government involving themselves, and the Metis associations want to run their own programs, et cetera.

My attitude at the moment is that we have a series of institutions in northern Alberta and we'd like to make those institutions open to all Albertans, and not just according to class, colour, background or educational level. We're inviting all Albertans to participate in this. Now this is causing some concerns, because individual groups -- and I might say the Indian Association and the Metis Association are two, I think, that are anxious to create their own separate educational and training centres apart from initiatives of industry and apart from initiatives of government. There is no doubt that there will have to

be close coordination between the efforts of industry, government, local groups and special Native organizations like the Indian Association and the Metis Association.

One of the advisory committees proposed in the department, Mr. Chairman, is a committee of Native educational affairs. We are hoping in that way we can be kept in touch from a broad policy point of view. That doesn't affect the working coordination at the community level however. There is absolutely no doubt that much is yet to be done in that area and I take the member's comments as more than notice, because they surely are.

MR. CLARK:

Just to follow along, Mr. Chairman, and I'm sorry I'm rather dominating the questioning, but it's a rather important area. With regard to Fort McMurray and the submission made by the Indian Association, the Metis Association and Syncrude -- the proposition that was made to you last June, I believe. Where does that proposition stand now?

MR. FOSTER:

I'm sorry the member was absent during my estimates, but that was discussed then. The proposition in a nutshell, Mr. Chairman, was that there should be a company formed with several shareholders, one of them being government as a major shareholder, one being industry, one being the Indian Association, another the Metis Association and perhaps others, and that this body corporate should, in fact, be the organizing agency to legally organize and create the vehicle for delivery of educational services throughout the northeast region of this province.

That was put forward at a time when the takeover arrangements from the federal government with respect to NewStart facilities, were not firmly agreed upon, as they now are, and before we had any plan for assuming responsibility for those centres. We have not totally rejected that proposal and that has been communicated to the parties involved, Mr. Chairman. We have said in the short run, we felt it was preferable that the government attempt to work with the federal government to come to an arrangement in the NewStart facilities which we have, take them over, open them up, and begin some programming in cooperation with local organizations, having them help us identify local needs and acting in an advisory role.

Now that assumes that the Department of Advanced Education will be responsible for those institutions, and organizations like Pa-ta-pun for example in Lac La Biche would not be. I'll give you an example in Fort Chip where the Kiwitinook association, for example, has expressed a very clear desire to take over and have sole responsibility for that centre. I have had, I think, two petitions on that basis. The community of Fort Chip, sometimes involving the same people, I think, on the other hand said, "No, we don't want that. We want the department and the Department of Manpower and Labour and Mr. Adair's staff, to operate this in close working relationship with us, which is what we prefer to do." So we have that kind of thread or wheel to try and steer in that community. We have these facilities open, we have them staffed, we are working in a modest way with some programming. We have effected a coordinating group through the office of program coordination of the Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs Department, to work with all agencies of government involved in that area, to try and coordinate these activities.

We are hopeful that we can, and we are in fact, establishing a working relationship with industry, Indian Association and Metis Association. One of the problems of that specific brief, Mr. Chairman, and my colleague the former minister will appreciate this, is that within days, I think, after the change of leadership of the Metis Association of Alberta, I was advised, albeit informally, that that proposal did not have the approval of the Metis Association. So we were back to square one, and that wasn't the basis for which we decided we would go it alone in the short run, but at that time we were not sure that's what they wanted done. So we said, "Fine, we'll hold that proposal in abeyance; we'll get these facilities operating, and we will then discuss how best to coordinate, how best to operate." Now it may be in the final analysis, some external agency, body corporate or otherwise, along the lines of NEEDCO of a year or two ago, or the proposal from Syncrude and the Native groups will be found acceptable.

I have some serious reservations about that, but I am quite prepared to examine them. I didn't feel we could work through all the detail on that, which would take several months, and then start to open these facilities and get them going. I have spent some time in those communities talking with groups and

getting these things off the ground, but I recognize that there may be better vehicles than just government alone operating these institutions. There are many alternatives. I don't know how we want to take on the subject, but one of them certainly is industry operating training programs on their own base which they intend to do, and which we intend to help them do. But that's only one prong of a many-pronged attack on this question of educational opportunity for Natives and northern Albertans.

MR. CLARK:

I'd just like to ask two questions, hoping to draw an end to them, Mr. Chairman. One is, Mr. Chairman, have you advised the Indian Association, the Metis Association and Syncrude of your feelings on this project? Because speaking to representatives of those organizations as recently as the last part of last week, they didn't feel they had received a definite answer from the department.

Second, might I say, that if the NewStart experience taught us anything, it should have taught us that there are several advantages to an industry-government cooperative venture, likely from a corporate standpoint. I am sure the minister has heard all sorts of stories of what went on as far as NewStart was concerned, about various people involved in NewStart, and unless you've been more successful than I was when I was there, I wasn't able to find much substantiation to those -- but an awful lot of smoke. I would just say to you that I think you should consider very seriously veering away from that particular approach based on the NewStart approach, of a corporate approach as opposed to just government doing it itself. Because government doing it itself, in dealing with the problems of Native people all across this country, has been eminently unsuccessful as far as training programs for Native people are concerned and getting them on the job and working for a substantial period of time after that. If we are really serious about that northeast part of the province, we perhaps should gauge our success by how successful we are in improving the opportunities for those people.

MR. FOSTER:

Could I just make one final comment, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the fact that we are moving on the basis of opening AVCs or CVCs now, and holding in abeyance this question of the involvement of industry, any other associations and a corporate structure or what have you.

I am aware that there was comment by these people that we don't know what is happening. I recall sometime, I think October or November, having written to these people and suggesting exactly what I said here, that we are not prepared to accept the proposal at this time. We are moving to open these facilities, take over NewStart facilities, make them part of our vocational training area but that we will be coming back to this question of structures and governments and the authority which we should use to do it, which we intend to do. So I don't know where the confusion lies.

[All sections of the bill, the title and preamble were agreed to.]

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 18
The Colleges Amendment Act, 1973

[Sections 1 through 6 of the bill were agreed to without debate.]

MR. SCHMID:

May I ask permission of the House to revert to Introduction of Visitors?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS (CONT.)

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, the hon. Laurent Desjardines from Manitoba, Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs; the hon. Ed Tchorzewski, Saskatchewan Minister of Culture and Youth, and Minister of Consumer Affairs and Provincial Secretary; Mr. L.J. Wallace from British Columbia, Deputy Provincial Secretary, who are here to discuss a lottery system for western Canada.

If the hon. members permit me, I would just like to tell you what the meeting was all about.

MR. CLARK:

Did you make some money at it?

MR. SCHMID:

We will try to.

A western Canadian interprovincial cooperative lottery will become a reality within a year if the provincial governments of the four western provinces ratify a report agreed to at the meeting. If implemented, this interprovincial lottery would provide funds for cultural and recreational activities within each of the western provinces and would also assist many community charitable organizations in raising funds for their programs.

One of the significant operating principles agreed to is that each province retains its own profits for distribution to the desired programs under its own priorities. If approved by the respective government cabinets, an implementation task force will be established to take the necessary steps to make the scheme operational across western Canada.

And, last, discussions took place on the proposed national olympic lottery, that the ministers will be referring this to their respective cabinets for decision.

Mr. Chairman, these have been the points of discussion at our conference. The meeting has now concluded and could I now ask the hon. members and their resource personnel to rise and be recognized by this Assembly.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I have a very relevant question to put to the minister, if he doesn't mind, concerning his announcement. In the event that he requires any committees, boards or commissions set up to implement this program, will he follow the general pattern and practice of his government to pick well known Conservative supporters for these committees?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Chairman, for the interest of the hon. member opposite it was agreed by all ministers that people are first in our discussion; and they were first, I guarantee you.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (CONT.)

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Thank you, Mr. Minister. Now to return to the study of Bill No. 18.

[Section 7 through 16 of the bill were agreed to.]

Title and Preamble

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, we have discussed the question of the elimination of the Colleges Commission and the Universities Commission and I think we've made our point, at least I've made my point, very clear. I think it's a serious mistake because it is infringing upon the freedom and the independence which the college system in this province has come to appreciate in the past. We have told the government they are moving in the wrong direction; our advice seems to be

falling on deaf ears. Certainly I, for one, am going to vote against this. I think it's a serious step in the wrong direction and I regret very much that the minister hasn't seen the errors of his ways.

[The title and preamble were agreed to.]

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Chairman, I move the bill be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 23 The Universities Amendment Act, 1973

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There is an amendment with Bill No. 23. Have all the members got the amendment?

[Sections 1 through 3 of the bill were agreed to without debate.]

[Section 4 as amended was agreed to without debate.]

[Sections 5 through 17 were agreed to without debate.]

Title and Preamble

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, with reference to Section 16(8) if we may revert?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Please.

MR. TAYLOR:

I would like to say a word or two in connection with this. This appears to be moving the money that comes to the Universities Commission as ultimate heir, which when it was provided or given or willed was under the control of the Universities Commission. I am wondering now if it's fair to those who will such moneys to the Universities Commission to change the basis upon which that will was made previously. I understand there are moneys that come in trust to the Universities Commission. It seems now that the ground rules are being changed and there are two points really in question.

First, does this in any way affect the basis upon which the money was willed or given to the Universities Commission?

The second point that bothers me a little bit is why the Universities Commission or the universities are not able to handle this particular item. Were the moneys given to the commission or were the moneys generally willed to the University of Alberta, the University of Calgary or the University of Lethbridge? I wonder if the hon. minister could give us some enlightenment on those two particular points?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Chairman, some years ago before there was more than one university in this province, I think The Ultimate Heir Act provided that all escheated estates would go to the use and benefit of the University of Alberta. Now, when more than one university came into being, it then became a question of how we should handle this.

Escheated estates, estates for which there are no beneficiaries -- it was decided that to resolve the matter the funds would be set aside in trust for the use and benefit of universities. There would have to be some manner of dividing these funds between the institutions. The time following the establishment of the Universities Commission it was concluded that the commission would make that decision. So the function of the commission was merely to divide the revenues among the various institutions. All we are doing now, as I said before, is removing that from the commission and having it done by government, by the department in particular, on the advice if you will, of the Advisory Committee on University Affairs.

Now this does not affect, Mr. Chairman, any person's right to leave as beneficiary, any person or institution competent and entitled to receive it. For example, if any citizen of Alberta wanted to put in his will that he would like his funds to go to an institution eligible to receive it, for example a university specifically, and the law did not preclude that, that would be allowed. This does not apply in this case. This is only for estates for which there are no beneficiaries, or escheated estates, and the situation is not effective.

The shift from the commission to the department in this sense does not violate, in my judgment, Mr. Chairman, any trust arrangement or condition of any of the wills involved. Were it so, it would mean that one must keep the Universities Commission in existence in perpetuity to comply with wills made by other people. There is no problem, sir.

MR. TAYLOR:

I appreciate that information. One further question then. Are there some of these moneys that remain today vested in the University of Alberta?

MR. FOSTER:

Yes, and others as well.

MR. LUDWIG:

I would like to touch on several matters concerning this bill and the minister's approach to the universities in Alberta, and particularly with regard to Calgary. It is my opinion that the universities in this province made tremendous progress under the system and set-up that existed prior to this date. It is also my opinion that they would not have been as progressive and as well developed and as well known and effective, had this system the minister is now advocating prevailed in the past.

I am amused when he states that the Athabasca University is a live university, when the pressure was put on him. If that is his opinion of a live university I would hate to know what a dead one is.

When he talks about not centralizing power so far as his attitude is concerned, I think the legislation has to be looked at. I think that the attitude of the government generally with regard to centralization has to be looked at. It isn't enough for the minister to stand up and say, oh, we are not going to do it. We believe that the fears and suspicions of the university boards, university staffs, the presidents, are well justified. When you look at part 3 of the bill it says, No. 10. Minister's Powers. That is exactly what the universities don't like -- the minister's powers. He can set up a board of his own choosing who is going to be in charge.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am sorry; that is not correct. Could the member please explain himself when he says, who is in charge?

MR. LUDWIG:

"The Minister may delegate to any person or body of persons any of the powers, duties and functions conferred or imposed on him pursuant to this Act". That is what I meant. I am sorry, but the intent was proper, Mr. Minister. So you can pick anybody you like to represent you and exercise your powers. Is this good or bad? I think it is terrible and I think the universities ought to be concerned. The minister may delegate to any person or body of persons and it could be a one-man board, it could be his campaign manager or it could be a series of campaign managers. I see the hon. Government House Leader saying, "Order," but I believe everything is quite in order except this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we'd be quite remiss if we didn't stand up and express the concerns and the fears of the university president, and I'm referring to Calgary particularly. I believe the same thing could apply to Edmonton, but they have a good number of MLAs from Edmonton. I suppose if the minister says it's all right, they have no need to question it. They never questioned anything else before, why should they start now?

So I wish to be on record that this thing might work, Mr. Chairman. It might work, but the possibilities of a little bit of minister's influence -- not a little bit, but all of it -- a little bit of taking over, a little bit of feeling that if they don't criticize me too much I might treat them differently.

But if they stand up and face me and fight me, I might just be able to use my ministerial power to put them in their place.

Now you might say this isn't the attitude with the government, but we have an excellent example of how this thing works by way of grants, when you look at the Alberta Fish and Game Association. They will criticize the government, they will criticize every government that there is. It's their business, it's the way they operate and they've done a lot of good. So what happens? Some well-intentioned minister chops their grant.

That is something we have to compare and have to read into every action of the government. So when we see a bill that gives the minister almost unlimited powers, we can't help but be concerned about centralization.

Maybe if that's the policy of the government, that they want to centralize, let them stand up and say so, but they are talking decentralization. Their political program was decentralization. Everything is decentralization, but they're not fooling anybody because their legislation points to centralization.

One could hardly say that the universities in the past in this province have not risen and progressed very rapidly in keeping with the economic conditions, in keeping with the influx of people and the demand of our society for educated people. So we've done well but the minister has not come around and said I'm going to improve the system, he just says, I'm going to change the system. And that's all he is doing. He is going to get rid of the commission and who's going to be the boss now? Ultimately the minister, and if he isn't, it says here, "The Minister's Powers." That word "powers" is rather ominous. It says here under Part 3, Provincial Universities -- Administration, "The Minister may delegate to any person or body of persons any of the powers, duties and functions conferred or imposed on him pursuant to this Act." And that, Mr. Chairman, speaks for itself.

I believe I don't need to belabour this point. I believe that all hon. members here have heard the concerns of the universities. They've heard the press reports. They've heard the tremendous and capable fight put up by Dr. Carruthers from Calgary and a lot of faculty and staff members who are not happy, not so much that this thing can't work, but the fear that there is centralization here, the fear that they may be cramped in their legitimate needs and the fear that there is a downgrading of the real importance and the significance of a university in a community, Mr. Chairman.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS (CONT.)

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I should like to request permission to revert to Introduction of Visitors for a moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

May the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place introduce some visitors?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. YOUNG:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members. On behalf of the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour, the hon. Dr. Bert Hohol, I have the privilege to introduce this afternoon a group of Grade 9 students numbering 28, I believe, who are present in the members gallery with their leader, Mr. Bill Kobluk from the St. Cecilia School in the constituency represented by the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask that they rise and be recognized.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (CONT.)

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Thank you. Any other comments?

MR. CLARK:

I think, Mr. Chairman, I will just echo the comments made earlier. Certainly we on this side don't object to the government taking a serious look at perhaps tightening the financial belt of the universities, if the government feels that's essential. That certainly is completely within the power of the government and this Legislature. No one is being critical on that particular ground.

I don't think there is any indication at this time that the universities are being, shall I say, starved from a financial standpoint. I would say, on the other hand, that I think there is genuine concern on the question of academic freedom, academic independence. We raised that point with the minister earlier.

The next largest concern I can raise on this whole principle of removal of the commissions is that in approving this bill, we are wiping out the two commissions, but at the same time we are not replacing by legislative statute the system of advisory committees or other kinds of committees which, as the minister has outlined to this House, will function in the place of the commissions. The minister suggested to us on several occasions that these advisory committees will operate as a buffer, and yet to this date he has not seen fit to set out the guidelines for these committees, the personnel involved in these committees or the responsibilities for these committees.

So we are really being asked to, for a lack of a better term, buy a pig in a poke. I don't believe that's a responsible position to take. However, the government in its wisdom or lack thereof, depending upon your point of view, has embarked on this scheme and certainly it is our responsibility on this side of the House to see that the academic independence and especially the academic freedom of those institutions is maintained in a manner appropriate to educational institutions across this continent.

MR. NOTLEY:

I would just like to say very briefly that I agree with most of the comments raised by both the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury and the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, and reiterate the concern that I expressed during second reading with respect to the elimination of the Universities Commission.

In my view there is a real need to have some kind of buffer, not only if academic freedom is going to be preserved at the universities, but if in fact the government is going to be able to handle the rather vexing and difficult problem of providing secondary or advanced education in the province.

I can readily see many times when the minister, without the shield of a buffer, will find himself embroiled in some rather difficult politics. And though I don't pretend to be an expert --

MR. CLARK:

...[Inaudible]...

MR. NOTLEY:

Pardon? I'm sure none of the hon. members on this side would ever think of stirring it up. Mr. Chairman, let me just say this. From my fleeting experience with academics I think all of the hon. members in this House, including even the Deputy Premier, are rank political amateurs compared to university politicians when it comes to maneuvering and the skilful footwork of some of our academic personnel. While I have confidence in the political skill of almost any Tory, I say political skill, and certainly their PR ability, nevertheless I think they are undertaking a challenge here which is really pretty big. So I have a certain amount of sympathy for the minister, because I think he is almost like the Christian thrown into the lion's den. It's very seldom that the Christians eat the lions.

But in all seriousness I really would ask that the government reconsider its view. I'm a little concerned too that we haven't got the guidelines, at least, for the university committee which is to act, as the minister explained during the estimates of his department, as a liaison between him and the university community. It seems to me that this information would be really pretty useful to the members before the bill, which in effect eliminates the Universities Commission, is passed.

But after expressing those concerns, Mr. Chairman, I do think that we're taking a rather dangerous step. I've made some perhaps whimsical comments about the political skill of academics, but at the same time I think most of us on both sides of the House would recognize that we do have an excellent university system in the province; and regardless of our differences over this particular bill, all members of the House recognize that basic to a good university system is the principle of safeguarding academic freedom. My concern is not that the minister has any rather devious scheme up his sleeve to undercut academic freedom. I'm certainly not accusing him of that. But my fear is that by eliminating the buffer between the universities on one hand and the department on the other, we are going to see the universities and the government engaged in a much more ongoing, controversial political situation than would be the case if we had the buffer.

I realize this is a matter of judgment. The minister has obviously concluded that the defects and the pitfalls we see on this side are outweighed by the advantages which he sees. He's going to have to live with the decision he makes. I, as one member of the committee, feel that we are making a rather serious mistake by eliminating the commission.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, there has been a considerable amount of debate on this particular bill, and I would simply like to say that I am confident the minister recognizes the responsibility, a responsibility which he is accepting upon his shoulders slightly more directly than before. Much of this, in my opinion, arises out of the development of our university system, based on the concept, perhaps rather fuzzily defined, of the right of access of all who can benefit from a university education. This has, in consequence, created a mammoth expenditure of public funds. It has therefore attracted the attention of governments, not only in Alberta but elsewhere. To the best of my knowledge, no system has been found which makes everyone happy. I think it might be much too much to expect that that would be developed. Some criticism, some caveats, could be reflected upon the previous system with the commissions. While they did a good job, I think there were some of us here who, on questioning them during the public accounts, were not all that satisfied that some of our concerns had been resolved by the commissions' existence.

Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to say that I think the issue of academic freedom is one which has been used as a general heading under which all kinds of privileges acquired or desired, and discretionary actions which were again either acquired or desired, have been lumped. Some of them, actions and discretions, opportunities for decision at university level -- at least assumed by people at the university to be opportunities for their decision within their purview -- this Legislature may have never intended.

Now I hope, in the administration of this act -- and I'm sure that we will all be listening and watching extremely carefully -- the minister will be able to sort out what is truly academic freedom from what is not truly academic freedom. I think there's a distinction here. Without wanting to develop it very far, it would seem to me that what goes on in the classroom, and for that matter some of the types of classes that are taught, may properly be called academic freedom. But there are some things, and all of us I believe are aware that universities claim they are under the heading of academic freedom, which really are pretty far removed from having anything to do with academic freedom. They may have more to do with academic empires than academic freedom as such.

I realize, and I'm sure the minister does, the challenges of this particular move, but in saying that I think it can be fairly said that the other systems tried have not been as successful as we would have liked.

[The title and preamble were agreed to without debate.]

MR. YURKO:

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

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 4 The Garagemen's Lien Amendment Act, 1973

[All sections of the bill, the title and preamble were agreed to without debate.]

MR. HANSEN:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 4 be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 7 The Agricultural Societies Amendment Act, 1973

[All sections of the bill, the title and preamble were agreed to without debate.]

MR. J. MILLER:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 7 be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 10 The Public Service Vehicles Amendment Act, 1973

[All sections of the bill, the title and preamble were agreed to without debate.]

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 10 be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 11 The Libraries Amendment Act, 1973

[All sections of the bill, the title and preamble were agreed to without debate.]

MR. DOAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move that this bill be reported as amended.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 12 The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Amendment Act, 1973

MR. HENDERSON:

Just a question of clarification on Section 2. Why is the \$500 ceiling being removed?

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Chairman, that's to permit the administrator to waive the requirement of notice in all cases.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to bring up a point at this time. I have a case in point, and I'm sure there must be others, where legal action started and the person trying to get compensation back from this fund -- in this case it is a widow in Calgary -- has had difficulty getting the thing finalized, not so much through the fault of The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Amendment Act, but from the fact that her lawyer has been anything but, I think, perfect in this case. I think that he has dragged it on, that we have had an awful time trying to get the thing finalized. This man was run down by an uninsured driver and eventually died. Then they had to go all through the rigmarole of the estate and have somebody else go through it. So it has cost a lot of money up to now and still no settlement. It could go for four or five years.

I was wondering what provisions there are once the case has started. Is there any inquiry by the government as to whether or not there is a followup and especially in a case involving a fair size claim? It seems that nobody can act until the original lawyer decides to go forward with it. I am just wondering, is there any provision or any way where the government can demand that this thing be settled as quickly as possible one way or the other?

MR. HARLE:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I would hesitate to comment on a case that is presently before the courts. I think it would be unfair to comment. I would say that she quite obviously has her remedies and I think that is as far as one should go without going into very great details. I think it would be unfair to her to make comments any further than that. I am quite sure she has her remedies.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, she has her remedies, but let's put the case of a widow who has already gone to that expense. Sure she can eventually go and change the lawyers but that can be an additional expense. What I am trying to prevent is that very thing happening. Where a lawyer has already started on the case and then it proves that he is not carrying it forward within a reasonable length of time, then you think somebody could say what is happening to this case, why doesn't it go forward? As I understand it, the department has its solicitors and the two lawyers get together and more or less decide at that stage what is going to happen to it. This is what I am talking about rather than before the courts.

I was just wondering if there were some way that after a claim, especially a serious claim, has been before the Motor Vehicles Accident Claims Fund, that something maybe should be done to try and finalize these things. This case in particular has been going on now for four or five years and it is still not settled. To me that doesn't seem reasonable.

MR. HARLE:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I get back to my original comment. It seems to me from what the member has said that it must be in fact before the courts. I can't conceive of any other way but that the matter is presently in court. It may not have been finalized but it must be in court and quite obviously, she has her remedies.

[All sections of the bill, the title and preamble were agreed to.]

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 12 be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 22
The Marketing of Agricultural Products Amendment Act, 1973

[All sections of the bill, the title and preamble were agreed to without debate.]

MR. APPLEBY:

I move that Bill No. 22 be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report.

[The motion was carried.]

[Mr. Diachuk left the Chair.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration the following bills: Bills No. 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18, 22 and begs to report same.

Also the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration the following bill: Bill No. 23 and begs to report same with an amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the report by the hon. Chairman, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Public Works that the amendment be read a second time.

[The motion was carried and the amendment was read a second time.]

PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS
(Second Reading)

Bill No. 13

The Health and Social Development Statutes Amendment Act, 1973

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Stony Plain, second reading of Bill No. 13, The Health and Social Development Statutes Amendment Act, 1973.

The bill has three main parts. The first deals with amendments to the 1967 Cancer Treatment and Prevention Act. The amending act which is before us today removes the uncertainty of the term of appointment of members of the board appointed under the Act by removing the provision that they hold office during the pleasure of the minister and gives them prescribed terms. This should enhance the autonomy of the board in giving them a greater sense of stability in their appointments.

Mr. Speaker, the second part of the act amends The Hospital Visitors Committee Act. The hon. members will remember that last year this original bill was introduced by the hon. Dr. McCrimmon which set up the Hospital Visitors Committee. To date the bill has been well received I understand by the various institutions involved. It provides for an impartial committee to visit the various hospital institutions in the province to determine whether or not they are fulfilling their role satisfactorily in the health care delivery system.

Now the objective of the amending act, of course, is to extend the rights of this visitors committee to visit also nursing homes and homes for the aged.

The third portion of the amending act before us amends The Public Contribution Act which is the 1965 Act. Members are probably aware that under the existing Act local committees can be set up by the various municipalities to approve various fund-raising projects. There are only three cities in Alberta that have their own municipal committees doing this and those are Edmonton, Calgary and Medicine Hat.

An example of the operation of one of these local committees is our committee here in Edmonton which last year approved 61 applications and rejected 6. Some examples of rejections are -- in other words of organizations which were refused permission to go to the public to raise contributions -- were cases where they were mainly motivated by professionals, who would appear to be getting most of the proceeds. Now the local committees do work closely with the provincial committee to minimize any duplication where there is a province-wide charitable campaign. The objective of the amendment before us is to again promote the autonomy of the local committee by giving them the final say as to whether or not one of these organizations can make an application to the public for funds.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 13 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 16

The Students Loan Guarantee Amendment Act, 1973

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate I indicated I would be meeting with some groups involved which had asked me to meet with them regarding this bill. I have done that now and my remarks will be more appropriate during the committee study.

[The motion was carried, Bill No. 16 was read a second time.]

Numbering of Bills (Cont.)

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly I might interject at this point to answer the inquiry of the hon. Leader of the Opposition concerning Bill No. 21. There was a Bill No. 21, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act which appeared in Votes under notice. It was subsequently withdrawn and the number was reallocated.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, does this constitute notice of the bill that was introduced today and did we have due notice of the bill that was introduced today?

MR. SPEAKER:

I would think probably it does.

MR. HENDERSON:

I think probably, Mr. Speaker, I just might comment on a point of order. The bill was on the Order Paper but there seems to be a bit of delay in getting the Votes and Proceedings out. It is not a particular problem relating to these bills but we did not get the Votes and Proceedings that really gave us notice of the bills. The bills were in the House, really, before the notice was distributed to the members.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would like to assure the hon. members that we will look into the reasons for the delay and see that it is remedied.

Bill No. 19
The Hail and Crop Insurance Amendment Act, 1973

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 19, seconded by the hon. Member for Bonnyville.

Mr. Speaker, in Bill No. 19, of course, are amendments to The Hail and Crop Insurance Amendment Act, 1973, in response to the report of the special committee on crop insurance and weather modification whose final report was tabled, Mr. Speaker, approximately one month ago.

One of the highlights that would be included in this bill is Section No. 3. This amendment will increase the board of directors in the Alberta Crop Insurance Corporation from five to seven.

I would like to read to you, Mr. Speaker, from the recommendations of the select committee, the recommendation that the Board of the Alberta Hail and Crop Insurance Corporation be changed from the present five man board to a seven member board, four of whom shall be farmers and one farmer shall be appointed as Chairman. Further, none of the board members shall be an employee of the corporation. We think this is a major point in that we can get more farm representation on the board.

Mr. Speaker, another item I would like to point out to you is Section 37 of Bill No. 4. This is again in response to a recommendation made by the committee that all-risk crop insurance be made available to all agricultural areas in the province.

In Section 13 of the bill, are recommendations that the Alberta Hail and Crop Insurance Corporation be requested to change the date a farmer can cancel his all-risk crop insurance policy from January 31 to March 31. Mr. Speaker, that is what Section 13 is about.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the All-Risk Crop Insurance Corporation has sent out to the majority of farmers in Alberta this pamphlet. I am, Mr. Speaker, a little embarrassed by the colours. But I would like to read what they have included in here:

Important Changes for 1973: Lower Premiums -- Increased government assistance lowers premiums by one-third on the average.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this is a very significant change.

Higher Coverage -- Coverages are now based on the latest 10-year period, rather than 25 years as before, reflecting modern improvements in farming methods.

Hail Endorsement -- Low-cost Spot Loss protection from hail available on an optional basis.

And the cancellation deadline which I've just mentioned.

Deductions Through Liens -- Premium reductions will be limited to one-half of the value of any grain delivery.

Of course there are allotments for small losses and --

Major crop -- No longer need a policyholder insure his major crop. Each crop is optional with election to be made by April 30.

Mr. Speaker, the history of crop insurance in Alberta and especially in western Canada started out a number of years ago with a tremendous amount of faith and hope that this might be the answer to disaster. Now when a farmer loses a crop that is a disaster. That's a loss of income that reflects on his earnings for a good number of years.

A fair percentage of the farmers at that time joined this program. The program did not change and, Mr. Speaker, last year approximately 1,000 contracts were lost, the year before that 1,200 contracts. Now with the recommendations that have been put into the new contracts, I'm happy to report to this Assembly a conversation I had this morning with Mr. Mickey McKay, Chairman of the Board, that there has been an increase of approximately 3,000 farmers or 3,000 contracts. Mr. Speaker, this is an increase by one-third.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 19 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 20 The County Amendment Act, 1973

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Ponoka, that Bill No. 20, The County Amendment Act be read a second time.

The significant change in this bill is that it will allow summer villages with a population of over 150 permanent residents to have a vote in school matters. In some of our areas where we have summer villages situated with a population of over 150 they have no say in school matters at the present time but they still pay in the approximate cost and supplementary requisition.

I can compare two villages in the constituency of Stony Plain and one in the Whitecourt constituency where representation is held on the school board by the village of Entwistle, and if you compare the assessment of Seba Beach compared to Entwistle it is at least four or five times more. So I think this amendment will allow these residents of the summer villages to have a say in the school matters.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 20 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 24

The Alberta Gas Trunk Line Company Amendment Act, 1973

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lloydminster, second reading of Bill No. 24 being The Alberta Gas Trunk Line Amendment Act, 1973.

The major amendment provides for the exchange of gas, that is to provide that gas purchased in a given field may be exchanged for gas from another field more conveniently located with respect to the transmission facilities of the purchaser.

This was recommended in the Energy Resources Conservation Board report on field pricing of gas of August, 1972. Where gas is exchanged or commingled, the amendment allows for the Alberta Gas Trunk Line Company to make whatever adjustments in volume or heating value or component content that might be warranted.

Further amendments provide that notice of intention to exchange be given to the owners of the gas, with a copy of the notice going to the Energy Resources Conservation Board, and if no complaint is received after 90 days the company may then implement the proposed exchange.

I think, Mr. Speaker, most Albertans are quite familiar with the Alberta Gas Trunk Line Company since so many Albertans are shareholders. But I thought I might just take a few seconds to hit a couple of the highlights.

The company was initiated by an Act in this Legislature in 1954, which allowed for the issuing of capital stock for the par value of \$5. At the end of 1972 the company had a pipeline network throughout Alberta of over 4,000 miles. It operated 365,000 compressor horsepower and it transmitted an average of 4.46 billion cubic feet of gas per day.

The charges for gas transmission in 1972 averaged \$1.65 per 1,000 cubic feet per 100 miles. The company had 781 permanent employees at the end of 1972 with a payroll of some \$9.5 million, and including the families of the employees it is estimated that the company actually supports over 2,700 persons.

At the end of the year there were 21,374 common stock shareholders and of these 98 per cent, and I think this is a really significant statistic, 98 per cent are resident in Canada. They own 98 per cent of the shares. The "A" common shares were split on a 4 to 1 basis on September 29, 1972 and are currently trading at about \$16.50. That's an equivalent of \$66 when you compare it to the original \$5 share value. So I think that has to be considered a real Alberta success story.

MR. HENDERSON:

Social Credit success.

MR. CHAMBERS:

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think it is evident that it is in the Alberta public interest that gas may be readily interchanged throughout the province, and the proposed amendments will ensure full competition among gas buyers and add greater convenience and economy in gas marketing.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 24 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 27

The Livestock and Livestock Products Amendment Act, 1973

MR. FLUKER:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Stettler, Mr. Harle, second reading of Bill No. 27, The Livestock and Livestock Products Amendment Act, 1973.

Mr. Speaker, The Alberta Livestock and Livestock Products Act deals principally with the various aspects of trading in livestock and products. The act is complementary to the Canadian act of the same name and The Canadian Agricultural Products Standards Act, and provides authority for the appointment of federal inspectors to act on behalf of the province in the inspection of certain products. It provides additional authority to the province, particularly in the area of stockyard regulation and in the regulation and security required by dealers of livestock and poultry.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments submitted are intended to provide the flexibility necessary to cope with rapid changes in trading practices and volume of trade with security measures commensurate with good trading practices and present day levels and values.

Animal production represents the major source of farm income in this province and the estimated farm cash receipts from all animal products for 1972 was \$512 million, compared to \$431 million in 1969. The meat processing industry is by far the largest provincially based industry in terms of dollar return. Mr. Speaker, the cattle population in the province of Alberta in 1972 totalled some 3,700,000 head, and taking an average value of \$300 per head, this figure represents a total worth of over \$1 billion.

In 1972, Mr. Speaker, there were over 41,000 brands registered in the province of Alberta, and during the past year there were 2,538,000 cattle inspected for brands, identification, manifests and so forth. Involved in the movement of all these cattle, there were 458 licenced dealers. It goes without

saying, Mr. Speaker, that these dealers provide employment for a considerable number of people in rural Alberta.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of people involved in dozens of firms in the handling and transportation of cattle throughout the province and from this province to other parts of Canada.

It would be well to mention, Mr. Speaker, in giving these figures with respect to the livestock industry, the employment figures in the cities of Calgary and Edmonton with respect to the meat packing industry. Certainly in these two cities, the meat packing industry outranks all other industries in terms of employment. We also know, Mr. Speaker, that if we could increase our cow-calf operations in this province by 20 per cent, it would mean an additional 4,000 jobs in the meat packing industry in Alberta. Indications are that the animal industry in the province will continue to accelerate in sophistication and volume, thereby improving Alberta's agricultural income position.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 27 deals with points designed to do the following things:

(a) refine definitions;

(b) to provide authority for lease of security under certain circumstances;

(c) to put a responsibility on patrons who have suffered a default in payment for livestock and products by stipulating a time period within which such patrons must give notice to the minister.

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, should give the department an earlier warning of problems with livestock and poultry dealers than we have had in the past, and thereby permit us to investigate such cases and hopefully avert the proliferation of defaults.

(d) Another amendment, Mr. Speaker, adjusts certain factors relative to the Livestock Patrons Assurance Fund by increasing the readily available sum from \$25,000 to \$50,000, deleting the redundant clauses that were made specific in the Verigon bankruptcy. It increases the fund limit from \$250,000 to \$500,000 and provides clarification of eligible recipients of benefits from the fund.

This is reference to a problem that arose in 1972 from interpretation by our solicitors that patrons of the poultry industry could claim against the fund. The change in the Act should allow differentiation between livestock patrons and poultry patrons as contained in Section 8 of the amendment.

(e) Another aspect of the amendment, Mr. Speaker, simplifies the appointment of federal inspectors who work for Agriculture Canada and the Canada Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and who carry out certain inspection duties under this Act.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, as indicated, the amendment is designed to bring certain sections of the Act up to date, to clarify certain aspects relative to the assurance fund and to permit more flexibility in definition of livestock dealers and stockyards to meet the rapidly changing procedures and practice in the livestock industry today.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, in his preliminary remarks, you referred to the increased volume versus 1969 to 1972, as I understood it. Have you made any studies to see if --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please address his remarks to the Chair?

MR. RUSTE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Has the member made any study as to what percentage of that can be attributed to the increased price of cattle in that time?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 27 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 47 The Land Surface Conservation and Reclamation Act

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Advanced Education, second reading of Bill No. 47.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very privileged and somewhat humble in bringing this bill before the Legislature, in that I know how much effort has been put behind the structuring of it. This bill has been in the making for some 16 months and has had probably more extensive review within the various departments of government and the various cabinet committees than any other bill brought before this House during the tenure of this government. But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this was all necessary, because we are dealing here with a vital aspect of our society, and that is, the land.

Mr. Speaker, land use and land management legislation in Alberta has, after a review, been determined to be in need of substantial revision, mainly because we expect before this province pretty substantial programs of industrial development and energy resource development.

We have particularly needed some new legislation in the area of management and conservation of the surface of the land. The legislation now in existence is fragmented, is certainly not all inclusive, and is generally remedial rather than preventive in scope. Furthermore the existing legislation is deficient in many aspects in regard to enforcement and administration.

May I state that at present, numerous provincial statutes regulate a variety of land service disturbances. In many instances these regulatory features are inconsistent with each other as they reflect primarily the views of the administrative agency and its relationship with its clientele. Consequently, land is not viewed in its broader context as the environmental base but as one divisible and discrete component thereof.

In addition the present statutes emphasize reclamation to some undetermined standard after the disturbance has in fact occurred. This is costly and confusing to the operator responsible for the disturbances since he is never quite certain what is expected of him. More emphasis will have to be placed on prevention.

The present Surface Reclamation Act provides a degree of protection in specified areas of the province, but it only includes specified forms of disturbances relative to the energy resources. The Public Land Act provides equivalent legislation to public lands located in the remainder of the province, but the administrative practices places more emphasis on preventive action as opposed to a remedial action.

The intent of the Land Surface Conservation [and Reclamation] Act is to consolidate the authority presently given in numerous provincial statutes and to one land-policy setting statute in which the objectives for conserving Alberta's land would be clearly visible for specific resource management in other statutes. It is an omnibus piece of legislation which regards specific resource administration. Furthermore the administration responsible will be clearly defined and delegated either within the statute or in the regulations.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the nature of this bill, the extent of this bill, is such that I could speak on it for some length in introducing it, but I expect we will be speaking more about the bill in clause by clause. Thus far in terms of the purposes and principles and the underlining of administrative aspects of the bill I must say that the bill has received some fairly favorable comment, in recognition of the complexity that's involved and it is recognized that the government has to move slowly in regard to regulations and the regulations that will be structured will of course be subjected to the widest possible public discussion.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will end at this time but will be making more in-depth discussions in closing the debate if necessary. Thank you.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few very brief comments. First, I would make it clear that I basically support the purpose and intent of the bill.

I think it should be of interest to members to know that really this matter of land management has been under examination -- it came under considerable study and public scrutiny, I think, dating back as far as 1966 so far as land reclamation was concerned, in standards at the time of the Legislative Committee on Boards and Tribunals, on which I had the privilege of serving with the now Minister of Mines and Minerals.

There was a great deal of criticism brought forth at that time about the land reclamation legislation that existed, and between then and the next few years a considerable amount of study by the previous government went into the issue.

At the time of the reorganization of the Energy Board and the transfer of a number of functions from the Department of Mines and Minerals to the Energy Board as well as the establishment of the Department of the Environment, the question of tackling the matter of land reclamation at that time was examined by the government. The study indicated, I think, as the minister has pointed out in his remarks, the complexity of dealing with the problem of land management even as it relates to reclamation.

It was concluded at that time, with the complexities the problem dictated, that the matter would have to be examined in considerably greater detail before any significant changes in legislation were made. We concluded at that time also that the reclamation council really did not appropriately belong in the Department of Mines and Minerals but the responsibility should be vested in the Department of the Environment.

I therefore would reiterate my initial remarks, Mr. Speaker, by saying that in principle as a member, I support the purpose and intent of the bill. I recognize in reading it there has been a lot of study and scrutiny into the matter. I am sure that the minister himself doesn't presume to suggest that the bill is going to resolve all the problems that rest in this area, but at least does bring the administration of this complex area under the jurisdiction of one department which undoubtedly is a big step forward.

I note also that there is tremendous ministerial authority in the bill and I also have to confess that is in keeping with the legislation establishing the Department of the Environment, The Air Pollution Control Act and The Water Pollution Control Act.

Finally, I even note that it has provision for stop orders in it and I can't help but close by saying I recall the comments of the now minister on stop orders in the original legislation related to his department and his rather scathing remarks of, what sort of ridiculous exercise was that? I am pleased to see he has decided it wasn't so ridiculous after all and it is incorporated in the present legislation. It is certainly my intention to support the bill.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to raise this question to the minister and he might answer when he closes the debate. Upon first reading of the bill he referred to the following from Hansard, "Thirdly, the preventative part of the act does not apply to any agricultural operations or activities". My question to the minister, does he foresee this applying to agricultural activities and if so, how far down the road?

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate I suggest that I for one recognize that there is such a process as a broadening of one's mind and if in fact, I did take exception to the idea of a stop order at one point in time, I must recognize that it obviously was with respect to the position that I was sitting in the House at that time.

MR. HENDERSON:

To say nothing of strip mining.

MR. YURKO:

But I recognize now, Mr. Speaker, that a stop order does have a useful tool and can be used in a preventive way as well as in a curative way.

In regard to the effect of the bill on agricultural operations, without getting specific and referring to the various sections of the bill, I would say this. After the bill was written in its entirety it was recognized that there may be some very sensitive areas and perhaps it wasn't timely to introduce a somewhat rigid form of land management in some particular areas of our province.

One area that was recognized was the area of agricultural operations. I'm using the words "agricultural operations" as distinct from agricultural land. In terms of agricultural land we recognize that there are operations of major magnitude such as pipelines and transmission lines where the owners of agricultural land recognize and want an order of protection from the government with respect to their rights, and particularly with respect to minimizing the sterilization of land and minimizing the wastage of topsoil and using that land for subsequent and other uses, even though a pipeline or a hydro line has gone through. So we recognized that the Act, particularly Part 3 of the Act, had to apply to agricultural land.

Nevertheless, in terms of the second part and that is the preventative part which is an area where there is need for a pre-approval prior to the undertaking of certain operations, we recognize that this may be a very difficult thing to incorporate at this time in terms of agricultural operations. And we also recognize that even the very idea that it was possible in the Act may, in fact, cause considerable apprehension on the part of some of the agricultural operations particularly where relating to farming as distinct from an industrial or agribusiness which may and will, be regulated under the Act.

This is why a very specific exception was made recognizing, of course, that perhaps the greatest conservationists -- and certainly I can say this without equivocation -- were, in fact, farmers. I still think today that most of the farmers are the greatest conservationists in our society so there is hardly any need to apply the stringency of government in regulating their operations. They have a direct relationship to the land and they have a direct understanding that the land must be kept productive. This is why this exception was made.

The other exception, of course, was made in regard to a person's residential lot or area around his house because it was recognized that we simply couldn't build up the type of bureaucracy, nor would we want to. Nor would we want to cast that apprehension out there that we would be concerned with running a water line to a man's house, or a gas line to his house and our vast bureaucracy would come in and say this must be done in such and such a manner. So we excluded that part of the Act.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I just might say very quickly that the old Act applied to wells, pipelines, batteries, mines and quarries -- unless the current approach is limited, remedial and applies after the fact. We propose in this bill to expand our limited and remedial approach and make provision for prevention of unnecessary surface disturbances. Under The Land Conservation Act, that is the present one, we will be including the following for surface disturbances: wells, pipelines, batteries, mines, quarries, geophysical operations, aerial transmission lines, sand and gravel pits, waste disposal sites, railroads, access roads, trails, Kananaskis highways and so forth and regulated surface operations. With cabinet approval the following could be designated as regulated surface operations requiring approval before the surface disturbance takes place, thereby providing for the prevention of unnecessary surface disturbances.

These would be wells, pipelines, batteries, mines, quarries, geophysical operations, aerial transmission lines, sand and gravel pits, waste disposal sites, roads, railways, landing strips, water diversions, topsoil removal, archaeological excavations, coal, gas and petroleum processing plants.

I would like to suggest that under this act, if we pass regulations in this regard, a railway company would have to get permission to abandon its railway and may be required, in fact, to do certain things which may not mitigate ready abandonment of that railway. Thus we have extended our current remedial approach and we are adding provisions for preventative measures.

I might just say that the regulations will certainly not all be written in six months or one year. This is an ongoing process and may, in fact, take years. The regulations may very well be structured over a period of, perhaps, five or ten years in this part two, this remedial section of the act.

We recognize the enormous responsibility in regard to this act. I hope that whoever is the minister in charge of this act will act in accordance with the enormous trust placed on him with respect to this act. I have no doubt that governments recognize the importance of this act, and governments in total will certainly respond with a great deal of care, a great deal of consideration, a great deal of public discussion in terms of particularly applying the second part of this act. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[The motion was carried, Bill No. 47 was read a second time.]

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. Member for Ponoka be prepared to take the chair?

Does the hon. Government House Leader wish to proceed with his motion?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider Bill No. 1.

[The motion was carried.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (CONT.)

[Dr. McCrimmon briefly in the Chair]

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of Assembly will come to order. Bill No. 1, The Investment Contracts Amendment Act, 1973.

[Sections 1 through 4 of the bill were agreed to without debate.]

MR. HENDERSON:

Point of order, Mr. Chairman. It was my understanding we didn't go through clause by clause unless the Chairman called the bill and someone brought the matter up. Otherwise we moved straight to title and preamble.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Thank you.

[Sections 5 through 11 of the bill, the title and preamble were agreed to without debate.]

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Chairman, I move the bill be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

It has been moved by the hon. House Leader that the committee rise and report. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Diachuk left the Chair.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration the following bill, Bill No. 1, and begs to report the same.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the report, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 4:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until Monday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 3:55 o'clock.]