

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday, May 10, 1973

[The House met at 2:30 o'clock.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Legislative Committee on Professions and Occupations, I beg leave to make the following report.

The Special Committee of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Alberta was established by resolution on April 26, 1972, to do the following:

to review legislation, to examine generally policies and principles underlying such legislation, and to hear representations from associations incorporated under such legislation; all pertaining to the regulations of professions and occupations.

The Committee found that because of the complexity of the subject matter of its review, it is unable to complete its work at this time.

Therefore, the Committee seeks approval of the Legislative Assembly to continue its review and examination and to report thereupon at the fall sitting of this second session of the 17th Alberta Legislature.

In support of the above request, I am pleased to table for the benefit of the members an interim report which indicates the degree of progress achieved by the Committee at this time.

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, it may not be appropriate to table these two pistols which I am about to table in the Alberta Legislature, but I am wondering if the hon. Speaker will be at the Farmer's Day shoot-out in Stony Plain June 8 to defend his title, which I'm confident of winning?

MR. SPEAKER:

It may be irregular to reply to the hon. member, but I was not planning to retire as undefeated champion.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to give notice of motion in respect of four matters. First to give notice of motion, which I will move, seconded by the hon. Miss Hunley, as follows:

Be it resolved that:

(1) A Select Committee of this Assembly be established consisting of the following members:

Hon. Mr. Hyndman  
Mr. Appleby (Chairman)  
Messrs. Amerongen

Dixon  
Henderson  
King  
Young

with instructions to study, simplify, update and modernize the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta and report its recommendations at the fall sitting of this Assembly.

(2) The Committee shall meet at the call of the Chair.

(3) The Committee may incur reasonable expenses in connection with the conduct of its responsibilities; members to receive remuneration pursuant to Section 59 of The Legislative Assembly Act; all disbursements to be subject to the approval of the Chair and charged to Appropriation 1902.

The second notice I wish to give at this time, Mr. Speaker, is in relation to another select committee, a motion which I will move, seconded by Miss Hunley.

Be it resolved that:

(1) A Select Committee of this Assembly be established consisting of the following members:

Mr. Zander (Chairman)  
Mr. Benoit  
Mrs. Chichak  
Messrs. Clark  
Diachuk  
Harle  
Lee

and possibly one other opposition member with instructions to invite submissions from the public concerning Alberta regulations, consider same, and make recommendations to the fall session of this Assembly.

(2) The Committee shall meet at the call of the Chair.

(3) The Committee may incur reasonable expenses in connection with the conduct of its responsibilities; members to receive remuneration pursuant to Section 59 of The Legislative Assembly Act; and all disbursements to be subject to the approval of the Chair and charged to Appropriation 1902.

The third notice, Mr. Speaker, is a notice of motion moved by myself and seconded by the hon. Dr. Backus.

Be it resolved that:

when the Assembly adjourns for the summer recess, it shall stand adjourned until 2:30 o'clock in the afternoon of Wednesday, October 10, 1973.

The fourth notice, Mr. Speaker, which will be moved at a future date by the hon. Premier, seconded by the hon. Dr. Backus:

Be it resolved that:

the hon. Premier report to the Assembly respecting the operations of government during the period of the adjournment of the Assembly for the summer recess to the 10th day of October, 1973, and that the said report be received and concurred in.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

#### Bill No. 59 The Occupiers' Liability Act

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to introduce to this Legislature a landmark bill, one of the first, in fact the first in Canada of its kind, a bill, Mr. Speaker, that will hopefully clarify a complex area of our law, namely the law of occupiers' liability.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. In the introduction of the bill -- I think perhaps we referred to this briefly some time ago -- comments which extol the uniqueness or virtues of the bill or describe the necessity for it because of past history are strictly in the nature of debate and are not in order, since the motion for leave to introduce a bill is not debatable.

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, I then beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Occupiers' Liability Act. The bill is the result of an exhaustive study, Mr. Speaker, conducted by the Institute of Law Research and Reform at the University of Alberta and presented to the government in December, 1969. The purpose of the bill, Mr. Speaker, will be to clarify the very complex area of occupiers' liability and to place upon occupiers of premises responsibilities with respect to individuals who come upon their land.

Mr. Speaker, I think all members would like me at this time to commend the members of the Institute who prepared this very exhaustive and commendable study, the result of which is the bill I am honoured to introduce today.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 59 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour that Bill No. 59, The Occupiers' Liability Act, 1973 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 58 The Coal Conservation Act

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Coal Conservation Act.

The bill deals with the basic duties and responsibilities of the Energy Resources Conservation Board and the industry vis-a-vis each other and the public as it relates to coal.

The basic purpose of the bill is to: provide for an appraisal of Alberta's coal resources; appraisals of coal requirements in Alberta and in other markets outside Alberta; to ensure orderly, efficient and economic development of Alberta's coal resources in the public interest; to effect conservation and prevent waste of Alberta coal resources; to assist the government in control of pollution and ensure environment conservation in the development of the coal resources of Alberta; to ensure the observation of safe and efficient practices in the exploration, mining, storing, processing and transportation of coal, and lastly, to provide for the recording, the timely and useful dissemination of data and information relating to the exploration for coal and to the occurrences, reserves, quality, production, transportation, processing and use of coal in Alberta.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 58 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 219 The Community Health and Social Services Centres Act

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 219, being The Community Health and Social Services Centres Act.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is part of a broad legislative program to bring about coordinated community health and social services. It will define and make provisions for administrative structure, social facilities and services in areas to be served.

The principles of the bill are to elevate total health to an optimal level; to provide an alternative to institutional care and assure local autonomy; to promote health rather than [to treat] sickness alone; to provide, through community health and social services, quality of life; to assure that the consumer, that is the people in a community, can respond to the needs, and to

furnish a key link-mechanism for a total health delivery system. To provide ongoing evaluation --

MR. SPEAKER:

Can the hon. member abbreviate the introduction somewhat please?

DR. PAPROSKI:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, there are only two or three more sentences -- to provide an evaluation of needs of health and social services and to minimize bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, I am both humble and proud to introduce this bill because it required quite a lot of community [support].

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please.

DR. PAPROSKI:

--pace-setter. Thank you.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 219 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to introduce a bill without the usual notice.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Bill No. 220 An Act to amend The Alberta Health Care Insurance Act

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being An Act to amend The Alberta Health Care Insurance Act. The purpose of this act, Mr. Speaker, is to prevent the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission from paying for the cost of abortions except in unusual circumstances.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 220 was introduced and read a first time.]

#### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and a pleasure for me today to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, 50 high school students from the Jubilee Junior High School in Edson, Alberta, the heart of the Yellowhead country. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Yeomans and Mrs. J. Wynn. They are seated in the public gallery and I would now ask them to rise and be recognized by this Assembly.

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, two young gentlemen, Peter Piening and David Long from the Lacombe Composite School; they are making a study of the operation of the Legislature. I would ask that they rise and be recognized by this Assembly.

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, 25 Grades 5 and 6 students from the Paddle Prairie School in the heart of the Peace River constituency. They are accompanied by their principal Mr. Mulloy, and Mrs. Mulloy, by counsellor aide Mrs. Lariviere and teacher aide Mrs. Parenteau. They are in the public gallery and I would ask that they stand and be recognized.

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to introduce to you, and to the members of this Assembly, 65 enthusiastic high school Social Studies students from the Willingdon High School in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Dushinski who has been a member of this Legislative Assembly for eight years. They are all in the members gallery. Would they please rise and be recognized.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, it is a very special privilege to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, the hon. Member of Parliament for Edmonton Centre, Mr. Steve Paproski. He is in your gallery.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very special privilege indeed because he is a brother, but even doubly so because he is senior and bigger. May he rise and be recognized.

MR. SPEAKER:

We are honoured today to have in the Speaker's Gallery the distinguished Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of our sister province, Saskatchewan. I would ask if Mr. Gordon Barnhart would kindly stand to be recognized.

#### FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a reply to notice of Motion for a Return, No. 124, the reply to Question 138 and the reply to Question 239.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to table two returns requested by the Assembly. One, Return No. 122 on the motion by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, the other, Return No. 123 also on the motion by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the following returns on Sessional Papers Nos. 189, 244, and 226.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to the question of the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, No. 228 in regard to the number of active and auxiliary hospital beds built in the last ten years.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the task force on Manpower Training and Retraining, I would like to table four copies of the final report of the task force. Copies have also been made available for each of the members.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table a series of reports which I am sure will be of interest to the members. The first is Water Supply for the Saskatchewan-Nelson River Basin. It is a follow-up to the report tabled in this regard last fall.

The second report has to do with the land use hearings on the eastern slopes. I will be tabling Bulletins 4 and 5 in this regard -- and I think they have already been distributed to the members.

The third is a summary of the air pollutant emissions in Alberta.

The fourth is a summary of the water pollutant emissions in Alberta, 1970-

The last one is a study of the universal container depot system in Alberta.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table three Motions for a Return that have been requested by the House, No. 46, which is before me in the boxes, No. 152, and No. 205.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the size of the return just tabled by the hon. minister, I would suggest and ask the permission of the House that the doors to the Assembly which normally cannot be opened, be opened momentarily so that these might be moved out of the Assembly, insofar as the double doors are the only ones through which the said objects can pass.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker, is the Government House Leader going to push it? Is it covered by compensation?

[Laughter]

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table Return No. 186 --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. I take it that the House consents to the removal of the return through the doorway. Perhaps we could just stop a moment while the pages do the necessary pushing or pulling.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, with the tabling of the returns which have been tabled today and the one that is still to come from the hon. Minister of Advanced Education, in responding to the request by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday the government has now presented all those that appear able to be tabled, certainly within this week. There are some delays caused by the fact that many of the returns outstanding had, as a part of them, the need for approval to table private correspondence, and that approval is still being obtained.

Because certain ministers are out of the House and out of the province today on government business there is a possibility that we will be able to get one or two others through their offices, and if that's the case we may request the approval of the House to revert to Tabling of Motions for a Return perhaps at 8:00 o'clock this evening.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table Return No. 186.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the chairman of the special committee on The [Workmen's] Compensation Act could advise the House whether we are going to receive a copy of the report, or do we rely on the front page of The Edmonton Journal for the information?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I indicated earlier this week in answer to a question from the member of the loyal opposition that I would table, in fact, the document this week. I will do this.

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Does the chairman by chance have any information as to how the information was leaked or made available to the press before the report was tabled?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I haven't the slightest information with regard to the information in The Edmonton Journal. I'm satisfied beyond any question that the information was not obtained from any member of the committee, as a committee of this Legislature, which was assigned the task of bringing down the report.

MR. HENDERSON:

A final supplemental. Could the minister advise whether the report is at least reasonably accurate?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. Member for Cypress, followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

Water Use Study

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. I note that the reports have been coming in on the study of the Saskatchewan-Nelson basin on water supply. My question to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker, would be, are the three provinces and the federal government giving any consideration to a water use study of the same basin?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the water supply study the board put before the ministers a proposal to study water uses both up to the present time and projected uses in the future. The Government of Alberta found that this type of study involved government policy both at present and into the future and felt that it couldn't justifiably associate itself with this type of study in terms of projection as to what water use might be in the future because this represented, to a large degree, future government policies.

As a result, the Government of Alberta requested that the terms of reference of a such a study be modified so that, in fact, if any use study was to be done it would only take into consideration and study the uses up to the present time. Consequently the board was asked to revise its terms of reference and take into consideration this request, and this is presently under consideration by the board members.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Would the minister be making a report to the Legislature when a final decision has been made with regard to that particular study?

MR. YURKO:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I happened to see some of the working technical members of that organization yesterday and asked them when the new terms of reference might be available for consideration. All I can say is that they are working on it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Little Bow, followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

Communal Property Liaison Committee

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Would the minister be prepared to call a meeting at an early date involving the cabinet committee responsible for the communal property liaison and advisory committee and Mr. Platt and his advisory committee and a representative group from Vulcan, Mossleigh and adjacent areas as requested by a meeting of some 300 residents at a Mossleigh meeting last evening to discuss three things: first of all, the guidelines for the special advisory committee and its chairman's responsibilities; secondly, the relationship of government and the local community and concerns over communal lands; thirdly, the future actions with regard to this situation.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared and the government would be prepared to call such a meeting provided it is clear it is not the intention of the government to reinstitute The Communal Property Act or to go through that debate again. But if we can sit down with people in the area and have their input with regard to the terms of reference and guidelines under which the advisory committee should function, we would be quite pleased to do that and to go ahead with such meeting.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the minister be prepared to contact the other ministers and have the meeting within the next few days or early next week?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the date of the meeting will depend on the itineraries of the ministers involved. Personally, I have an important meeting in Regina next week which I think is important, not only for Alberta, but for agricultural policy in western Canada. Having regard to those kinds of things we will do it as soon as possible.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has the minister made special arrangements for loans to farmers from the Agricultural Development Corporation where farmers are or can be potentially affected by communal land acquisitions?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have, as a government policy directive to the Agricultural Development Board that loans in these particular areas should be given the highest priority both as to time of being looked at and as to the loans themselves.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. Has the minister received a copy of a motion passed at a meeting last night in Mossleigh that reads as follows:

That this meeting go on record as not accepting the interpretation of the Government of Alberta as related to The Alberta Bill of Rights being in conflict with The Communal Property Act.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member's first question was of doubtful propriety and rather excessive in length. If the hon. member has further questions of that nature they should be put on the Order Paper.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the government giving any thought to introducing a bill giving some authority to the committee the government has set up?

MR. RUSSELL:

No, we are not, Mr. Speaker. Certainly I know the committee is anxious to review its own terms of reference specifically since the matter of the land use forum has been introduced during this session and we can foresee many useful functions the advisory committee could serve in that purpose. But of course the thing to be emphasized is the fact that everybody in Alberta, notwithstanding their religious beliefs, now buys land on the same basis and the committee referred to is an advisory committee.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East, followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.



Lethbridge Packing Plant

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment. What progress is being made by your department with regard to remedying complaints of the odour emanating from the City Packers in Lethbridge?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, we have had this matter under advisement for some time. We've asked the company to instigate an engineering study in regard to the economics of meeting either the department's standards or moving the plant. The company has, in fact, done this. I have travelled to Lethbridge and looked personally in regard to the possible location with respect to a suitable site. I think the organization has applied to DREE for a grant with respect to relocation. It is negotiating, I think, with the City of Lethbridge with respect to a suitable site in terms of relocation.

The company has, of course, discussed the matter of assistance with the provincial government in terms of relocation. The matter of relocation grants or a relocation policy to meet environmental requirements is a matter the government has under consideration and advisement at this time, but it has not as yet resolved that matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation, followed by the hon. Member for Bow Valley.

Blue Cross Deductible for Senior Citizens

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Is it the intention of the minister to remove the \$15 deductible from Blue Cross for senior citizens?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is a question which perhaps should be directed to the Minister Without Portfolio in charge of the Health Care Insurance Plan.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, it is a very desirable feature. I do not yet have a policy established on it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Bow Valley, followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

DR. PAPROSKI:

[Inaudible]...let me on that last one, if the hon. minister would please indicate to the House whether you have had strong representation on this side of the House for such a change?

MISS HUNLEY:

Not only from this side of the House, but from various parts of Alberta, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Bow Valley, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

1973 Game Regulations

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Would the minister tell the House when he'll be completing the 1973 Game Regulations and having them sent out?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, as all hon. members are likely aware, that's a matter of considerable work and consultation and much of this has occurred. Once the House is completed it will be possible to find the additional time necessary.

MR. MANDEVILLE:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the regulations be amended to stop the hunting of hen pheasants in the province for this coming season?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, that matter will be dealt with in the 1973 Game Regulations.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Hull Home Budget Cut

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the minister advise if he has information today on the budget cut at William Roper Hull Home in Calgary and the subsequent 25 member staff cut?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much if the reference to a budget cut is accurate. It is a well-established course for most areas of the Health and Social Development services as well as many other areas of government service to experience increases in budgets rather than decreases. It may be that the board, although that is not clear, would prefer more money than they get. But I don't think a budget cut is the case here.

The rate per child per day for the 77 children at the William Roper Hull Home is, in fact, being increased by almost 10 per cent in this fiscal year. The rate will go from \$37 per day per child, last year, to \$40. The board, I gather, has had some difficulties in staying within that area of expenditure but the decisions taken in regard to staff adjustments are decisions of the board.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister confirm if the government hired the number two man formerly employed by the William Roper Hull Home?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I can check into that for the hon. member.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. While the minister is checking into that could he also advise if he would check into the possibility of government plans to employ the experienced personnel laid off at William Roper Hull Home?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, one of the additional bits of information I'm asking the department to provide me with this afternoon relates to the actual classifications of the people whose services may have been found by the board to be no longer required. When I have that information I hope it will answer some of what he has asked about.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise what social services will be cut back at the William Roper Hull Home now, and if the government plans to replace those services, if so, where and how?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, programming in any such institution is a matter of decision-making and priority-setting which is largely left in the hands of the board.

But as to the specific question of what services may have been provided in the past that might not be provided now, I think the answer to that will depend upon information still to come to me, I hope this afternoon, as to the classification of people whose employment may have been affected.

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps we could revert to this topic. The hon. Member for Little Bow has a supplementary and then we might go on to another topic.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Is the per diem rate greater at Spruce Cliff, the government-operated centre, than that presently at Roper Hull?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know offhand the rate at Spruce Cliff, but I'd be glad to find out for the hon. member.

Differences in Power Rates

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. NOTLEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. It concerns the community of Wabasca. Is the hon. minister aware that power rates charged by Alberta Power in Wabasca are substantially higher than in adjacent communities and as much as four times higher than those charged --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member has made his complaint and it is on record.

The hon. Member for Drumheller.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, could I just rephrase that by saying is the hon. minister aware of the fact that power rates are substantially higher in Wabasca?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is giving rather than requesting information. If he wishes to ask concerning consequences of that information, that would escape the strictures of 171 of Beauchesne...

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, can I rephrase the question and ask the hon. minister whether he can advise the House whether power rates in Wabasca are substantially higher than in adjacent communities?

MR. FARRAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, although I receive through my colleague, the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place a daily epistle from Wabasca, this subject has not been mentioned. However, if the rates are considered exorbitant in that area, the right course is to appeal to the Public Utilities Board.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the hon. minister's department any policy to equalize rate structures as far as power distribution is concerned in these smaller communities in northern Alberta?

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, the policy so far as power rates are concerned is that an allowable return is permitted or ordered by the Public Utilities Board on the basis of cost-of-service areas.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller, followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Red Deer River

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Has the department of the hon. minister studied the snow situation at the headwaters of the Red Deer and if so, can he advise if the flood possibilities of the Red Deer are good or bad for this coming summer?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, if my memory doesn't fail me I believe the same question was asked of me earlier this year and I gave an answer in regard to the various areas of the province at that time, indicating there was a shortage of moisture in the southern part of the province and a near normal amount of precipitation in the northern part. The central area, the Red Deer area, was included. I believe, if my memory doesn't fail me, there was a below normal amount of precipitation so that unless some very heavy rains occur in the central and southern part of the province, the department doesn't expect any flooding conditions in the central and southern part of the province.

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Minister. I have one supplementary. Does the department of the hon. minister plan to do any work in regard to a dam in the upper waters of the Red Deer River this coming summer?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, we have been investigating a number of possibilities with regard to flow regulation of the Red Deer River.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation, followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

Transfer of Taxing Powers

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Deputy Premier. What is the provincial government's response to federal government proposals that it is prepared to reduce its personal income tax by 6 percentage points and eliminate federal taxes on tobacco, liquor and beer to enable provincial governments to take over those tax fields as a means of financing federal-provincial health care programs?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has asked a question which has considerable scope in the area of policy. If the hon. minister believes it can be answered briefly, we might deal with it now. Otherwise, it should be on the Order Paper.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as a proposal was just made at a federal-provincial conference on Tuesday, I could say the government was pleased that it was a recognition by the federal government of a principle we have been arguing for some time, and that is, there should be instead of shared-cost programs, a transfer of fiscal capability; in other words, a transfer of tax points, in order that those governments which have certain responsibilities also have the taxing ability and funds to carry out those responsibilities other than through a shared-cost program.

Nevertheless, the government's proposal in this matter was a much more comprehensive one in conjunction with eight of the other ten provinces, and the new federal proposal, while moving some way in principle, does not completely meet the requests of the provinces. At this time we have only agreed to study their proposal. The matter has now been referred to the First Ministers' Conference which will be held May 23 to 25 between the Prime Minister and the premiers of Canada to determine whether there may be a compromise or some agreement reached.

Mr. Speaker, would it be possible to revert to Introduction of Visitors for just a moment?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS (CONT.)

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today to introduce an individual in your gallery to you and to the Legislature, a distinguished visiting journalist, Mr. Alfred Ries who is from Capetown, South Africa. He is a journalist with the daily newspaper, Die Burger, in Capetown. I'd ask him to stand and be recognized by the House.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (CONT.)

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Would the government be prepared to schedule a special debate in the Legislature to discuss these significant proposals?

MR. GETTY:

Not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. In connection with the submission by the Canadian government to the provinces, will the Canadian government be offering a reasonable sum of money when they return the total responsibility, or are they simply asking the provinces to take on the total responsibility without a comparable sum of money from the federal government?

MR. SPEAKER:

As to whether the sum is reasonable is obviously a matter of opinion and debate. Possibly the hon. minister might wish to deal with the amount or percentage of the sum.

MR. GETTY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a difficult judgment matter as to whether or not the taxing ability which the federal government is prepared to shift will meet the existing commitments of health costs in Alberta and whether it will grow as quickly as health costs are growing as well. That's a judgment factor and one which we have not been able to determine totally, inasmuch as the new proposal was only presented to the provincial governments on Tuesday. It is interesting though, Mr. Speaker, to note with some irony, in trying to determine the amount of money, that if you have a great deal of tobacco consumption and a great deal of alcohol consumption you will probably be able to finance your hospitals more adequately. It is ironic that that would be one of the ways in which you might do it.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Tax Concessions for Northern Workers

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister Without Portfolio in charge of Northern Affairs. Does the minister support proposals that special federal and provincial income tax concessions should be made to people working in northern Canada in order to attract workers and stimulate northern development?

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, it is a very broad question indeed, but I think the subject has been under quite a bit of discussion and certainly I can take the question under advisement and continue the discussions.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Have any specific recommendations or representations been made to officials in Ottawa concerning the suggestion?

MR. GETTY:

I would have to check into that, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps to get exactly the information the hon. member requires it would be wise to put that question on the Order Paper and we would get exactly what he required.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Gasoline Supplies

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals regarding the National Energy Board's interest in making sure there will be enough gasoline in Canada this year for our people.

My question is, has the Alberta government or its agency, the Alberta Resources Conservation Board -- is it working with the National Energy Board to ensure that gasoline will be available for Canadians this year?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, the first knowledge I had of the National Energy Board's action was the article in the Toronto Globe and Mail this morning in which it said the National Energy Board was moving rather discreetly in this area. I can advise the hon. member that in all the discussions we have had with the National Energy Board, or with members of the federal government dealing with natural gas, we have never had a discussion dealing with a shortage of gasoline.

I also could advise the hon. member that I have just completed meetings with the representatives of the petroleum industry, that is both IPEC and CPA, and we discussed some of the major problems of the industry. During those discussions the question of the shortage of gasoline was not raised. So I assume it hasn't been a factor, certainly not in the Province of Alberta.

I could only surmise that maybe some of the concerns of the National Energy Board dealing with the question of the refineries in eastern Canada receiving crude oil from Alberta, and some of the concerns that have been expressed in the United States about the shortage of gasoline itself, and there may be some question there would be a spill-over problem in Canada into the United States of some gasoline from some of these refineries.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a further supplementary question. Rather than direct it to the Minister of Mines and Minerals maybe I should direct it to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Is it true that the -- I won't put it that way, I'll put it this way -- I may have difficulty getting the minister to say whether it is true or not, Mr. Speaker. Apparently there are negotiations going on at the present time,

according to the Under-Secretary of State for the United States, that Canada's energy resources, before they can be exported, are going to be tied in directly to the export of Canadian manufactured goods. What effect is this going to have on our resources in Alberta? Are they being bartered at the present time in this situation?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, there is a shade of a hypothetical question built into that. However, it has been our understanding in all our negotiations with the federal government and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources that the handling of energy matters between Canada and the United States is being dealt with strictly as energy alone; the supplies, the export, security of supply in the future dealing only with energy.

Nevertheless we are aware of the rumours that it is one of the negotiating tools in the hands of Canada in any of its dealings with the United States. I would only then say, Mr. Speaker, that it is potentially being used that way; however, we do have my previously mentioned assurances from the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Grande Prairie - Edmonton Air Service

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, I would like to direct this question to either the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs or the Minister Without Portfolio in charge of Northern Development. What steps are being taken by the government to establish the air service between Grande Prairie and Edmonton recently vacated by Northern Thunderbird Airlines?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, without discussing the matter with the Minister of Industry and Commerce, I would be unable to answer that question fully. Therefore, I would suggest the hon. member either wait until he is available in the House, direct the question to him privately or put it on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Taber-Warner.

Acupuncture

MR. D. MILLER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Is the hon. minister prepared to act on the Canadian Medical Association's report for the use of acupuncture to eliminate pain during surgery?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, once again I think the question of the use of that particular procedure is one that the medical profession will be resolving, and must be resolved in their hands, as to whether or not the procedure is used.

I have noticed the recent reports of the group of Canadian doctors who did tour China and the reports are that they were very impressed with what they saw. I am sure that the time is past when the attitude toward acupuncture is one of total skepticism. I think that enough people in Canadian medical circles have been impressed by it now. It will have to be gone into further and I would have to say to the hon. member that I do not know the particulars of the report of the Canadian Medical Association he has referred to, but I would be glad to familiarize myself with the report.

MR. D. MILLER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I had a supplementary but I will wait until the minister is informed.

Hull Home Staff Cut (Cont.)

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could add very briefly to the answer I gave the hon. Member for Calgary Bow in regard to the William Roper Hull Home. My understanding now based on information from the department is that final notices to some employees are likely to be given tomorrow, but the precise number is not apparent from the information I have. It does not mean to say that the number originally given was incorrect. The ones who will be terminated will be chosen from a group, most of whom are child care workers, and others included in the group from which the termination notices will be selected, include child and family therapists and teaching aides.

It should be mentioned that 28 persons have only recently been employed, being employed an average of three months, and therefore the recent expansion of staff may have had a direct bearing on the necessity now to cut back.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could advise the House as to whether the government is reducing the number of children it is placing in the home and if this in any way accounts for the problem at the home?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. The figure I gave a little while ago was that 77 children are there. I don't know what the actual record of admissions had been prior to that time. Once again I would be glad to follow that up.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

## MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to rise and announce a position paper of the Government of Alberta respecting provincial parks policy. I will be tabling the position paper and it's of some length, including appendix information, so I shall not read it but rather add some additional remarks with respect to its nature.

In the new Provincial Parks Position Paper, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Alberta recognizes the need for a definitive parks policy and to this end the paper sets forth the following policy positions, some seven in number, as seven major provincial parks program areas.

The first is expansion. The Alberta government commitment to provincial parks will more than triple over the coming three years. In this major expansion, Mr. Speaker, it will provide land acquisition for new parks. It will upgrade present provincial parks which are badly needed and it will develop presently undeveloped provincial parks.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the provincial parks policy of this government will emphasize natural ecology in that provincial parks should be developed in harmony with their natural attributes, and we take the position that they should develop according to their ecological characteristics. There should be an emphasis on outdoor recreation. We should preserve the natural setting of provincial parks in perpetuity and we should protect them from mechanized use and certain other intensive developments.

Parks in this province, Mr. Speaker, should be oriented to people and the provincial parks of this province must be more accessible to Alberta citizens and visitors. To this end metropolitan parks are needed and an important step has been taken in that direction already with the Fish Creek Park in Calgary and the announcement that, in addition, there will be a metropolitan park in the Edmonton area.

We need to improve access to our provincial parks for senior citizens and the disadvantaged among us. There should be an emphasis on family outings and we should encourage, and we will encourage, public involvement in the planning process for new parks and major park expansions.



There are resource development conflicts in provincial parks to be resolved. We propose to reconcile these long-standing conflicts, preclude development where recreation conflict is substantial, provide strict supervision of existing resource developments and enforce rigid reclamation requirements.

This government is prepared to encourage the involvement of private enterprise in the provision of recreation facilities outside provincial parks in this province. Some of the factors involved are recreation opportunities that can be provided by private developers such as campground facilities. But these would be subject to proper environmental and health standards and in most provincial parks day-use facilities would be emphasized. We shall take advantage of the use of private consultants in provincial parks planning.

Provincial parks in Alberta should be larger. Most provincial parks are small and should be balanced with larger parks because more park space is needed in Alberta. Larger parks will be favoured and will emphasize open space. These larger parks would be zoned to mesh with the recreation capability of those areas.

There is a need for -- and we shall emphasize this as the government of this province -- integrated parks planning to coordinate with national and municipal parks, forest reserves and public land management, historical, cultural and wilderness areas and with tourism promotion in Alberta.

The overall objective, Mr. Speaker, is to provide these expanded recreation experiences for the people of Alberta and their visitors while conserving Alberta's natural beauty for her future generations.

#### GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS

MR. HYNDMAN:

On a point of order, I believe we go to Written Question No. 251 on page 5, Mr. Speaker.

#### WRITTEN QUESTIONS

251. Mr. Wilson to ask the government the following question:

What has the government done concerning the following recommendations in the Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada which have been further recommended by the Alberta Citizens' Advisory Board to the Executive Council for action? The recommendations referred to are as follows:

- (1) That a special education committee be established to check carefully school textbooks that may perpetuate many male-female attitudes considered detrimental to improving the status of women;
- (2) That training in all fields of endeavour should be available to male and female alike;
- (3) That Family Life Education should be considered at all levels from the lowest grades to adult educational classes with respect given to the needs of the specific age groups concerned, and that these should include: (a) home money management, (b) child development training, (c) domestic training in preparation for leaving home, and, (d) domestic training in preparation for leaving home, and, (d) pre-marital emotional counselling;
- (4) That special programs to upgrade the status of women should be considered at all levels of communication from workshops to radio and television programs; and
- (5) That family planning facilities be enlarged and the information available through them increased.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I agree to accept the question.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development that the Assembly now proceed to consider government business until 5:30. I make this motion pursuant to notice given yesterday afternoon.

[The motion was carried.]

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS (CONT.)  
(Third Reading)

Bill No. 18  
The Colleges Amendment Act

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development that Bill No. 18 be not now read a third time but be referred back to Committee of the Whole. I make this motion simply because one further small amendment is necessary to The Colleges Amendment Act. So the motion is for the purpose of moving it back to committee.

[The motion was carried.]

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

2. Hon. Mr. Hyndman proposed the following motion to this Assembly, seconded by the hon. Dr. Backus:

That the report of the Select Committee on Foreign Investment be received and concurred in.

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for St. Paul the following amendment to that motion. After the words 'that the' the following words be added "May 9, 1973".

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, does the report refer to the verbal report given by the hon. Chairman yesterday?

MR. KOZIAK:

The amendment makes it clear that that is the verbal report I gave yesterday.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Concluding debate, Mr. Speaker, there was an interim report provided to the Assembly last fall by the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona, Mr. Koziak. This motion does not concur to that but simply accepts and concurs in the report of yesterday which asks for further time during the summer and to report in the fall.

[The amendment was carried.]

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House wish to deal further now with the motion as amended?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The motion as amended was carried.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider bills on the Order Paper beginning with The Labour Act.

[The motion was carried.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

Bill No. 35 The Alberta Labour Act, 1973 (Cont.)

MR. CHAIRMAN:

We had adjourned at Section 60.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, we had completed Section 134 and had voted on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

That is correct. Very well. Section 60.

[Sections 60 through 71 were agreed to without debate.]

Section 72

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, if I might just raise a couple of points and ask a question on Section 72, subsection (ii) on page 32 dealing with,

a majority of those employees in the unit on the date the application for certification was made (or on such other date or dates fixed by the Board)...

Now, Mr. Chairman, the concern I have with this particular section is that, if the board sets a date sometime in the future, it makes it possible for the employer to add additional people to his staff and in effect defeats a certification application, even though at the time the application was made, had the vote been taken on the basis of that personnel, the union would have been accepted.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, it would be a little bit similar to us changing The Election Act. I notice in The Election Act, a person has to be a resident of Alberta for a year. Once the election is called, that's tough luck. If they aren't residents of Alberta for a year they can't vote. Well, what in fact we're doing is, after the application has been made, giving an opportunity to increase the voters' list -- change the voters' list for certification after the application has been made.

It's my submission that the date for deciding who is eligible to vote should be when the application is made by the unit asking for certification. I should point out that organizations are not able to apply for certification on frivolous grounds. They must be able to demonstrate that they have a majority support within a particular proposed bargaining unit. So once they have demonstrated that, it seems to me the fairest approach would be to make the date for computing those eligible to vote the date the application is made.

So that would be my comment. But I'm interested in the minister responding as to why the government felt it was necessary to have this additional leeway.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Chairman, a perfectly good question on a somewhat contentious issue. One of the problems with specifying the date of application is that an employer could legitimately have field staff away from the base operation, thus some time is necessary to get notice to the people in the field to report for a vote or alternatively to make arrangements at field centres to conduct such a vote.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview makes a good point. We have had circumstances where the employer has performed in what might be a frivolous manner by padding the list of those presumably eligible to vote. Now there is a real onus on the Board of Industrial Relations to make sure that in examining the lists for eligibility, they ascertain in this kind of circumstance that the list is a fair and proper one or if in their judgment it is not, then they perform accordingly.

-----

This is a contentious issue. This is where you are into the halves and sixes, but we found in our experience some time is necessary. If we state "on the date of application," there is no question in my mind that some members who are altogether eligible to vote just wouldn't have the opportunity to do so. So this is the attempt at positive compromise in a tough circumstance.

[Section 72 was agreed to.]

[Sections 73 and 74 were agreed to without debate.]

Section 75 (as amended)

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, if I might very briefly express some concern with respect to the amendment, I would like to observe that as the section read originally, it provided for the same privileges for both the employer and the union. As we have now amended it, that privilege has been restricted to the union.

I would like to point out that in collective bargaining through the historical process of the origin of craft unions and the more general unions as we have them today, we have developed quite a variety of certified unions. It can well be that one employer may find himself dealing with as many as a dozen different unions.

There comes a time I think, Mr. Chairman, when one has to ask whether this is good in terms of the interests of the employees, in the interests of the employer, in fact, in the interest of society in general; whether it might not be more appropriate for the employer to be dealing with fewer unions.

I concur with the amendment at this time, but would like to record my concern to the minister. I believe in passing this amendment, if the unions in certain situations wish to act irresponsibly -- at least as some of us may view it -- they are in a position where they can do so and the employer is not in a very strong position to object. What I really want to conclude with, Mr. Chairman, is to indicate that in my opinion this amendment places somewhat greater responsibility on the unions than would otherwise be the case. If the unions fail to observe that responsibility, it will place even greater responsibility upon the Board of Industrial Relations and may, in fact, require the matter to be returned to our attention at a later date.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, briefly I would just like to congratulate the minister on this particular section.

It seems to me if we are going to have labour rationalization, rationalization of bargaining units -- when we are talking about organizations, free associations, the people who make that decision should be the members of that particular association or in this case, union -- I just don't feel it is the proper place for an employer, no matter how much he might prefer to deal with one union to be able to make an application for consolidation of bargaining unions, bargaining agents, in his particular company. I think that really has to be up to the members of that particular union, or of those unions collectively.

I personally feel that we are going to see a move toward consolidation of unions in Canada because I do agree, to a certain extent, with the hon. Member for Jasper Place when he points out if you look at the history of the craft union movement, there's quite a multiplicity of unions. I think what we are going to see in the next few years is that the union movements themselves are going to recognize the advantage to individual union members of merger. We are already seeing that now in several important cases in Canada. I suspect that is the kind of thing which is going to take place in the years ahead.

I feel the decision to bring in the amendment is consistent certainly with the philosophy of Bill No. 1. At the same time, I feel it is consistent with the pattern now emerging among organized trade union people themselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well. Agreement on Section 75 and the amendment?

[Section 75 as amended was agreed to.]

Section 76

MR. NOTLEY:

On Section 76, I certainly agree with the principle here, that individual members have a right to apply to revoke certification because I don't believe any organization should be granted indefinitely the unchallenged right to represent people.

But it seems to me that one of the recommendations made by the Alberta Federation of Labour to the cabinet is one which this Legislature would do well to consider, and that is, that there at least be prima facie evidence of a majority. Because in the first place, it must be noted under Section 72 which we have passed that we don't allow a certification vote to take place unless there is prima facie evidence of majority support in a particular bargaining unit. In other words, we don't allow frivolous certification votes, and I agree with that principle.

By the same token it seems to me that we should have a test on the other side of the fence, that if there is prima facie evidence that a majority of the people in a given bargaining unit are fed up with a particular union, then it's well, proper, that a vote should be taken. But the test, in my judgment, should be the same test for decertification as we apply for a certification vote, that is, evidence of majority support.

[Section 76 was agreed to.]

[Sections 77 through 83 were agreed to without debate.]

Section 84

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure this is where I should be bringing this up, but I want to somewhere, and I think this is probably as good a place as any. Bills Nos. 1 and 2 give every individual certain rights, some of which, in my personal opinion, are taken away by unionism. That's my opinion, right or wrong.

But what I am concerned about, Mr. Minister, is that when you have a closed shop, for instance, this makes union membership compulsory, and membership makes payment of fees and dues compulsory and so on. There are those individuals who don't prefer to support this type of activity, and I think the minister has had representation made to him by the Christian Labour Association of Canada in this regard.

I would like to ask the minister's opinion as to whether any consideration at all is being given to putting a section in The Labour Act -- which I don't think appears in this particular rendition -- in the future?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Chairman, this is a particularly complex and difficult kind of consideration for a judgment decision with respect to inclusion or exclusion in Bill No. 35.

I might point out that to the best of my knowledge only two provinces have legislation in this area. It is a moot question and the relationship of a clause like that to Bill No. 1 would likely have to be ascertained in the courts, whether in fact discrimination might not be the other way around -- that is to say, permitting a person who wants to work and benefit from certain kinds of associations on a work site or in the field or in an office, and yet not belong to the formal association.

On the other hand, it could be that what the hon. Member for Highwood suggests is the finding of the court. It is very difficult to say which way the discrimination would in fact operate. We did give considerable thought and examination to this. It's sometimes difficult to separate feelings from the objectivity of the meaning of the feelings to receive benefits from an association without paying dues.

The case made for paying fees that go elsewhere, for example to a designated charity, runs into a peculiar kind of problem which on the surface is probably not too clear. I'm not sure that I am clear. But to specify the charity or a charity of one's choice is a kind of compulsion also, if you will, and when you get into a field that is unclear and would likely need the examination, thoughtful study and decision of the judiciary. In the absence of

that kind of activity up to the present time in Alberta, it became our judgment then as a government that under the circumstances we would not make provision.

But that is not to say, Mr. Chairman, that I personally did not find it to be one of the most touching human experiences I have had in watching and listening to those who came before us [to hear it] said, very simply, without notes, without preparation: As a man of conscience, I want to be a plumber but I don't want to belong to a union, therefore I am driving a delivery truck -- or something like that.

It is not likely that in Alberta this is a serious problem because of the low proportion of the working force in the membership of unions. But that is really not the point. If one person, against his wishes, is in that circumstance we have a particular and peculiar kind of problem with which I personally, this government at this moment -- and, I'm sure, the prior one has a similar kind of difficulty. Because it was not then in the legislation, and will not be now. It is a difficult problem.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss this matter a little further, but I would like to do it under Section 98, if that is satisfactory.

[Section 84 was agreed to.]

[Sections 85 through 97 were agreed to without debate.]

#### Section 98

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, the remarks made by the hon. Member for Highwood and the hon. minister, I think apply very definitely to Section 98 where continuing an existing agreement or entering into a new one, all units of employees are required to become members of the trade union.

This, as the hon. minister said, is something that applies to a few people but not to a very large number. But it is the recognition of the individual rights of those who have a religious conviction that they may not join a trade union.

I notice the way the Ontario Legislature has handled this in Section 39 of the Ontario Act which I might take the time to read.

Where the Board is satisfied that an employee because of his religious conviction or belief,

(a) objects to joining a trade union; or

(b) objects to the paying of dues or other assessments to a trade union,

the Board may order that the provisions of a collective agreement of the type mentioned in clause (a) of subsection 1 of Section 38 do not apply to such employees and that the employee is not required to join the trade union, to be or continue to be a member of the trade union, or to pay any dues, fees or assessments to the trade union, provided that amounts equal to any initiation fees, dues or other assessments are paid by the employee to or are remitted by the employer to a charitable organization mutually agreed upon by the employee and the trade union,

but if the employee and the trade union fail to so agree, then to such charitable organization registered as a charitable organization in Canada under Part 1 of the Income Tax Act (Canada), as may be designated by the board.

Then the board may decide what charitable organization that money is submitted to.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the conscience or the conviction of a worker may be that he must not join a trade union, but at the same time it would be very doubtful if he would object to his money going to his own church or to another church or another charitable institution. So I think Ontario has found a very plausible way of handling this very complex problem.

I would hesitate to put the actual wording in The Alberta Labour Act at this time although I would like to see it covered by regulation somewhat along the lines that the Ontario government has found to solve a problem.

But I do think there is another way of doing it, by adding subsection (2) to Section 98. This amendment I propose to make seconded by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican -- and I would pass these around -- would I think, provide the machinery whereby any individual may at least go to court to have the court decide whether he has a case or not.

The amendment that we propose is No. 2, the present one is No. 1.

Such agreement shall in all cases be subject to the rights of the individual as set out in The Alberta Bill of Rights and the Individual's Rights Protection Act, and shall be interpreted subject to the said Acts.

Now this doesn't make a decision, it simply provides the machinery whereby any individual may take the matter to a court if his own religious beliefs are that he cannot within the framework of his religion properly make a contribution of dues and fees. It doesn't deal with the problem of a man who refuses to join the union getting all the benefits for which the union fights and secures. It doesn't deal with the matter of fees or dues. It simply deals with his right as an individual under The Individual's Rights Protection Act, and The [Alberta] Bill of Rights.

I think this is a good way of handling this problem, of bringing into practical reality what we have said in the Individual's Rights Act and the Bill of Rights. I would submit this amendment to the favourable consideration of the government and the hon. members.

MR. COOKSON:

I will just make a comment because I was quite interested in what the Member for Highwood and the Member for Drumheller had to say. I think I have raised this issue at other times in this Assembly about the importance of the rights of the individual -- particularly in view of the fact that Bill No. 1, The [Alberta] Bill of Rights, and Bill No. 2 have been passed in the Assembly -- and that is the free right of association, I think the Member for Drumheller is trying in his amendment, as I understand it, to give the individual this right, or at least an opportunity to express this right in the courts.

I know I have been approached a number of times particularly in the area of the teaching profession to give the teacher the right to belong or not to belong to their organization. They don't criticize the fact, I don't think, that they have to pay the dues. I think in the main they feel this is a responsibility as being part of an association. What they do object to is the fact that they are compelled to be part and parcel of all of the actions of their association. So, I appreciate the attempt from the Member for Drumheller and the Member for Highwood to incorporate this sort of wording into The [Alberta] Labour Act.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Chairman, I much appreciate the intent; as I said this is a difficult area. But I would make two comments and indicate that I would take the amendment as encouragement and direction to continue to study this area over the summer as we had intended to do because there are many areas in the act which precipitate decisions.

I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that in the instance just cited and in nearly every instance of a closed shop, a person who prepares himself for that particular trade, profession or whatever, knows in advance, even before he begins, that when he files his application, when he makes the final decision to be a teacher, he will be a member of a closed shop. It's important to say this, that in North American industrial society, as it becomes that, it will inevitably become more and more that way in Alberta as we move into the Syncrude era of a permanent project approach to secondary, tertiary and integrated industry. That will be the case more and more.

The people going into these areas know in advance and make a mature personal judgment. Now this is a difficult thing for some individuals and we will take it under close consideration. But I think it would be precipitated, in view of the fact that all actions and all associations and all matters referred to in the amendment and many others outside of it are, in fact, subject to Bill No. 1 and Bill No. 2. Whenever it's a question in anyone's mind that that might not be the case and he feels the constraints of that circumstance he always, without exception, has access to the courts.

With real respect because I have personal feelings for the kind of intention indicated in the amendment, I have to ask that the amendment be defeated and in so doing indicate the commitment by the government to pursue this delicate and difficult problem.

MR. TAYLOR:

One further suggestion. I appreciate the words of the minister. Would the hon. minister be prepared to hold the section for a few hours until he at least has an opportunity to discuss the ramifications of this amendment with the Legislative Council? And if at that time he feels more time is required we could hear it then.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Chairman, the point that the hon. Member for Drumheller makes is the real reason why I can't support the amendment, namely the ramifications. My judgment would be that it would take -- I would be quite prepared if we could do it a few hours -- but it's my judgment we would have to have the Legislative Council's counsel on it, if I can put it that way, take it to cabinet, discuss it in caucus. It's really a government type of decision that we would have to make, as indeed is the whole of Bill No. 35.

Under those circumstances I hope the hon. member appreciates the fact that referring to the Legislative Counsel at this time when the session is nearly at zero hour would not make it possible for us to make the kind of judgment which he is seeking.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this occasion to register my support for the amendment proposed. I want to say that I certainly appreciate the point the hon. minister has made in regard to the difficulties involved. I'm sure it will not be easy to resolve the problem but I think the request is one we need to look at very carefully. I can say it is not a new one and certainly I'm sure the minister can appreciate it is one that government has had to wrestle with for quite some time. I do not feel we have dealt with it adequately. I think we have passed it over and hoped it would resolve itself. But it really doesn't.

I note the hon. minister suggested that in the case of teachers they certainly were aware of the fact there was a closed shop before they became involved as teachers. I recognize that but what really concerns me is that I am sure there are those who still feel this is the vocation that they would like to be in. I'm sure they could do a very excellent job, maybe it is the better job they can do. But they are prevented from going into it, from making a choice that is their first choice. I think this is something we have to keep in mind.

Mr. Chairman, I would certainly hope that we would be able to resolve it in a manner acceptable to everyone concerned. I would hope the union people would look with a little bit of understanding at the request being made by a very few people. But I have to say that I have learned over many, many years that there are small minorities which hold very strong views. I have also learned it behooves me to give consideration to their views and not to suggest they are necessarily totally wrong. Sometimes time proves them to be right. At this time I, for one, would not want to press the amendment but I want to make my position clear so that the minister might also have it for consideration when looking at it.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one further comment. The amendment has been worded so that it would not create any new ramifications. It says:

Such agreement shall in all cases be subject to the rights of the individual...

which is really what is said in The Individual Rights Act, as set out in The Alberta Bill of Rights, and The Individual Rights Protection Act. It shall be interpreted subject to the said acts.

It does give the machinery in The Labour Act whereby a labourer who does have a conscience or a spiritual reason for not joining a union to take the matter to court and find something upon which he can hang his hat. I really don't think the ramifications go further than that. With respect to the hon. minister and the arguments that have been advanced, I really can't see how this



could in any way cause or disturb waters if we really mean business in The Bill of Rights Act, and The Individual's Rights [Protection] Act. This is an application of those Acts and I certainly recommend it to the favourable consideration of the hon. members of the Legislature.

MRS. CHICHAK:

I would just like to comment briefly with respect to this matter. The issue of compulsory membership in any kind of association or organization or trade union is certainly one that has come under discussion within the realm of the terms of reference of the work the Legislative Committee on Professions and Occupations has been carrying out and is still dealing with.

I would just like to bring to the attention of the House that that type of thing is being discussed and considered very seriously in our committee work. We haven't come to a conclusion on it.

I would think that to bring in the amendment at this time, as it appears to do something that we perhaps have basic agreement with, it certainly may have much broader implications and may not be required or in fact it is an area that really has to be looked at and some very clear direction taken, not only with respect to this bill but perhaps other areas.

Since the matter is being discussed and studied, I would really suggest that we not put forward the amendment or not ask for a vote in order that it be defeated but perhaps held and brought into discussion in the fall at the time when our report should be final. It may be that our report will be able to give some very clear directions for consideration by the government. Whether they would be then taken would be a matter that could be discussed later. That would be my recommendation.

MR. NOTLEY:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly respect the arguments advanced by the hon. Member for Drumheller and also the hon. Member for Highwood. I am not entirely sure that I agree with them in every sense but I think it is a very, very difficult subject to grapple with.

Certainly it seems to me there are two points here I would like to make. One is just to echo what the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood has had to say. It seems to me if we do have a special legislative committee already studying this matter, I should say, Mr. Chairman, on a somewhat broader basis than just The Labour Act -- because if we are going to talk about compulsory membership we shouldn't just look at it from the viewpoint of trade unions. We may well have to look at the ATA and we may well have to look at the bar association, we may well have to examine the medical association. I don't think we can just say individual rights exist for trade union members and they don't exist for lawyers or teachers or what have you. So it's really a rather extensive question and quite frankly I'm rather interested and eager to see the report of this legislative committee because they have a rather difficult assignment.

The other point I would make, Mr. Chairman, is that it seems to me, as long as we insist that Bills Nos. 1 and 2 apply, then the individual has a right to seek remedy under Bill No. 2 anyway, The Individual's Rights Protection Act. I'm inclined to think that in many of these cases we may find the best way to develop, rather than trying to put into an act a particular clause, is to let the wisdom of the judicial process take its natural course.

There is no doubt that with The Individual's Rights Protection Act being passed, certain of the people that the hon. Member for Cypress pointed out, also the hon. Members for Highwood and Drumheller, are going to take this matter, Section 98, to court. It's going to be tested in the court anyway. Therefore it seems to me that we would be wiser to wait until the committee reports before we consider any action if, in fact, action is needed by the Legislature. But I suspect that in the broader sense we may find that the best course would be to allow the natural course of judicial interpretation to protect the rights of the individual.

MR. BENOIT:

I have two brief comments if I may, Mr. Chairman. The first one is that we more or less limit this to religious beliefs and it isn't always a matter of religious beliefs. There are individuals who are anything but religious who have certain convictions along this line as a result of their training and their other convictions.

The other aspect I'm concerned about is this, and it will have to take its own course, but the very people who are opposed on religious grounds to making contributions one way or another to union activity are the ones who also have strong beliefs about not going to court. So they will continue in these respects to suffer what they consider is the injustice of it and never take it to court, and the courts will never have the opportunity of finding out from them whether there is justification for their attitude or not. So I just want to make that comment.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a few comments here at this time also. It's all very nice to say, well we won't put it in The Labour Act because it's covered in Bills 1 or 2 or they can take it to the courts. If a worker has such convictions that he has to take it to a court, he then becomes a marked man pretty well in his own union. This is what happened in Ontario when there were three or four fellows who made a stand and eventually the government there gave in and allowed them to have this right. But these workers were pilloried by the other workers in other unions for years.

Now we talk about -- not being a union man myself being a farmer -- we talk about the free association. And the more I listen to The Labour Act the more I come to realize how little freedom people actually do have when it comes down to, say, the right to work. If he wants to work and if he wants to pay the union dues he can go to work. If he doesn't want to pay the union dues it doesn't matter how skilled he is, he cannot work at his own profession if it requires a closed shop.

I would ask the minister -- and I'm not pressing for this amendment although I am in favour of it at this time -- to look at it from the point of view that this right was won for them in the highest industrial province in Canada, which was Ontario, at quite a price. I think the unions, other than what we would call the normal unions, have accepted it today. And if Alberta is in a position where we have not -- as the minister has said, we are going to have in the future, he sees, and I agree with him, a higher degree of union workers, then it might be as well to consider, before we get started right at the bottom, that labour unions realize workers have this right to belong to one union or another or to pay union dues or to give it to charity.

MR. DRAIN:

Just a few brief remarks on the amendment. Although my colleagues on this side of the Legislature have made a very strong point in regard to this particular amendment, it is with regret that I have to say I find from my personal background in the labour movement the implications of this amendment are too far-reaching to be lightly accepted at this time.

It has been mentioned that there are protections for the individual in The Alberta Bill of Rights and The Alberta Human Rights Act. But beyond this the amendment fundamentally strikes at the time-honoured basis on which labour unions have been organized and have functioned in the past. The rights that labour has today have been achieved by blood and sacrifice over hundreds of years.

The implications of this amendment, as I see them, are too far-reaching to be accepted at all at this time. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to vote against the amendment.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Chairman, if I could close the very useful, important and significant discussion on this important matter. I should like to take the discussion as direction to make this item one of the priority matters to discuss with management, labour and the government, and attempt to mutually arrive at some conclusion in the course of the next several months.

I believe the ramifications, the possible anticipated and unanticipated consequences, are the kind that in fact will need a great deal of [study]. And in all fairness, because this matter is [important] to both management and labour -- and certainly the government as policy -- I should like to make an undertaking on behalf of the government to work with labour and management to try and get a mutual conclusion to this complex problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Ready for the question?

The amendment, moved by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Dixon, that the existing part of Section 98 be numbered Clause (i), and clause (ii) be added as follows:

Such agreement shall in all cases be subject to the rights of the individual as set out in The Alberta Bill of Rights and The Individual's Rights Protection Act and shall be interpreted subject to the said Acts.

[The motion was defeated.]

Any further debate on Section 98?

[Section 98 was agreed to.]

[Sections 99 through 116 were agreed to without debate.]

Section 117 (and amendment)

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have an explanation from the hon. minister in connection with the amendment. The amendment appears to indicate that if they can't make a decision, the chairman makes a decision and that becomes a recommendation of the entire board. This doesn't appear to be completely right. I would like to have the thinking of the hon. minister on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

That's the amendment to Section 117, Mr. Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR:

Yes, 117.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Chairman, in discussions on second reading or the debate, I had indicated examples when a conciliation board could not make a majority judgment, and a board made up of three people would then be in a position where they would file individual reports, all different, in which case there was not a conciliation board award. In the vernacular we would call the circumstance the "hung jury", and then the minister would have to appoint another board after dismissing the one that could not reach an agreement. We felt that it was likely the intention of legislators over the years to give the chairman more status than apparently he had, when he was in a circumstance where his judgment could not be the majority judgment when three people had a separate mind.

The amendment here intends to give the chairman that kind of status -- as I think it was intended he should have -- so that when all three members have different opinions and cannot have a majority opinion, to give the chairman the right to make a judgment knowing that that would be the judgment of the board, I think, is reasonable and proper. It gives the chairman the kind of status he ought to have. It prevents, in a pragmatic and real sort of way, the wasting of time which is always detrimental to effective collective bargaining. When you have to dismiss a conciliation board and then get representatives of labour and management agreed upon -- in one case this took nine recommendations before the chairman was agreeable to both parties. The kind of time that goes by, if I can use the expression, cools off the negotiations and they sometimes bog down.

Our intention here, Mr. Chairman, is to ensure that one dispute does not have the attention of more than one conciliation board. We had this experience with the Lethbridge school dispute where we had to release a conciliation board and then appoint a second one. A great deal of time had gone by and, in my judgment, it was detrimental to that dispute. The intent here is to give the chairman a seniority position and give him the status of an award-maker should the two find it impossible to reach a common judgment.

MR. TAYLOR:

I have no argument with the difficulties and with the suggestion of accepting the decision of the chairman of the board. I think if this were passed the members in all conciliation boards will know that if they don't agree, or if there are three different opinions, it is the opinion of the chairman that is to be acceptable. While I don't entirely agree with that, I can see some logic in accepting the decision of the chairman of the board.

But to say that that decision is then the decision of the conciliation board, in my view, is putting a connotation on the other two members. It is not their opinion. It is not the view of the board. It is the decision of the chairman of the board, and I would much rather have it said that it will be accepted. But to say it is now the decision of the board is saying something that is not true, because the other two members have not changed their views. The other two members still are at variance, but what we are intending to say is that the view of the board chairman will now be acceptable. If the hon. minister wants to do that, fine, but I certainly don't think we can say it is now the decision of the board, because in fact it isn't.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is altogether accurate in his statement, and I think it's a matter of language. The intent is exactly that and the approaches we have here will not take away from the dissenting members the right to draft a minority report and submit it to the minister.

[Section 117 as amended was agreed to.]

[Sections 118 through 122 were agreed to without debate.]

Section 123

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I have one further amendment I would like to make to the act and this is the last one I know of right now at least. And I think it will probably be the last one. I would like to pass these around if the pages are available.

This deals with the point I raised in second reading of the bill, that if we treat trade unions as children then they will likely act that way. If we treat them as mature they will likely act in a mature way. Other jurisdictions have proven by giving them the responsibility of conducting their own strike vote that they act in a mature and responsible way. It's a little thing in a way. You might say, what difference does it make who conducts the strike vote? But it does place a status of responsibility on the trade union if it is permitted to conduct its own strike vote.

I think the responsibility shown by the vast majority of unions in the province throughout the years where we have probably have fewer labour strikes than anywhere else in Canada does warrant a change in the act. So I am moving, seconded by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that in both (a) and (b) and it is the same amendments covering the same one, striking out the words "supervises strike vote" and insert the words "require the bargaining agent to conduct a strike vote."

MR. NOTLEY:

In seconding the amendment, let me just say first of all, it seems to me there is a lot of merit in the argument that the trade union movement or the particular bargaining agent should be able to conduct their own strike votes. If we look at other jurisdictions in Canada it is my understanding that only Alberta conducts strike votes, but in nine out of the ten jurisdictions this is provided to the bargaining agent.

Now frankly, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me when you consider the provisions you insert under Sections 59 and 155 where we set out some fairly specific provisions as far as their constitutions are concerned, as far as their conduct of action within their internal operations, it seems to me then, that having at least done that, I personally disagree with it, but having done that as a Legislature we can now say fine, in the interests of the individual members is sufficiently protected by these two sections, that the bargaining agent should be allowed to conduct their own strike vote.

I would suggest the possibility of any abuse of this particular provision is highly unlikely. It seems to me, as the hon. Member for Drumheller has more than adequately pointed out, it is stating very clearly to the organization that we are treating them not as children but as organizations that have been granted certain particular privileges as a result of The Labour Act and that we feel they will conduct their internal operations in such a manner that we trust them to have their own strike votes.

It seems to me that having said that, Mr. Chairman, and also citing the record of other jurisdictions, that the argument for the government intervening

in conducting strike votes is really an extension of an unnecessary role for government. It seems to me that in a free enterprise assembly with one exception, we should be trying to get away from government involvement as much as we can, to be consistent with theory anyway. Therefore I think there is a lot of merit in the suggestion that the bargaining agents be allowed to conduct their own strike votes.

There is no question about it that there are occasions where strike votes have to be taken and the amendment says "The bargaining agent be required to conduct the strike vote." It is not a question of whether they have the right to or not to but where a strike vote is going to be taken, it seems to me that we should have sufficient confidence in the integrity of that particular bargaining agent that we let them conduct their own strike vote.

If, Mr. Chairman, somewhere down the road we find that this particular provision isn't working, then fine, the Legislature can review its stand and bring back government supervised strike votes. But I think we should give the benefit of the doubt to the organizations trusting that they will conduct their affairs in a responsible manner.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, if I may very briefly express some reasons why I oppose the amendment:

First, Mr. Chairman, my experience in labour relations has indicated to me that there are occasions when the significance of the vote to go on strike may well be lost because of the circumstances in which it is conducted. By having the government responsible or government agency responsible for conduct of the vote, it brings home in a way that I think cannot be brought home to the union members otherwise, the significance, the severity and the potential consequences of their action.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, it provides for a period of time between the notice for the conduct of the vote and the actual taking of the vote when more rational thinking can be applied than might otherwise be the case. I have known some large meetings to become quite emotional and people in those circumstances to act in ways they had wished, on a later occasion, they had not acted.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, there are occasions, and not limited to union leaders, where errors are made sometimes in judgment, sometimes just simply because information is lacking. I submit that this gives yet another opportunity to avoid that kind of error. It doesn't guarantee it but it gives that much more assurance.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, as a member of this Legislature, I have to consider the consequences of a strike to the public interest. We have to be well aware that the action of a small group of people at times can affect a much larger segment of society than just that group of strikers or would-be strikers and the employers or employer concerned. It is a public interest which I think in this instance needs to be kept in mind because of the tremendous interdependence which we see in the world of commerce today.

So, Mr. Chairman, for those four reasons I find myself opposed to this amendment.

MR. NOTLEY:

I just want to make one final observation. I think, Mr. Chairman, we shouldn't be left with any inference -- I am not suggesting the Member for Edmonton Jasper Place did this -- that it is an easy thing to have a strike.

I think we have set out in these sections some pretty specific steps that have to be taken in the collective bargaining procedure. We have set out provision for a conciliation commissioner, upon the advice of a conciliation commissioner, the establishment of a conciliation board. So throughout the process, there are certain definite steps which are clearly there, not only to make the collective bargaining process work. I certainly agree that a conciliation officer is there to make the collective bargaining process work -- but also in the sense that you protect the public interest by these very steps. So when you get to the point where a strike vote is taken, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we are not really dealing with a frivolous situation, and frankly, most trade union officials are not all that happy about going on a strike.

The suggestion is made that a strike might be undertaken rationally with a very small majority. I know, from the trade union that I'm aware of, that the last thing they want to do is take the men out on strike unless they get a very, very substantial strike vote. Because you are just putting yourself into the mouth of an alligator if you are a trade union official and you go with a 51 per cent strike vote. That's just not a very smart thing to do. You're going in with your ranks clearly divided. Very few trade union leaders really like to consider strikes unless they have a very substantial backing from their members.

So it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, because of the steps we have already outlined in the conciliation procedure that the public interest is protected because of the fact, as the hon. Member for Drumheller has pointed out, the trade union movement has a good record in this province. Again, I say that is sufficient argument to give them the benefit of a doubt in this case. If it works, as it does in other provinces, well and good. If it doesn't, if we find that we are getting ourselves into difficulties and troubles then, of course, we have a fall session of the Legislature and we change it, or we can change it next year. I think we should give the benefit of a doubt as much as possible and this is what the intention of this amendment sets out to achieve.

MRS. CHICHAK:

I would just like to add a few more comments and not delay the debate too long, but I think it has to be recognized that where there are two parties in disagreement it is only logical that they would act with self-interest in whatever action or determination they may have to take to reach their end goals.

We as legislators, I think, have to remember the kinds of powers that we are legislating away to individuals, groups or associations that really quite rightly belong in the hands of the government and the government only. And when they are being legislated to someone else they must be recognized as privileges.

But today we see more and more that many powers being requested are being lobbied on the basis that such powers are their right. We seem to forget, that once this is legislated it is very difficult to again remind people that these are only privileges and not rights, and when we want to take them back it is not as easy a matter as maybe thought in the first instance.

So I really have some great concern that we should be more careful in what kinds of privileges we convey to the individual groups, particularly where it relates to matters such as disputes. Where the two parties concerned with each other have disagreements, it's only understandable and only human to be acting in their own self-interest. I think it's very important that we keep a neutral body available to determine certain aspects of these actions.

DR. HOHOL:

In view of the importance of, and the excellent debate on this subject, I would just briefly make two or three comments in addition to those made, and not repeat any which have been made.

There is a principle involved here and the principle is that of the internal self-sufficiency and capability of the union to look after its own affairs. I want to point out to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Assembly that in recognition of that principle, and specifically having to do with the vote, we have in another amendment permitted the union to take its own accreditation votes on the certificate for bargaining agents. We have withdrawn totally from that area as a government. So we have moved in that direction and will work at this kind of thing, I suppose, on the instalment plan. And to the extent that votes with respect to accreditation are responsible then we can look at this kind of proposition in future years.

Also a very significant change in the language of this clause that has missed the Assembly -- and I want to draw very specifically to your attention -- is that in the existing Act the Act reads that the board shall "conduct" the vote. This one says the board shall "supervise" the vote. There is a significant difference. The work can actually carry out all the mechanics and all the procedures with respect to the vote. Supervise means that the government presence will be there and it will be as visible or non-visible as the circumstances require.

So I point out to you, Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen of the Assembly, with respect to giving the union more responsibility in the area of the vote we have done it in two significant ways. And I offer these explanations as a reason to oppose the amendment, not just that I oppose from a force of habit. We have amended several of our amendments now in Bill No. 35.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A question has been called. Moved by Mr. Taylor and seconded by Mr. Notley to amend Section 123(1) (a) and (b) by striking out the words "supervise a strike vote" and insert the words "require the bargaining agent to conduct a strike vote."

[The motion was defeated.]

[Section 123 was agreed to.]

[Sections 124 through 126 were agreed to without debate.]

Section 127

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, on Section 127(2), the same applies in 128(2). I wonder if the minister could explain to us the reason for putting that particular clause in the Act?

DR. HOHOL:

The question is, why is it in the Act?

This clause has to do with a voluntary employers' association in contrast to a registered employers' association. This clause distinguishes the two bodies in the circumstance that where the recognition of the employer or the association of the employer is voluntary, any member of the employer can withdraw from that association at the point of a strike. In the registered employer situation that is not the case. They continue for a period of 60 days to be locked in to the bargaining unit.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I don't know that I really understand the explanation given. Because I had thought possibly the minister would advise the Legislature that either labour or the employers had asked for it or requested it. It is my understanding, from information I have been able to get, that neither one of the groups have asked for this particular section.

As I read it and think about it I have difficulty in understanding why it is in. It seems to me that what the law is doing is suggesting that maybe a man's word or a group's word is no longer to be depended upon. Because even though they say in the beginning that they wish to have this voluntary organization and that it will exist until the dispute is settled, the law is now saying that even though it is a voluntary one it is not one set up by regulation. They can do it by their own free will. The law now comes in and says, well really your word wasn't worth anything, or my word wasn't worth anything. I can now withdraw at some period before the dispute is settled.

To me it seems unnecessary. It seems to me to be a wrong approach. I am not going to move an amendment, Mr. Minister, but I certainly do feel that it is a part of a section that really has no place in the Act.

MR. GFUENWALD:

Mr. Chairman, on this section can I just ask the minister would this withdrawing from a group apply to the trustee negotiating a group, like the Southern Alberta school authorities? Could any one of those school districts have pulled out at any one time and taken the settlement that the group had offered. Does this apply to groups like that?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Chairman, it depends on the conditions they set down for themselves at the point of association. If the conditions are that they can, then indeed they can. If the conditions are that they remain until a collective agreement is effected by whatever routes that effect is achieved, then that is how it works. It depends on how the association is initially put together. In some cases it was one way and in some cases the other. In some cases we weren't sure on examination of the credentials of the employers' association with respect to school boards.

The point that the hon. Member for Cypress makes is an interesting one and one which some of my management friends up in the gallery will appreciate a great deal. Because, Mr. Chairman, not only is it that they made no

representation for the clause, once they got the draft bill in and were aware that we were contemplating it, they were very much opposed to it, because they feel that if they enter the thing voluntarily they should remain until a conclusion is arrived at.

However the two points to be made are that because it is voluntary they can, in fact, continue to stay together until they have an agreement. While the clause on the one hand, says that an individual can withdraw or a bargaining agent can make or conclude an agreement with one employer, it doesn't on the other hand say that the employers can't remain together voluntarily until they conclude an agreement. So there is sometimes some real onus, and apparently a difficult one, on the employers to keep together, particularly in the construction industry. But that is one reason and maybe it's a gratuitous and not a proper reason and we'll certainly re-examine it.

But there are times when a strike of some number of days could well bankrupt a smaller company or a company of lesser stature in an economic sense, and this is likely a protective clause that the industry doesn't want or doesn't appreciate. But those are the two explanations, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I still feel that if it were felt necessary to have it in there because of the fact that it could carry on indefinitely, then I would have liked to have seen it coincide with the clause that deals with the organized situation. But here it seems to set it into a separate category and I must confess that I have difficulty in following the line of reasoning.

May I say to the minister that I have not directly discussed this with any of the employers. I have a copy of the brief submitted to the government, and it is from there I got the information that no request had apparently been made for this from either labour or from the management and that they apparently were happy with the arrangement already existing.

But I have to say again that it does strike me as being a rather odd regulation when you are dealing with a voluntary arrangement. But after listening to your explanation, if the government felt there was a need of an end date to it, then I think it should have coincided with the point made in sub-clause (3) or (4).

As I say it is not my intention to move an amendment because I feel that if the government recognizes this as a logical argument we would then do something about it. But I can't help but add again that I do feel it is wrong to have it in there as it is at the present time.

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Chairman, I, too, was troubled by this very clause and the Member for Cypress has ably put the one side, and I agree with the concerns of the people who presented the brief to us in that regard. However, there are other sides which I think should also be placed on the record.

I think our legislation should lead us in the direction of seeing that strikes come to as quick a conclusion as possible, rather than in the direction in which strikes are prolonged, any longer than they must possibly be prolonged because we all know that a strike really benefits no one in the ultimate. It hurts the employee, it hurts the employer and it hurts the economy.

Therefore I feel if such legislation would result in a much quicker conclusion in a labour dispute in which a strike has been invoked, then the clause has merit.

There is also the other particular aspect of it. We all here are concerned with the rights of the individuals. We must, of course, realize this is a voluntary organization of either individual or corporate employers. What this clause does is recognize the rights of individuals who voluntarily banded for a particular purpose and giving one or more particular groups or individuals who have so banded the right to leave the group they joined. Again, the point of view that has been brought and placed before us by the hon. Member for Cypress is a valid one. At the same time, I think, the other two I just raised are also valid. On the balance, I favour retention of the clause in the act.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, just a brief -- I was going to hold this for title and preamble, but seeing the subject has come up, I was just wondering, Mr.



Minister, what liaison you and the department had with industry and labour as far as the proposed draft bill is concerned.

The reason I bring this up is that maybe you have reached perfection because apparently you have both sides unhappy about what happened. The thing I would like to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, is they claim they received certain rough drafts, but the bill has really no relationship to the drafts sent out. You mentioned it just a few moments ago that you didn't understand why this point wasn't brought up before. Was this point in the original draft bill, so they did have an opportunity to discuss it with you?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Chairman, once we get into the area of how much discussion we had, the comment I made -- I would say I am certain there is nothing in the bill, to the best of my knowledge, that wasn't in the draft or working paper, including this one.

All I said is that discussions, of course, are one thing. Management and labour people begin reacting specifically when they have something in print, such as the working paper we sent to them. There should be no inference from that that anything in the working paper and this document are two distinct pieces of anticipated legislation. That is simply not a fact.

You can never have enough discussion. But I can stand in my place and say since we had the public hearings on The Labour Act, we have had continuous and continuing discussions with management and labour. You can always use more, no question about that. But I have sat through Saturdays and Sundays -- not only I, but also with members of my department; they by themselves; myself with different groups, committees of cabinet, the cabinet -- we have met at great length. We have exchanged points of view.

We've read briefs, we've studied them. I just don't know how long you can continue to do this because obviously at some point the draft has to go to the printer. The government must always -- and I am sure labour and management appreciate this as does everyone else -- at some point the government must make a final determination on each clause in the draft bill or else you can never send it to the printer.

Management has indicated we didn't have enough time -- some of them did. Labour has done the same. I respect that attitude and point of view. They said you have made a change that is different from the last time we were together. That could well be, because we are constantly studying, and as each group represents itself to us we have to, in all conscience, also consider the representation and could, as a result of it, as indicated to five or six amendments that government brought in on Bill No. 35, have the responsibility, onus or duty to make those amendments. I am sure management and labour will and do respect and appreciate the circumstance government is always in.

The option to that, of course, is to receive a first round of briefs, as occurs generally in the House of Commons, as well as some of the promises, and stay with those. Then the people become aware of what is in the bill when it is first introduced in the House. That will never be the case with us. To the extent possible we will continue to hold discussions on all legislation until zero hour, but at some point the material has to go to the printer. So I'd rather say that all possible effort -- and I personally met for many, many hours with sections of labour and management and the leadership of both.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to delay the debate much longer, but I do have to express some personal concerns with respect to Section 127. They would be quite grave except for my conviction that anyone who starts to bargain on behalf of a voluntary organization better have more conviction with him than the letter of the law. In other words, he or she had better know that there is 100 per cent support down the line. For that reason I think we may not have problems arising out of Section 127(2). I say that because I have been through this route about 20 times with voluntary groups and it is just absolutely necessary to have that kind of conviction.

I have a little stronger concern with respect to Section 127(3). I realize that we are pioneering here in a very, very difficult area, so I wouldn't wish to prejudge it. I do wish to throw out the cautionary note, however, that my experience in collective bargaining has been that where there is a handle for one of the parties to use as a lever to gain a foothold or an advantage over the other party, they make the most of it. We may see disputes becoming a little

more protracted because taking 60 days, nobody knows what is going to happen. After 60 days it is fairly predictable. I'm afraid that, in fact, in some situations we might have strikes go the 60 days just to see what will happen at the end of the 60 days, in which case I'm sure we will be back to the drawing board.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate what the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place has just said about the matter of any individual who is going to bargain on behalf of a group, wanting to be sure that he has the backing of the particular group or the strong conviction of support. I'm really not debating that fact, except to this extent: that the law is now sticking its nose into that bit of business and saying to them, "You can now go to them; pick out the weakest individual." And this becomes a matter of assessment.

I'm not suggesting that any particular group would necessarily be weaker. But if they follow that line and simply say, "The law said you don't have to stay by your voluntary agreement and you can now break it." -- all I'm saying is, in my view, the law has no business sticking its nose into it at this point in time unless they want to say, as the minister has said, that there needs to be a time limit placed on it. Then I can buy it. But really, Mr. Chairman, I cannot buy it with the arguments that have been given up to this point in time.

[Section 127 agreed to]

[Sections 128 through 135 were agreed to without debate.]

[Section 136 as amended was agreed to without debate.]

[Sections 137 through 149 were agreed to without debate.]

#### Section 150

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I have the amendment here. Before I speak on the --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is that on Section 150?

MR. KOZIAK:

Section 150, that is correct, that is the spin-off provisions. With respect to Section 150, during the course of second reading I made my remarks on this particular clause. I notice that the amendment to Section 150 does not dispel my fears and although I believe the minister has made some comments in that regard, I intend to treat the interpretation of 150 as overkill.

There is no doubt there is a practice, which Section 150 is properly trying to curb and that is the practice of a company which has an agreement setting up a new company or a replacement company so as to avoid the effects of collective bargaining. That type of activity we all expect should be curbed by this Section 150.

The problem that the section might, in its present wording, create -- and this is why I refer to it as an overkill -- is in generally accepted areas. I think we all appreciate that in Alberta there are two markets. There is the union market and the non-union market. Much of the industrial-government work is done by the union market, particularly out-of-town house building -- is usually done by non-union market employees.

What this would mean is the possibility that a company which operates under two separate corporations, one in the one field where union labour is required and one in the other where non-union is acceptable, could be found in the position where a certification is imposed automatically in the second aspect of its business, strictly by reason of the fact of it having an associated firm involved in the particular area in which union labour is accepted and in which they, in fact, employ union labour.

A lot of your out-of-town work would be covered by the provisions of Section 150 to the point where perhaps costs would increase; some of the local construction may not be able to be performed by a company that is in this dual field. If that were the case it would restrict perhaps the number of companies

doing business in that particular area, maybe reducing the ability of an owner to obtain the proper price in certain areas.

We all know, of course, that any increased cost in construction is in some way or another passed on to the consumer, and concerned as we are about the cost of living today, I would be afraid of the improper use of Section 150 to certify as bargaining agent a union that has been certified for one field of a company's endeavour to all fields of a company's endeavour strictly by the use of Section 150. I would hope that the minister in replying could assure me and others that the provisions in Section 150 will be used only to correct those items and those particular concerns for which they were intended.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise and support the statements made by the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona. I think his choice of words in describing it as overkill was very good. I agree wholeheartedly in this definition.

It seems to me that one could add to the point under this section of labourers being automatically members of a union in a new company, and I think here is a principle involved that ought to be looked at very carefully. I think it unfortunate that we would have a section requiring ministerial definition in order to understand really what it meant. I can appreciate the hon. member asking for the minister to give assurance that it might be helpful if someone knows enough to go back and take a look in Hansard. But I do believe it is more important that a section stand on its own merits. For that reason I think the minister ought to take a very good look, because I certainly agree that it has gone a little further than necessary. Certainly we can all accept the fact that there are some abuses as far as spinoffs are concerned.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, with great respect to both previous speakers, I feel that Section 150 as it stands should be retained in the Act. First of all, I think it is important to note, Mr. Chairman, that we are not talking about a mandatory section. It says "upon the application of a trade union where, in the opinion of the Board," and then goes on to say, "the Board may". It doesn't say, "the Board shall"; it says, "the Board may".

Now, the first thing I think we have to realize, Mr. Chairman, is that the Board of Industrial Relations, as the minister described earlier, is going to be a representative board. We are not specifying that in the act, but that has been the practice and he has given us the assurance that that will continue to be the practice. And frankly, it seems to me that the problems that have been pointed out, both by the Member for Edmonton Strathcona and the hon. Member for Cypress, are more likely to be handled intelligently by the board because of its representative nature, than by us trying to find the perfect clause which will deal with this problem. I think there are going to be certain areas where you have to provide some latitude to your Board of Industrial Relations. This is clearly one of them.

It seems to me that while the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona has talked about overkill, if we reword it to accommodate his objections, what we would have is a clause which wouldn't have sufficient strength to deal with the problem the minister has talked about before and pointed out or cited when he introduced The Labour Act in the first place.

So I think this is one of those sections where we have to rely on the good sense and judgment of the Industrial Relations Board, recognizing that within this section they have a good deal of discretionary power.

DR. HOHOL:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona did ask for a specific response from the minister and I would respond in two ways. First, the use of the word "overkill" is overkill!

[Interjections]

It is just a bit heavy, just a bit heavy. However, I give him and also the hon. Member for Cypress the assurance that the assurance they seek is one I can give. In drafting legislation for the first time in my life, I found out how difficult it is to put into language what you know you want to do. I don't know how many drafts of Section 150 we went through and worked together on, and we had assistance from both management and labour with their counsel on how to do it.

However, the language comes closest to what we intend, and let me be fair about what we intend -- I do agree with the Member for Cypress that legislation should stand on its own. A clause should be able to stand on its own and if there is any ambiguity, as there appears to be, we will keep working on it.

[Interjections]

But the intention is very clear, that the practice commonly referred to as spinoff will be ascertained in the circumstances where it subverts the proper procedures relating to certification or collective bargaining or the consequences of collective bargaining and none other.

[Section 150 was agreed to.]

[Section 151 through to Section 162 were agreed to.]

### Section 163

MR. NOTLEY:

On Section 163 and really dealing with Division 15 of the act I would just like to state my concern about this section. I realize that any emergency section of a labour act dealing with essential services is a difficult section. But as I weigh the balance it's my view that the powers which are given the cabinet in this particular case to impose compulsory arbitration are unwise.

I just want to say again that I think free collective bargaining is the only feasible way you can operate successfully concerning relations between employers and employees. I think that no matter how you may search to try to find alternatives you are just not going to come up with a better more workable solution to this rather vexing problem than the interplay of free collective bargaining.

Mr. Chairman, the problem with an essential services clause that provides the cabinet with the power to ultimately impose compulsory arbitration at some time is that it is going to make it difficult to bargain collectively. Whether I am representing a union or whether I am representing a group of trustees, if I know that at some point compulsory arbitration is going to be applied to the solution of our agreement or to resolve our agreement I am not really going to engage in the give and take which is a part of collective bargaining.

I think we are all quite aware, Mr. Chairman, that the principle of collective bargaining is give and take. The employees to their unions start out by asking for more than they really expect and the employers start out by offering less than they are prepared to give. As a result of the juggling and negotiations and the hard nosed eyeball to eyeball bargaining in the vast majority of cases we arrive at a settlement.

Now the way in which you make that situation workable is that at some point the employer has the right to lock out or at some point the employee has the right to strike. That is the weapon which gives discipline and strength to the collective bargaining process. Without that weapon if the thing is going to go to arbitration the last thing the negotiators are going to be inclined to do is surrender too many brownie points during negotiations. Because if it's going to go to arbitration anyway we want to be clinging, whether we're management or labour, and clinging to as many of our initial points as possible when it goes to the arbitration board or tribunal. So the imposition of compulsory arbitration, in my judgment, is going to jeopardize, subtly perhaps, but nevertheless in a rather important way, the effectiveness of the collective bargaining process.

I know the argument is made that in the case of essential services the right to strike shouldn't exist. I realize that when I say this I no doubt stand alone in the Legislature. But frankly I think that the right to strike is a basic human right. The right to be able to withdraw one's labour is really elementary if you are going to have any bargaining power at all. When we deprive people of that right I think we have to be very careful in doing so. I submit that if that decision is made to deprive any group of people we consider to be in essential services of the right to strike, the test of it should not be what the cabinet, on the advice of the minister, thinks is the public interest but the test should be calling the Legislature itself.

I realize this may involve some inconvenience but it seems to me that if we are going to impose an arbitrary compulsory settlement in the collective bargaining process that should be brought in as the result of legislative decision. Collectively, as legislators, we should have to take responsibility

for it. Now I realize it is much easier to deal with the emergency situation which may arise with the provisions that we have in this Act, but I feel that because the right to strike is basic to a person's freedom, it seems to me, that right should only be denied upon the specific resolution or motion or bill, whatever the case may be, duly authorized by the Legislature or in Ottawa, if it deals with a federal matter, passed by parliament.

I would like to say that I feel the imposition of compulsory arbitration in southern Alberta in the teachers' strike case was wrong. I realize it was a long strike and I appreciate the pressures the minister was under. By the way, one thing I want to say about this whole affair is that I don't really disagree with the minister's "imposition of a news blackout" during the negotiations because I think any of us who know anything at all about labour management negotiations know full well that you are not going to be able to negotiate in any kind of sensible way, especially in an essential service, if you do so in front of the news media.

Therefore with great respect to some of my colleagues on this side, I think that may have been a necessary move. I had a rather amusing discussion, I should point out, with a prominent labour lawyer who is also quite a civil libertarian. I asked him what his assessment of the news blackout was and he said, "Well, as a professional in the field the news blackout was absolutely necessary. As a civil libertarian, I didn't like it."

Nevertheless, that is getting away from the point I want to make, and that is I really feel, in weighing the scales -- and I am fully willing to acknowledge that this is one of those situations where you have to weigh the pros and cons -- that the imposition of compulsory arbitration by the cabinet is wrong. But where an emergency exists, if in fact one does exist, then the test should be the Legislature being called and all 75 of us taking our public responsibility and laying it on the line and being responsible to our respective constituents for the decision we make.

MR. LEE:

Just briefly, I think we should be very aware of what a strike and a lockout was intended to facilitate. A strike is meant to put the employer in a position where he will bargain with the employees in such a way, through some force procedure. But during the last few decades I sense that the nature of the strike has changed, that in fact, the strike does not bring about what it is supposed to. It does not bring about a direct effect upon the employer.

What occurs very often now in strikes in our society is that the public, or some other party, is held to ransom through the strike procedure. So when the dock workers go out on the coast, we find that the farming population and the whole population who have nothing to do with this particular activity are held to ransom and very often the actual people who pay the salary are the last ones to be affected. When the airline pilots go out we find that the stewardesses are not working. We find there is a deprivation on the public at large. When the electricians go out on a construction job we find that all of the other people who work on that job also have to go out. We find that when the teachers go out on strike the last people affected are very often the public, the public school boards themselves, the children, the pupils are the ones who are affected.

I feel that in a few years society is going to demand that the strike is not a right, that the rights of the public -- the rights of the people are now being held up to ransom -- are the ones we have to start looking at.

MR. HENDERSON:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one or two points here so far as the way this type of legislation seriously interferes with meaningful collective bargaining. There have been provisions of this sort on the books for several years in the province and I find it hard to believe that their existence has been a serious impediment to meaningful collective bargaining in the province.

I quite frankly think that most people who are involved in collective bargaining in the final analysis don't want the government stepping in on either side and telling them what to do. It might encourage them to be a little more sensible about it but it can not be argued it automatically means that it impedes and interferes with meaningful collective bargaining.

I have to suggest that if we were living back in the "Bennett Buggy" era, calling the Legislature in might have been all right because things moved slowly enough that it would take a week to get the Legislature to go and, I suppose,

debate it for two weeks. But I think in a society changing as rapidly as the one is we have today, government has to have the legislative executive authority to deal expeditiously with the matter.

Politically, I'm sure it would be far better for the government to call the Legislature in and let everybody take collective responsibility for it. But quite frankly I don't think the public is prepared to afford government the luxury of making a political issue out of it to settle it. It has to act expeditiously in the best interests of the public.

So I don't see the section as making the job easier for the government. I think it may make their task as politicians more difficult. However, in the final analysis they are accountable to the public and to the Legislature for the manner in which they exercise it. But I suggest when we're not living in a horse and buggy era. We're living in an era where we have a rapidly changing technology and rapidly changing labour conditions and problems, and government has to have the flexibility to deal with it. Then, of course, I on this side of the House, look forward to the luxury of belabouring them, after the fact, as to whether they have acted wisely or not.

In the matter of the news blackout, I think it should be stated as a matter of record the question that was belaboured at that time was where the minister got his authority to impose it. I don't think anybody went on record as saying it was good or bad, but where the minister got his authority to impose it was the main issue raised at that time.

I scan quickly through this act and I've concluded that probably -- I won't bother raising the issue at this late time in this particular debate -- but I think the section we're talking about is in the public interest. Government has to have the authority to deal with the matter and, in turn, is accountable to the electorate for the manner in which it exercises it.

If they exercise it foolishly, they are not going to be in the government for any particular length of time. I think that's a simple statement of fact.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Chairman left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration a certain bill, reports progress and begs leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

#### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES (CONT.)

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House at this time to revert to the Order Paper to presenting reports by Standing and Select Committees for a committee report tabled by the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. Government House Leader have agreement of the House to revert?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, as indicated twice this week in answer to a question, I'm very happy and proud to report on behalf of the Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly, The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1973.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I move we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree with the suggestion of the hon. Government House Leader?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:29 o'clock.]