

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Monday, April 1, 1974

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

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly some 90 Grade 5 students from the Spruce Grove Elementary School situated in Spruce Grove. They are accompanied by their teachers, Miss Bailey, Mrs. Bauer, Mr. Brown, a number of interested parents, their bus drivers, Mr. Birecoupt and Mr. Morris. They are seated in both galleries. I would ask them to stand and be recognized by the members.

## TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to file a report, Assessment of Potential for an Edmonton Provincial Park.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to file two documents today. The first is A Concept for Enhancing Water-based Recreational Opportunities on the North Saskatchewan River at Edmonton. The second is A Feasibility Study of the Concept of Placing a Weir on the North Saskatchewan River in the Vicinity of Gold Bar Ravine.

MR. SPEAKER:

I'm tabling the report for the Alberta Hansard for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Department of Telephones and Utilities

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have an announcement concerning the Rural Gas Plan and secondary service which has been a subject of interest to several members in the last two weeks.

Regulations of The Rural Gas Act, Section 14, provide for a maximum grant of \$1,300 per farm consumer above the level of economic conversion to natural gas.

This conversion level was \$1,700 in terms of 1972 costs and propane prices. It is now calculated that as of 1974, the economic conversion level is in excess of \$2,500 per farm consumer. However, the conversion level of \$1,700, which is the responsibility of the farmer, will be maintained at the present time for the purpose of calculating grants.

However, the Rural Gas Plan also provided that an extra surcharge be levied against large consumers who may have caused the co-operative to invest in over-sized lines, regulators and meters.

Section 2 of The Rural Gas Act defined a "farm consumer" as a farmer or other domestic type of rural gas consumer whose share of the capital costs of a rural gas utility is the same as a farmer's share.

The question has now arisen as to whether a single farmer who holds more than one parcel of land can obtain further grants or loans for agricultural purposes on more than his home quarter or parcel.

Under Section 2 of the Act, the minister has power to determine any question in the regulations referred to him.

Modern irrigation systems and grain dryers requiring natural gas as a fuel may be situated at some distance from the home quarter.

The regulations are hereby stated to be as follows:

(a) Additional co-operative shares qualifying for additional guaranteed loans and grants are permitted for all occupied homesteads on farmer-owned parcels other than the prime home quarter section or parcel.

(b) One additional share qualifying for a basic loan and grant will be permitted for an agricultural use on an unoccupied parcel other than the home quarter section or parcel. It must constitute a separate tap and not be a mere service line extension from the homestead.

(c) Gas co-operatives are permitted to make a reasonable surcharge for capital costs involved in such additional service which may be financed by an extra per capita guaranteed loan above the normal \$1,700 and/or a small surcharge on the gas sold for this non-heating use.

(d) Any third or further additional loan/grant to any farmer may only be allowed by special permission after application to the minister who will judge such application on its merits.

(e) Notwithstanding this consent to only one additional loan/grant except under special circumstances, any co-operative may borrow on behalf of a member requiring third or further service up to \$2,500 under the same terms as the basic guaranteed loan of \$1,700. The farmer may contribute this or any additional amount in cash if he so desires.

(f) Extraordinary heavy users such as a Hutterite colony may qualify for a maximum of five loan/grants per colony.

(g) Since redesign of a system to accommodate heavy users may be costly, additional service under the terms of this ministerial order must be applied for in the early design stage of a rural gas system.

(h) Additional services will qualify to be counted as consumers for the purpose of determining 66 per cent acceptance before a service area is approved.

And finally:

(i) Although there may be special conditions which may justify special grants for such items as lengthy high-pressure transmission lines under the terms of the Act, any increase in costs per consumer above the \$3,000 per capita level envisaged in the Rural Gas Plan will be the responsibility of individual farmers through their co-operatives and will not qualify for extra grants above the basic \$1,300 at the present time. As pointed out the economic conversion point is now \$2,500 as opposed to \$1,700 and the extra costs may be financed by a small surcharge on the retail price of gas.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in commenting on the announcement made by the Minister of Telephones and Utilities, let me say that we welcome this announcement very enthusiastically. We think the announcement the minister has made today will be a significant step in the proper direction - in fact, one of making the rural natural gas program much more viable and certainly more meaningful to farmers in the rural portion of the province.

Unaccustomed as the minister may be to receiving this kind of comment from this side of the House, on this occasion he has taken a right step in the right direction.

Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, an announcement of major significance to the province's amateur sports associations, concerning a program which will promote physical fitness and participation in sport in our province:

Too many outstanding Alberta athletes and coaches have left the province due to lack of support and availability of expertise in coaching as offered in some other parts of Canada.

A new program has been devised to meet the needs of Alberta's amateur sports associations - to help the thousands of volunteers involved in these groups. Associations include the Alberta Baseball and Softball Associations, the Canadian Figure Skating Association - Alberta Region, the Alberta Amateur Football and Hockey Associations, the Alberta Weightlifting Association and many others.

During the fiscal year 1974-75, the Government of Alberta will provide over \$500,000 for a program which will help the province's amateur sports associations in their work - a program which will assist and allow Albertans to participate in physical activity and to compete at the highest level possible in provincial, national and international championships.

Grants of up to \$3,000 will be provided to each association, if they are matched by the association, to contribute to their work with the province's athletes and amateur sports participants.

Each association whose athletes are taking part in interprovincial or western Canadian events may apply for travel grants up to \$2,000 over a one-year period. The grant will be made without matching by the association.

The government has previously supported associations taking part in national championships with grants of up to 25 per cent of their travel costs, to a maximum of \$2,000. This support will be extended for a similar amount to teams participating in international championships.

Teams travelling to, and taking part in invitational national and international events will be granted up to 10 per cent of their travel costs, on endorsement by their provincial association, again up to a maximum of \$2,000.

Grants of up to \$1,000 will also be made to associations hosting national championships in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you are aware of some of the alarming statistics which have been quoted in recent years concerning the level of fitness among Canadians. It is said that the average 30-year-old Canadian is no fitter than the average 60-year-old Swede. We are too much a nation of spectators, and rising health costs illustrate how unwise this can be. This new program of support for the province's amateur sports associations will encourage the people of our province, young and old, to take part in sports. And that can only bring, of course, additional benefits to Alberta citizens in terms of the enjoyment through participation and in terms of an improved level of physical fitness.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Cattle Losses

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Agriculture. In light of the recent statements attributed to the Deputy Minister of Agriculture concerning the situation in the cattle industry in Alberta, I'd like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if the department has figures that indicate how serious this problem of starvation of cattle is in the province at this time?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the question from the hon. Leader of the Opposition to, in fact, clarify the situation. We've had the veterinary people in my department do a review of what might be called the difficult area in relation to feed supplies. My information this morning is that indeed there may be an increase in cattle losses during the past winter. This is primarily due to the extremely heavy snowfall and very severe winter we have had.

The normal attrition or loss in any winter, particularly in that area, is about 1 per cent. It may go as high as 2 per cent, representing an increased loss in the area.

I'd also like to report, Mr. Speaker, that we have been releasing, but are [now] releasing, in total, the forage that we have stockpiled in the Peace River country and indeed at various pelleting plants throughout the province for immediate use by any farmer who requests it, at our cost.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. In what areas of the province is this situation the gravest at this time?

DR. HORNER:

Primarily, Mr. Speaker, the same area unfortunately that has been snowed under in relation to grain crops. Because of the weather, it has had a very bad effect on the protein content of the hay that was harvested and, indeed, the short supplies of hay throughout that area.

MR. SORENSON:

Supplementary to the minister. Does he have any figures on the new calf crop?

DR. HORNER:

From the preliminary reports that are coming in of course at this time of the year, particularly with the kind of March we've had, it has been very difficult for ranchers in relation to the calf crop. There are sporadic areas in which scours has become a problem and indeed probably will be a problem this spring. I think all ranchers and cattlemen are aware of that and are taking the necessary steps wherever possible to try to prevent it. On the whole though, I would expect that we will have a pretty substantial calf crop with no more than ordinary losses.

#### Disposable Personal Incomes

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and ask the minister to indicate to the House the source of the figures he gave to the Legislature during question period Friday morning when he said, and I quote, "... disposable income in Alberta increased some 14 per cent over the year 1973 as opposed to the cost-of-living index increasing, something like 6.5 per cent." I would like to know the source of the information.

MR. DOWLING:

The Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, to put this correctly, personal incomes rose 14 per cent, whereas the consumer price index, Edmonton and Calgary, was 6.5. The actual growth in personal disposable income is estimated to be 50 per cent. In other words, the rise in personal incomes was more than double the rise in the consumer price index. The source is the Alberta Bureau of Statistics.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer then, Mr. Speaker. Why is it that the Alberta Bureau of Statistics indicates, as recently as this morning, that they won't have figures on disposable incomes for Albertans during 1973 until June of this year?

MR. MINIELY:

Well, I don't know where the hon. Leader, Mr. Speaker, is getting his information but basically the way the statistics work is that the figures we had were based on the first three quarters with an estimate for the last quarter. This is very normal in statistics presentation, that part of it would be a forecast, as hon. members know, as is the case with the budget.

It is true that the final figures for 1973 will not known for some months yet, but the Bureau of Statistics is confident that, based on the results through Statistics Canada for the first three quarters of 1973, statistically it is accurate to say that the personal incomes will rise approximately 14 per cent in 1973.

#### Gasoline Prices

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. What steps is the Alberta Department of Consumer Affairs taking to monitor the 5 cent per gallon reduction in gasoline tax?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, we have a system through the Fuel Oil and Tobacco Tax Branch under the Provincial Treasurer. I do know the details of it but perhaps he would be in more of a position to answer the question.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to answer that question. We have today, this morning, sent out ten cars - fuel oil tax inspectors - dispersed through different parts of the province.

I am also pleased to report that the initial indications from the Fuel Oil and Tobacco Tax Branch are that in the years that they have dealt with the industry, they have never received better cooperation in terms of the prices at the pump being reduced. In fact their estimates are that the percentage of pumps [where] the price has dropped this morning is well over 95 per cent.

MR. CLARK:

One further supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer. Is there any reason why there shouldn't have been 100 per cent cooperation as of this morning?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is debating.

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

#### Education Tax Reduction

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, and it is a follow-up to his speech on Thursday night.

Can the minister advise whether the government at this time has any other mechanism, apart from moral suasion, to ensure that landlords pass on the education tax reduction to their tenants?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I think I did comment during the address Thursday night that I would be bringing additional details to the hon. members later on in the session. The obvious answer, of course, and one which we are still considering - and it is difficult to say yet how effective it might be - is one which would involve legislation. But based on the experience of other provinces, we probably would just as soon not get into that field.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is there any mechanism at this time to monitor whether landlords actually pass on the tax reduction to their tenants?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, we have under consideration at the present time, Mr. Speaker, a number of moves via public information and monitoring systems, such as the hon. member refers to, which will be reviewed and brought to the Legislature prior to the June tax notices being delivered.

MR. NOTLEY:

A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether public housing units were subject to the education tax and, now that the tax has been eliminated, whether there will be a reduction to tenants of public housing units in the province of Alberta?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take that question as notice, to make sure that we do check all projects under the various sections of the act, and report back.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc.

Rapid Transit - Cost Sharing

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to either the hon. Provincial Treasurer or the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport.

Has the government committed itself to a definite percentage of the capital costs of rapid transit in Calgary and Edmonton?

MR. COPITHORNE:

As this time, no, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary. What is the basis of the contributions towards rapid transit in Calgary and Edmonton?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I have not at this time outlined the plan of contribution.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Has the matter of a federal contribution to Calgary and Edmonton for rapid transit been discussed with federal officials?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, this matter has been discussed with Mr. Basford through our Minister of Municipal Affairs. I believe the matter will be brought up today in a meeting. Mr. Basford happens to be either in the city or about to land in Edmonton and he will be meeting some time later this afternoon with our Minister of Municipal Affairs, our Minister of Highways and Transport and our Minister of Industry and Commerce. I am certain the subject will be discussed there.

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you. One further supplementary. Has the federal government as yet committed itself to a definite percentage or a definite project or part of rapid transit?

MR. GETTY:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc followed by the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen.

Holy Redeemer College

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I wonder if the minister could advise the House as to whether the Government of Alberta endorses the proposition that Sacred Heart College in south Edmonton be converted into a medium security prison?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is referring to Holy Redeemer College?

MR. HENDERSON:

My apologies, Mr. Speaker. Holy Redeemer.

MR. GETTY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Government of Alberta, when they were made aware of the federal government's intentions to consider this as a minimum or medium security institution, strongly expressed to the federal government that this was inconsistent with the development in the area. I think the federal government has understood our reasons for doing that. However, they have needs in the general area north of Red Deer, and I think they will be looking for other sites.

In the meantime the provincial government may acquire the Holy Redeemer site itself for other needs and other uses that are more consistent with the development in the area.

The matter is now in the hands of our Department of the Environment in one aspect, and also in the hands of our Solicitor General's department to work out their needs with the federal government.

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary to the hon. Solicitor General. With the closing of the Bowden minimum security facility, does the minister have plans to ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. I must say with respect to the hon. member that this is not a supplementary. It's a different topic.

The hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

Minimum Wage

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Manpower and Labour. What consideration has the provincial government given to raising the minimum wage in Alberta to the level of the federal minimum wage which went up today?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, after three raises in the minimum wage in our time in office of two and a half years, the last one as current as today, sir, it's not in the contemplation of the government at this time to advance the minimum wage again.

I think it's important to say, Mr. Speaker, that while the government is and must be always aware of the minimum wage of the federal government and all other provincial governments, the criteria upon which we as a government in Alberta assess the minimum wage has to be the conditions and circumstances in Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

---

CRTC - Cable TV

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. What specific direct action might have been or has been taken as a result of the decision of Canadian Radio and Television Commission which denied Edmonton and northern Alberta access to additional cable television channels?

MR. GETTY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I imagine the hon. member is aware of the letter the government has sent and which was tabled in the House. We have received a reply, just acknowledgment, and a promise of a quick answer from the federal government. I wouldn't want to try to consider the hypothetical case of what might happen if we don't get any cooperation from them, so I think, Mr. Speaker, we'll merely leave it on the basis that we are awaiting their response to our concerns over this matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Correctional Institutes - First Offenders

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'll direct my question to the hon. Solicitor General. With the closing of the Bowden minimum security facility, does the minister have plans to institute a similar facility for the treatment of young first offenders?

MISS HUNLEY:

Not an identical facility, Mr. Speaker, but we do have plans for similar facilities which will serve a better purpose.

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary to the minister. When may we expect a replacement for the Bowden institution to be in operation?

MISS HUNLEY:

It won't be a replacement for Bowden. It will be different in concept. I would anticipate that the officials in my department will have some viable alternatives ready within the next few months.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

Foreign Aid Grants

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. Could the hon. minister give us a brief outline of the current status of the government's matching private contribution to the foreign aid program?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, the provincial government made an announcement recently that they will provide matching grants for every dollar raised by Albertans through recognized organizations such as CUSO, OXFAM, Foster Parents' Plan, CARE and many other such organizations. We announced at the time that this would amount to a least \$1 million. Presently the cabinet committee responsible for these submissions is reviewing a submission from OXFAM, I think, and two or three other organizations.

In other words, whether Alberta citizens provide money through the Foster Parents' Plan or through CARE or any other of the organizations, this would be matched by the Province of Alberta for additional aid for the hungry of the world.



MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister advise how groups, other than those that are presently recognized, become recognized?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, this is usually done by the granting, I think, of a number through the federal revenue department. For instance, if a church group, let's say, wants to provide international aid for some group it would be wise for it to be a recognized group because these matching grants would also then be matched by the federal government. Not only that, they are also then tax-deductible.

MR. STROM:

Does the hon. minister have a list of those that are now recognized under this particular program?

MR. SCHMID:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I could submit a list of recognized organizations which are presently listed with the federal government.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the matching grant available only to organizations or to individual contributors as well?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, of course this is a somewhat difficult question to answer. Even though an individual may be sending \$200 a year as a foster parent to, let's say, Turkey or South Korea, this is still a registered and recognized plan. So even though it's an individual contribution it's still part of the overall contribution, which the Alberta people are happy to match for the hungry of the world.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of the present famine in Africa, is the government considering any supplementary assistance beyond the matching grant concept?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, one of the submissions is for the Ethiopian program, and this matching grant by the people of Alberta and by individuals will be matched in equal amounts. In other words, if \$1 is raised by a private Alberta person, it is matched with \$1 by the province. However, these \$2 are matched by the federal government, so this will be the total assistance then available to Ethiopia or other countries which get the benefits of these grants.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Recliff.

#### Cost of Living - Fixed Incomes

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Premier. Is it the intention of this government to maintain its stated policy of being alert to the difficulties of those on fixed incomes?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, unequivocally, yes.

MR. ANDERSON:

Supplementary. Why did the government limit the increase of the cost-of-living bonus paid on civil service ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member's question is one that is a preamble to debate which is not permitted in the question period.

MR. ANDERSON:

Supplementary then. Why was the cost-of-living bonus 5 per cent in 1974 when the cost of living was 9 per cent in Canada?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is still under the same difficulty. Perhaps he could put an appropriate resolution on the Order Paper.

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

Skilled Labour Market

MR. WYSE:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. It's regarding the shortage of skilled labourers in the province. My question is, Mr. Speaker, is the government considering any action to alleviate this problem?

DR. HOHOL:

Yes, of course, sir.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question. What action is the government considering?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the approach to the problem is so diverse throughout the province - for example, in the south in the sugarbeet and potato industry, and in the north where we need the tradesmen, like electricians, sheet-metal workers, pipe fitters and so on - that I would be pleased to reply to that question on the Order Paper.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the government considering bringing in skilled labourers, or labourers from abroad?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is pursuing the same topic and perhaps he might follow the hon. minister's invitation to put it on the Order Paper.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. minister could advise us whether his department has any survey of the disparity in skilled labourers in the province as a result of the heavy demands in the North?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, a committee that is addressing itself to this problem, called the Manpower Needs Committee, has under consideration and study this very problem. The information is difficult to assess; the data that we get has some margin of error. But certainly we are studying this very difficult problem of disparity of supply and demand of labour in the North.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Manpower and Labour. Is the government, at this time, considering expansion of the operation of Alberta House in London so that, in fact, it can be used as a Province of Alberta point of contact with the whole European labour market?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could answer the hon. member regarding that.

In the short period of time that we have had an agent general in Alberta House in London, England, he has had a considerable number of Albertans express a desire for assistance in finding skilled and unskilled labour for the province, and he has recommended that we have a stepped-up administration in Alberta House to assist in this matter. So the answer then to the hon. member is that we are contemplating increased efforts in this regard.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. In light of the minister's statement, have there been discussions with the federal government, especially with the immigration people? At what stage are those discussions now?

MR. GETTY:

To date, Mr. Speaker, they have been preliminary, but they have been both with Canada House in London, England, and with the immigration department in Ottawa.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary to the Minister of Advanced Education, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know if the minister can inform the House if NAIT and SAIT and these institutions have been made aware of this and had a step-up in programs providing skilled labourers for, say, northern projects?

MR. FOSTER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, very much so. We are also a part of the Manpower Needs Committee to which the Minister of Manpower and Labour referred, and while it isn't always easy to detail the precise numbers, and sometimes the precise skill, I think we're very close to it. We've satisfied ourselves that we have adequate physical plant in the institutions that exist in the northern part of the province, from Edmonton north, to provide the institutional services for the kinds and the numbers of men and women whom we need in northeast Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Taber-Warner followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

#### Chartered Banks

MR. D. MILLER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Could the minister indicate, in view of the legislation introduced in the House of Commons, if the provincial government is interested in utilizing the provision of allowing governments to set up banks or to participate in the purchase of [them] up to the 10 per cent level?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I think I've made quite a few comments over the last several months since the Western Economic Opportunities Conference about the tremendous growth we've had, particularly in the last two and one-half years, in Alberta's Treasury Branch system, and the responsiveness, Mr. Speaker, that we were able to achieve through that system to dovetail with provincial objectives.

It's a very complex matter for me to be able to explain my views to the hon. member within the format of question period relative to the advantages that we have, as opposed to taking advantage of the federal government's chartered bank proposal. I had hoped, this year, to speak on this particular matter during Throne Speech debate, but that didn't last very long so I was pre-empted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Where were you?

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. Can the minister inform the House if there is any limit to the number of branches of the Bank of British Columbia that are in Alberta? Is there any limit to the number of branches they will be able to allow?

MR. MINIELY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish the hon. member would have either been listening to some comments I was making, or else reading about them because, while the Alberta Treasury Branch system is 100 per cent owned by the citizens of Alberta, I think also the government feels that the more financial services that can be made available in the province by private people the better it is, the more competitive it is. We encourage the development of as many financial institutions as possible.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer then. Have you made any representations ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please address the Chair.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, to the Provincial Treasurer. Has the government made any representation to the federal government concerning amendments to the Bank Act?

DR. BUCK:

You have all the answers. Come on.

MR. MINIELY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the four western provinces at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference presented joint position papers. That was not because a particular province intended pursuing the same line on every item that was presented at the conference, but certainly at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference the Province of Alberta as well as Saskatchewan, Manitoba and British Columbia, presented a position paper on financial institutions in western Canada.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. Is it true that the Alberta Government gives more per capita for foreign aid for the world disadvantaged than other programs ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. The hon. member is making a brave attempt at making an announcement.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, could I rephrase the question? Is it true?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Say it is true.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican followed by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc.

DR. BUCK:

Is it also true they've got the most money?

---

School Boards - Spending Guidelines

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question today to the hon. the Minister of Education. With the removal of guidelines on municipalities for spending, I was wondering if the government is giving any consideration to removing the spending guidelines on school boards as requested by the Chairman of the Alberta School Trustees Association?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, no active consideration is being given to that at this time. I think one must remember the difference in the situation insofar as, by reason of the moneys from the school foundation program fund and grants, approximately 90 per cent of the cost of education is borne by provincial government moneys. I would like to say, however, that the present guidelines are much more generous than those that were in effect in 1970.

Certainly I would be more than happy to try to get some indication from the Assembly during discussion of The School Act as to whether they would, in fact, like to make changes in that section of the Act.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Alberta Crude - US Export

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Premier. I wonder if the Premier could advise the House as to whether the Government of Alberta has made any commitments to the federal government not to reduce the supply of Alberta crude in future that might be available for the export market in the United States?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, in responding to that question I wouldn't take it that we have made any commitments in that regard because good conservation practices are fully provincial responsibility. However, in any short term, 12 to 15-month situation I would think that from a standpoint of the Alberta government position, we would certainly not be fulfilling the general understanding and basic foundation of the interim accord if there were any significant alteration in levels of production. That, of course, would be something that would pertain for the 12 to 15 months and during that period of time, the government will be assessing the discovery rate of new oil that occurs in this province.

We will be assessing and coming out with a policy position in terms of the long-term conventional crude oil needs of the province. The Energy Resources Conservation Board is conducting a hearing on June 4 of this year, and which is considered to be a final report of future energy requirements for Albertans. We will be anxious to receive the report and recommendations from the Energy Resources Conservation Board.

So I believe in answer to that question, all of these matters will be matters that will come to the Executive Council under the energy committee of cabinet for consideration over the course of the next 12 to 15 months, but may play a part in our decision as to our future policy position at the end of that period of time.

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplementary as a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Premier could confirm then that the accord that was arrived at relating to the next 12 to 15 months did relate to the American export market as well as the Canadian market?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't be appropriate to tie it in the way the hon. member's question is phrased. I merely would take the view that if the Alberta Government had been contemplating any short-term substantial decline in production in the total from conventional crude oil, then I think it would have been incumbent upon us to bring that into the discussions. We did not, because we are not. However, we certainly in no way presented our position to preclude us at the end of the interim understanding of 15 months - and I should make it clear that it has now been agreed to be 15 months - to assess that factor in terms of other factors that may come to an assessment for Alberta future

policy, particularly in terms of our clear responsibility jurisdictionally for conservation for future generations of Albertans.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. the Premier. Are the present purchasers of crude oil in the export market, then, being assured that their supply will be continued for the next 12 to 15 months? I take it from the reply that this is the case. I would like to have clarification on it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LOUGHEED:

I wouldn't want to be unequivocal about that, Mr. Speaker, because there could be variables that develop in terms of quality. There may be decisions made by the marketing commission. There may be problems arise out of the Saskatchewan nominations. There may be some developments that might occur in terms of conservation practice in this province that are unanticipated - sudden changes with regard to the viability of particular pools that can't be anticipated at the present time - so I wouldn't want to answer that unequivocally. I think there are a number of variables that have to be kept in mind in relationship to that question.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. the Premier. Is this one of the subjects that would be a continuing subject for discussion with the federal government, and possibly with prospective customers in the United States?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it certainly would be a factor of discussion with the federal government and customers in the United States. Members of the Legislative Assembly will have to - in my judgment, should be aware of the need to assure good relationships in terms of the United States market if we want to look to the longer term development of production from the oil sands situation. We fought long and hard in this province, as the hon. member is well aware, to establish the alternative to the Montreal market for Alberta crude in the Chicago-Midwest area. I think it's important that we maintain good relationships in that area, and any significant changes of substance, particularly to those refineries which basically have been constructed on the basis of the quality of the crude oil coming from Alberta, could have a disruption on Canadian-U.S. trade relations.

So we have to watch those things in the course of the next 15 months. But particularly we're going to be anxious to get the report from the Energy Resources Conservation Board, hopefully in August or September of this year, make an assessment of that in terms of future energy requirements, make an assessment of the end of 1974 report on crude oil conventional reserves by the Energy Resources Conservation Board, and put that all together to come forward with an assessment of our position, probably a year from now.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the final supplementary on this topic.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary to the hon. Premier. Is it the intention of the Alberta government at this time to cancel any of the export permits of crude to the U.S.A. that are now in existence?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, in the crude oil area we are not operating and have not been operating, at least as yet, on any export permit in the sense that we have under The Gas Resources Preservation Act. Certainly it has been considered, but only considered, that we could have an oil resources conservation act with regard to Crown production, but we have not to this point had, in the history of Alberta oil management, that approach of permits in regard to exports of crude oil. It may be that's something in the course of this next year that we will have to consider, either in that way or some other way. So it really hasn't been a factor that we've had to face.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Hillhurst-Sunnyside Planning Committee

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Highways. Has the Minister of Highways reviewed the Hillhurst-Sunnyside Planning Committee application for assistance in studying alternate transportation corridors, which was referred to the Minister of Highways by the Minister of Municipal Affairs?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I've had the application from the Sunnyside group for assistance in studying it. As you know, we share with the city the costs of such studies and it would appear, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member should direct the Sunnyside group to approach the city because that's the area of application.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the hon. Minister of Highways notified the Hillhurst-Sunnyside Planning Committee of his decision?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, if they haven't been [notified], there is a letter on tape.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. the Premier. Could the Premier advise what department he would refer community organizations to when they are looking for financial assistance to study alternate transportation corridors in terms of welfare of the community, environmental considerations, and value of citizen participation?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I got the import of that question. If it involved, within a specific community, transportation and provincial government funds, I would presume we are referring to the Department of Municipal Affairs. But perhaps if I misunderstood the question, the hon. member could elaborate.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. the Premier as far as the invitation to elaborate is concerned.

It seems the existing constraints are not flexible enough to allow in-depth studies in regard to the welfare of the community plus environmental considerations, and citizen participation under the present cost-sharing arrangements between the province and the city. I was wondering what department you would refer the community organizations to, to explore this possibility further?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would refer the hon. member under those terms to the Minister of Municipal Affairs who no doubt would coordinate it with the other ministers involved and particularly the Minister of Highways and Transport.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

Segregation of Sick Prisoners

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. Could the hon. minister inform the House if any action has been taken to insure that prisoners will no longer be placed in segregation cells of correctional institutions when the only offence they have committed at the jail is being ill?

MISS HUNLEY:

I didn't hear the last expression that the hon. member used. Would he please repeat the last part of his question?

MR. COOPER:

I'm sorry. The last three words were "is being ill".

MISS HUNLEY:

I presume the hon. member is referring to the Ombudsman's Report, that we were forced to put some people in solitary because we ran out of space in the sick bay wards where we could keep people who had infectious diseases. We do have an ongoing problem there because infectious hepatitis is one of the areas of concern we have. Occasionally we do run out of space in our sick bays in the provincial correctional institutions.

We will have to try to find a better solution for treating infectious hepatitis which is extremely infectious, but I don't have that solution and I don't know whether the medical profession has, but it is one which causes us concern.

Coroners Act - Board of Review

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could take this opportunity to answer a question that was asked of me Thursday last by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

He asked, sir, whether it was true that the Board of Review had not had an opportunity to hear the College of Physicians and Surgeons or the Alberta Medical Association with respect to their recommendation on the operation of the coroners system.

And I have been able to make inquiries, Mr. Speaker, and learned that the College of Physicians and Surgeons did not present a brief to the Board of Review. The Alberta Medical Association did and was subsequently heard in Medicine Hat on December 6. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, some of their recommendations were incorporated in the report of the Board of Review.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

[The motion was carried.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair.]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of Supply will come to order.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of going into Committee of Supply at this time is to set up and arrange for the Estimates subcommittees which will start sitting tonight, and to have the committee concur as to the names of members on those committees, the names of the committees and the departments which they will study.

I would like to file at this time a document setting forth a suggested list of committees, chairmen of committees, members of committees and the departments to be reviewed by them. The document comprises three pages so rather than read the document which, Mr. Chairman, has been prepared in consultation with the hon. Leader of the



Opposition and members on both sides of the House, I would simply move the document which I have just filed, setting up the Estimates subcommittees.

Perhaps a word or two might be in order at this time, Mr. Chairman. The procedure follows essentially that which was initiated last year when this procedure was started for the first time. There are four subcommittees. There are four chairmen: the hon. members, Mr. Lee, Mr. Trynchy, Mr. Young and Mr. Ashton. The committees will meet tonight and tomorrow night this week, but not on Thursday night.

As to the location of the places where the committees will meet: Subcommittee A - and that will commence tonight with the Department of Advanced Education - will meet in the carillon room which is the new room on the fifth floor adjacent to the carillon.

Subcommittee B, under the chairmanship of Mr. Trynchy, will meet in Room 208 and will begin tonight the estimates of the Department of Agriculture.

Subcommittee C, under the chairmanship of Mr. Young, will meet at 8:00 o'clock tonight in Room 108 and will begin the estimates of the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation.

Subcommittee D, chaired by Mr. Ashton, will meet in Room 312 and will begin tonight the review of the Department of Industry and Commerce estimates.

The meeting rooms are somewhat better than they were last year. I realize hon. members had some difficulty in the library and I believe it was Room 315 last year.

One final comment, Mr. Chairman. It should be noted that although members are stated in this document to be on certain committees, they are entirely at liberty to move back and forth between committees as various departments are studied, insofar as under the new rule No. 51 there is no vote in the committee other than a vote to adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Any questions?

MR. STROM:

It may be an unimportant one in one sense, but I am wondering if any direction is given to the hour of closing. Is it a general agreement that there would be a set hour for closing of the committee work?

MR. HYNDMAN:

It's a fair question, Mr. Chairman. I think this should be essentially at the discretion of the committee and its chairman. I would think that probably targeting for some time - if we contemplate beginning all the committees at 8:00 p.m. - between 10:00 and 10:30 o'clock, whenever there is an appropriate break in the estimates being considered. I think that's perhaps the best way to leave it, at the committee's and the chairman's discretion.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Chairman, a question to the hon. House Leader. Just on a minor-major item - will coffee be served at these committee meetings?

MR. HYNDMAN:

If the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway would provide the coffee, I'm sure we would all be glad to drink it.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, we are pleased to accept the offer if the Member for Kingsway would supply the coffee.

DR. PAPROSKI:

... [Inaudible] ... thank you.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move the resolution be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

[Mr. Chairman left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply having considered the resolution providing for four subcommittees, identifying their members and the chairman and designating their appropriate responsibilities, begs to report same and begs leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS  
(Second Reading)

Bill No. 43 The Nursing Homes Amendment Act, 1974

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, in commenting upon second reading of Bill No. 43, The Nursing Homes Amendment Act, 1974, there are a substantial number of changes proposed in terms of the ordering of sections of the existing Nursing Homes Act, and some fairly significant amendments included among the changes which lead to ordering or sequencing changes.

I should like first, Mr. Speaker, to point out that a very new proposition is developed in The Nursing Homes Amendment Act, and that is the definition and indication of constraint on ownership for nursing homes which is spelled out here. I refer most specifically to the constraints in terms of the requirement for residency in Alberta of at least majority control of nursing home owners. The act itself says that the control must be in Alberta and if it is owned by residents, that a majority of the board of directors or governing body and a majority of the shares must be held by Albertans. This is a first. It is included here with the thought that the nature of service being provided to our senior citizens and to the other residents of nursing homes is such that control ought to be easily accessible to, in this instance, the Alberta Hospital Services Commission which would have the ultimate responsibility for quality of care. So the requirement then would mean that in future the ownership and control of nursing homes must reside in Alberta.

The one exception should be identified here and that relates to religious organizations. The exception is intended to cover those situations where a religious organization, while operated by a group here in the province, might well have its headquarters for legal purposes in some other province, but the order would be resident in Alberta in substantial quantity.

The second area of major change - I think it could be considered to be a major change - is a provision which will mean that applicants who wish to operate a nursing home may submit their applications directly to the Alberta Hospital Services Commission. Currently, Mr. Speaker, the order is that applications are submitted to a district nursing home board and then may be referred to the Hospital Services Commission. With this change, the applicant will be able to go directly to the Alberta Hospital Services Commission, so it is in one sense, a removal of some authority from nursing home districts in that respect. However, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to leave the impression of removing that much responsibility from nursing home districts. The act still makes it clear that the nursing home district board has a responsibility to supply itself with a plan for quality nursing home care in that district. That has existed in the past and still continues.

There is a provision, Mr. Speaker, in the amendments which makes it clear that on termination of a nursing home contract or on transfer of a contract, where the nursing home assets are being sold to a district board, there will be no recognition given for the value of the licence. In other words, we want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that there should be no inherent financial value to an operator who is selling a nursing home to a nursing home district board. The province which provides the nursing home operator with

that licence in the first instance should not be expected to have to pay, via the nursing home district, for the licence.

Some additional teeth included in the amendment, in the sense that in situations where the Alberta Hospital Services Commission deems the quality of care is not that which should be maintained in a nursing home, are that the Hospital Services Commission may restrict the admission of new residents to that nursing home. There is, continuing, the ability, of course, of the commission to terminate an agreement or a licence for a nursing home.

There is another change of consequence and that is, that in the case of persons who feel the quality is not adequate in a nursing home or in the case of application for a new nursing home in a given area, there will be or may be a hearing. If such a hearing is held, all interested parties who can be identified will be notified, are eligible to attend and participate in the hearing. In other words, there is an effort here to assure that those who are interested in nursing home care, either because they are operators of nursing homes, or because they are a nursing home district board with a responsibility for the level of care in the general area, or because, in the case of quality of care, they have a relative or a friend in a nursing home, will be able to appear at the hearing.

Mr. Speaker, I believe those are the main areas of change. Perhaps I could summarize by saying that the members may wish to direct their attention then to the constraints imposed upon the residency of owners of nursing homes, that they must in future be Albertans; that there has been a change in terms of the responsibility and procedure for processing applications for would-be nursing home operators; that there are spelled out in greater detail specifications dealing with the transfer of nursing home and nursing home assets and the opportunity to operate a nursing home and that there is spelled out in the amendments greater detail in the case of hearings which may be heard by the Alberta Hospital Services Commission to assure that those interested will have an opportunity to be represented.

I may conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that in some of these cases, some of these amendments are in line with a greater effort which has developed in the past year or so by the Alberta Hospital Services Commission to satisfy that an adequate level of care is provided at all times in our nursing home program in this province.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, rising to take part in this debate, dealing with the principles in Bill No. 43, I certainly have no objections to the question of better hearings and the greater opportunity for people to make their views known. But there are two points in Bill No. 43 that I would like to take just a moment or two to discuss, Mr. Speaker.

The first is with respect to the applications now going directly to the Alberta Hospital Services Commission. I can certainly understand the reasons for this, although the member, when he introduced the bill, didn't really take too much time to go into it. Obviously the arguments would be related to the quality of care and the standard of care, but I would like the member, when he closes debate, to perhaps specify a little more clearly the reasons for this step because, as he himself pointed out, we are now short-circuiting the district board in terms of the application. Instead of the application going to the district board, the application will now come directly to the Hospital Services Commission. While the district board will have responsibility for the general quality of care, it will be responsibility after the fact. It will not have the opportunity to survey the application before it is processed.

The other point I would raise, Mr. Speaker, and this is just a philosophical difference as far as I'm concerned, the change with respect to ownership is of some small marginal value. I can see the argument that having 50 per cent ownership by residents of the province would probably tend to make the institutions a little more responsive. But I would like to suggest quite frankly, and I know I probably stand alone on this particular issue, that nursing homes are not an acceptable place for the profit motive. I have no objection at all to private nursing homes that are owned by churches or non-profit organizations. I think the churches, as a matter of fact, in some areas have done an excellent job. There are certainly private nursing homes for that matter, too, that have an excellent standard of care. But I just basically philosophically don't accept the proposition that a nursing home is the place for the profit motive.

I think there are many opportunities, Mr. Speaker, in this province today where people can make money, where they can make a profit. Frankly I just don't see why we should consign the operation of nursing homes to the area of profit making. Even though admittedly most of the nursing homes in Alberta are not profit-making institutions, there are nevertheless some that are.

I would like to suggest that what the province should do is move toward acquiring ownership of those nursing homes which are presently privately owned, which are profit-making institutions. I wouldn't argue for moving into the ownership of non-profit,

church-operated nursing homes. I don't think that is necessary. But I do believe that we shouldn't, either in the future or even with existing institutions, carry on the practice of people making money out of the aged and the sick.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I have only a few words. I'll begin by saying that when I studied the bill I didn't particularly like it at all because of some of the features in it. Then when the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place spoke, it began to sound a little bit feasible, but only a little bit, because he sounded like a salesman selling us on the principle of the bill.

When he replies to the comments, Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate very much if he would tell us who requested the changes that are being made in this bill, or whether they came from the government solely. Also, I would like to ask why these changes were suggested by the people who made the suggestions because there are a number of things that concern me. For instance, the restraints on residency of those who own and operate the nursing homes may have some good features about it, but we know that we have received a good many benefits from people who have made contributions from outside the province to the good of the province. I'm not saying that this shouldn't be done; maybe there is good argument for restraining the ownership and operation to provincial residency.

The one thing that bothers me more than anything else is that upon which the mover of the bill dwelt considerably, and that is this matter of taking the authority from the nursing home district board and placing more and more of it in the hands of the commission. He goes on to say they will still have responsibility. This is a policy that is apparently developing in every area of this government, in every department. More and more there is a tendency to put the responsibility and the authority in a centralized area, putting it more and more at the provincial level rather than at the local level. This is done in two ways, by this kind of shift of responsibility and by-passing the local governments, and secondly, by funding almost entirely, if not entirely, most of the programs from the provincial level and not requiring the local level to have any input.

In this particular instance, and it apparently receives the approval of the second speaker today, they are not only going to do it that way, but are going to take it out of the hands of the private operators who have been governed by local boards and put it entirely in the hands of some government department, government commission or Crown corporation, whatever is available for handling it, so that everything is done at the provincial level. While there may be some responsibility left with the local board, there is no encouragement, inducement or incentive left for them to exercise that authority or responsibility because they don't have to raise any money, they don't have anything to say about how it's operated and there just isn't any reason they should assume the responsibility or authority that might be left to them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say these things plainly because it is a concern. If it were only this one bill it wouldn't seem so serious. But it seems that almost every bill that comes across our desks has a tendency in this direction, so that more and more we have government intrusion upon private enterprise and upon local responsibility and local governments.

In the case of the sale of a home, in this instance if I understood the mover correctly, there is no value for the good will. I guess that would be the way to say it. In an ordinary business you get money for the good will or the name, as well as for the actual institution itself. And if I understood him right - and if I did not I would like to be corrected on that - in this instance, if it was sold to the district board there would be no value allowed for that.

As the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview said, this isn't an area where we ought to be taking advantage of the people who are being looked after by charging them enough to offset such value in the transfer of an institution. On the other hand, it does away with all tendencies to private enterprise in these things. It seems that private enterprise is getting short-circuited every time we get a new bill in. And so there will be no incentive left for private individuals to get into this kind of business.

Now it was pointed out that the profit-making motive should be taken out of this kind of institution. The question is whether the government can operate it more cheaply or more efficiently than private enterprise which is making profit. If the government can, well then there may be justification for taking out the profit-making motive. But my experience has been in years - and I have heard this from many people, both in and out of government - that usually it costs government more money to operate than it does private enterprise to operate while it is making a profit. If this be the case, here again, then there is no justification for taking it out of the hands of the private operator.

If complaints are made of inferior quality of service in the institution, it may result in the hearings which will result in a transfer of ownership to some government

corporation. If enough people want to make complaints against a good private operator, it may be the hearings will justify this being done, even though the actual facts don't. Now this may be pulling something out of the air, Mr. Speaker, but the possibility is always here when we have this kind of legislation.

So I say again, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that all this is geared to centralize the authority and control in the provincial government. If the hon. members who favour this type of legislation can persuade me that it isn't that way, that there will be the same amount of freedom and the same amount of encouragement to operate privately as there has been, then I will favour the bill. But generally speaking, what I know of it now, without some answers to some questions, I am not in favour of this kind of bill in principle because of what it tends to do.

Now I'll conclude by saying that it was designed so there would be an adequate level of care at all times. And that, Mr. Speaker, is definitely 100 per cent the way I think. I think there should be an adequate level of care at all times. There has to be some control to see to it that that kind of care is available regardless of who owns or operates the home. But I don't think it is required that the homes be purchased by the government in order to ensure that type of care.

I raised the question just the other day with the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development with regard to the acquisition of a nursing home recently by the government and the change of operator, ostensibly for this very reason, to increase the level of care in that particular institution. But I am not sure that is necessary in order to improve the level of care.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we'll leave it at that. I am not in favour of the bill, the principle of the bill as it is presently set and as it appears to me.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, while I share some of the reservations of the previous speaker, on the whole I support the bill, largely because of experience relating to the operation of homes that I gained in the short time I was the Minister of Health in the province.

Insofar as the applications are concerned, it was my general experience, Mr. Speaker, that the question of the applications going through the local authority was largely one of formality. They put a rubber stamp on them and sent them on because the contracts for the operation of the home aren't contracts between the operator and the local authority. They are contracts between the provincial government and the local authority. Secondly, the financing of the operation of the home came out of the provincial treasury. The local operator just simply stamped them and sent them on to the commission, and that was the end of it anyhow. So I look on the change in that regard as primarily just one of administrative streamlining which basically doesn't alter the relationship of the local authority to the operation of the homes, because the local authority wasn't exercising any discretionary power over approving or disapproving the applications.

The question of ownership in the changes in the act I think are desirable. There certainly have been some unsatisfactory experiences with a home or two in the province in past years where ownership of the home rested outside the province and in the view of the government the management philosophy of the private operator wasn't consistent with the provincial government policy. I see nothing wrong with that. In fact, I say it is probably a desirable move.

One thing I have concern about is the question of public inquiries. Having gone through a few of these exercises when sitting on the other side of the House and dealing with the problems nursing homes get into - and it is with private operators invariably - the one thing that gets caught in the mill, in the bind, is the question of patient well-being while these inquiries are being carried out. I have to say that I think there is a tendency on the part of the operator, particularly if the inquiry is related to adequate level of care, of patient care in the home, and the operator on his side is saying he can't afford to provide it with the money he is being paid by the province, that it is the patient who gets caught in the middle. In all fairness and truthfulness I have to say, I think there have been cases where the operator attempted to use the well-being of the patient as a political club to force the province into making a specific concession aimed specifically at his financial benefit. And while the inquiry may seem to be a democratic procedure, I am not too certain that the best interests of the patient, if the inquiry relates to patient care, are being met through the means of a public inquiry.

I am aware of the fact that it has happened in the past and I think there will be in the future circumstances where some rather immediate action is required on the part of the minister. I have to say also that it may be immediate and rather autocratic-appearing

action on the part of the minister. In my view, in fact, it should be in the act that the minister has the authority to authorize the commission or the local authority to take over the direct operational responsibility of a private nursing home and then let the investigation be held if such action is necessary to assure the patient's interests are being protected during the period of the inquiry.

So I have to say, Mr. Speaker, I support the bill. In fact, I think the procedure as outlined in the public inquiries section of it, insofar as it relates to patient well-being, may not go far enough. I am of the opinion that action should be required in many cases first and then let the inquiry follow the assurance that the interests of the patient have been properly protected. I think the minister should have the authority to take over the direct operation of the home on an interim basis if it looks like it is necessary to protect the well-being of the patient. So in general, Mr. Speaker, I support the bill. As I say with reservation, I think in one or two areas it maybe doesn't go far enough.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in great fear and trepidation that I may have the wrath of the Deputy Premier brought upon my head. But he seems in an awfully good mood this afternoon so I will make the one or two comments I would like to make.

Mr. Speaker, this is in defence of the private nursing home operator. I happen to have one in my town and I have just never seen, and I say, never seen any government institution that will look after the people like the people do in this home. It is a private home and the care the people receive in this home is of the most personal nature I have ever seen. I am sure we have these types of people in the government-run institutions also. When the clock strikes five, that's when you quit, but if it happens to be your own business that you are personally and emotionally involved in, the clock never strikes five. These people are just like your children and you look after them. At the same time, there is a second reason why I don't think we should entirely rule out private nursing homes; it gives us a yardstick to measure our own programs against. By that I mean the government programs. It's the same with the public school system, the separate school system and the Christian school system. You have some yardstick to measure against.

We know, as members of the Legislature, that government programs are more costly than private programs. Now if we could convince ourselves that as we pay a higher cost to these homes the service would be proportionately higher, then I would say certainly, let's go entirely to government-sponsored homes. But Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I don't think we should have just entirely government-funded homes. I think there is a place for the private home because of the personal care and because we have a yardstick of measurement.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say a few words on Bill No. 43. At the outset let me say that I am prepared to support the bill. I recognize that there are some responsibilities of government that need to be met. As I listen to the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place outline the points that are included there I certainly cannot quarrel with him too much.

I would like to say, however, that I'm sure all the hon. members recognize that the nursing homes were really started through a desire to do something about the extension of home care. What really concerns me now is that in seeing the program evolve, I feel that there is a tendency on the part of a number of people to feel that this is a right that they should have as individuals, where government should provide whatever care is necessary and whatever quality of care is necessary.

As I view it, the setting up of a nursing home program has taken a very heavy load off many, many families who were tied down with situations that created some real problems for those who were trying to provide care for their fathers or mothers or some relative who could not take care of himself. It is not a case of providing medical attention per se, but rather just loving and tender care to someone who is unable to care for himself.

For that reason, when the program was originally set up, it was felt that there were a number of individuals in our society who, for various reasons, were anxious to do something for their fellow man. There are a few yet who, out of dedication to their fellow man, are trying to fulfill that responsibility in nursing home care. I would like to think that as government, as people who are legislating regulations and laws that govern the operation, we should be very careful that we encourage individuals, church groups and service organizations to do whatever they can in this particular area.

I think it has been suggested by some of those who have spoken that they can provide a better service cheaper, and here I would like to relate it in this manner, Mr. Speaker. I would like to think that there are some who are not guided totally by the profit motive, but rather that service motive where they want to be able to do something and do it as a service to mankind. I would hope that they will continue to receive every encouragement to continue. Because I agree that if there is only a profit motive, then we lose something in the relationship that exists.

I think of a home that has been in operation for a number of years in Calgary. It was brought to my attention that the particular individuals who were operating it were reaching an age where they no longer could carry on and they were looking for someone who would provide this same kind of care to take it over. This, I realize, may often be difficult and so certainly at this moment I am not making a plea that government remain out of it. I suppose what I am trying to do is to simply issue a word of caution that we do not make any moves that will remove individuals from being able to carry out their responsibilities as they have done in the past.

In regard to the patients' well-being - and I speak here, Mr. Speaker, from some experience - I think it is fair to say that we are dealing with maybe one of the most difficult areas in determining whether or not the patient is actually getting poor care or good care. I can think of the experience I had of many, many complaints that were made that really, I am convinced today, had no justification in fact because of the type of individual that we're dealing with. For this reason I would like to think that we are trying to involve people at the local level, maybe through some advisory committee that would be very, very closely associated in place of a family situation. I think this should, first of all, be a family situation where they ought, at all times, to be keeping a close liaison, a close relationship with whomever it is they have in there. But in the event that this responsibility is not fulfilled as it ought to be, then possibly there are other interested people within the community who can have a very close relationship and be directly involved.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I fear there is a shirking of responsibility in many areas of family responsibilities of one kind or another and this one, I think, falls into it. It really concerns me. On the other hand, I want to say that I know personally of experiences where I would not ask anyone to try to assume this on a twenty-four hour, seven day a week basis. It becomes impossible. We need these homes. Therefore I think as a government we should maintain close observation, be ready to exercise a degree of judgment and always be cautious of the so-called problems that apparently arise from time to time because of patient care.

But as I listened to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, raise the points covered in the bill, they may not be directly related to the comments that I have made. I see no particular area in which I would argue. I simply want to place these other points before the members so that we might look at this in the total concept of nursing home care.

DR. MCCRIMMON:

Mr. Speaker, there are two or three points that I would like to make on Bill No. 43. In general, I'm in favour of the bill, however there are some points I think should be brought out. One is this board issue. In many cases, we have a board for the general hospital, a board for the old folks home and a board for the auxiliary hospital or the nursing home. I think the one basic board does work so much better. I've been in local politics and each group tends to protect its own autonomy. It does reflect on the efficiency of three groups in the local area. The hospital board looks after theirs, and the nursing home looks after theirs, and the senior citizens' lodge looks after theirs. Unfortunately with older people there is a progression from one to the other. With one board overseeing three groups, I think it helps a great deal in making decisions, rather than conflicts, between boards and groups. When the time comes that a person has to move from the senior citizens' lodge to an auxiliary hospital, it is much easier to do it under one board than having boards having conflicts.

I do believe that - and I have had considerable experience, my parents were in a nursing home for the last four years, they both passed away this past year - so I have been in and out, I'd say once or twice a week for the last five years, the nursing home. It is a private nursing home and I found the service has been excellent. I couldn't ask for more for my own parents and I think that is a pretty good judge for others as well because they were all treated the same.

Now I do feel this fact of having control of the nursing homes in Alberta is a good point because I do know that some of the nursing homes that are chains of nursing homes - I don't think this is a particularly good situation and if there is going to be change, let the change be in Alberta and controlled in Alberta so that Alberta has a little more control over them, from both government and local issue.

There is one other point that has been brought to me by two or three nursing home operators. It is kind of a touchy point, I don't know just how to put it, but the moneys

received by the patients in the nursing home usually runs around \$50 or \$60 more than they can spend. What is happening now is that \$50-\$60 they not able to spend, because they are not in a position to spend - most of them are in wheel chairs or in bed or just sitting there - accrues to the heirs and relatives. I don't think that's where it was intended to go and I don't think that is where it should go. I do feel that there should be some way, perhaps a separate fund or something that the money should be spent on the patients in these homes, and not go to the relatives. That's what's happening now and it is thousands and thousands of dollars in every nursing home, every month. If we could get some program where that money is spent, whether it be entertainment, little extras or anything at all but I do feel that money should go to the patient. And there is that difference which isn't so perhaps if we could look into this issue.

While we are on this bill and on the subject of our senior citizens in auxiliary hospitals and nursing homes, I think it would be a good thing, Mr. Speaker, apart from those small points, I'm in favour of the bill because I do feel private enterprise can run things better than government on the same basis.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I'm glad there's one conservative.

DR. MCCRIMMON:

I do feel it is pretty difficult for a government to compete with the work an owner-operator will do, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I agree with this bill that we should continue our private nursing homes. Perhaps clamp down a little on this out of province control, but keep a strict view on them because I know there have been instances when private operators haven't done too good a job. But on the other hand perhaps there have been instances when the government hasn't done too good a job as far as running a nursing home is concerned. So I think it is six of one and half dozen of the other.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak on one or two principles on second reading of Bill No. 43 and I'd like to say at the outset that there are a lot of good amendments in principle in this bill. And before I point out some of the things I don't agree on, I would say there are some good amendments, worthy of this House supporting them.

The nursing homes in Alberta I think have always been the sort of poor cousins of the hospital health care system. This, I think, is why we arrive at a lot of the difficulty, Mr. Speaker, we are finding today. We should keep in mind that about one-third of the nursing homes in Alberta are privately owned, and I believe there are some 3,000 or 4,000 people working in this particular area for the private enterprise section. I don't go along with a lot of the suggestions that, well the government can do the job better because it will have more money to spend on behalf of the patients. I don't think that works out exactly that way. I have visited nursing homes, as the hon. Member for Ponoka has just mentioned, over the years, but in particular in the last year I have been in quite a number of them almost every week. One of them in particular is a private nursing home and in interviewing any of the patients there, not just the particular ones whom I went in to see but on the average, they are quite satisfied with the way the nursing homes are operated by private enterprise within the province. One elderly gentleman pointed out to me that he liked the idea that it was operated, Mr. Speaker, under private enterprise because he said it isn't a dead-end street. If you complain you can get some leverage because it is privately owned versus government owned. He said if it was government owned, it would be a dead-end street, that would be the end of it. They would say ...

MR. DICKIE:

That was under the old government.

MR. DIXON:

... the people would say this. For the benefit of the hon. member who said it was under the old government, this was just as recently as six weeks ago. I believe this 'now' government has been in for a couple of years. But anyway, the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals, Mr. Speaker - I am pleased that he mentioned this because I think he has a nursing home in his riding which is almost second to none in the nursing home system as far as giving good service. I believe the hon. member has two nursing homes in his riding, but in particular the Mayfair Nursing Home in Calgary is one I've visited quite often and the patients there are quite satisfied.

But I don't go along, Mr. Speaker, with this idea that if there is a profit, well then it is bad. Because if we use that argument, every doctor should be working for the



government, every hearing-aid salesman should be working for the government, every druggist should be working for the government ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Every lawyer.

MR. DIXON:

...somebody said every lawyer. But the point I'm trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that if it is wrong in principle to make a profit because you're profiting on somebody who is ill or elderly, I think you can use that argument right across the board on everyone who is associated in the medical field, or in the healing arts in particular. There are thousands and thousands of people who are affected, but we seem to single out the nursing homes. If he goes to sell his nursing home, he is not to make a profit. Well, I'm sure any doctor in Alberta - and they are all under Medicare at the present time - if he can sell his clinic and his practice and some good will, there is no law to prevent him from doing it. I think if a man is running a good nursing home or a company is running a good nursing home, and somebody feels, well I'd sooner buy that home and pay a bonus to get it, I can't see anything wrong with the fact that he can make that bonus.

So this where I part company with the hon. member who introduced the bill. I think you have to look at every situation because there is nothing to say the profit motive is bad or it means you are getting less service, because if you go across the province there may be some which are showing a good profit and yet at the same time are giving the best of service because they are well-managed and well-organized and were well-built in the first place to handle the type of operation they are carrying out.

There has been some concern by the operators - and one of the principles of this bill, Mr. Speaker, and maybe the hon. member who introduced the bill will enlarge on it - but there is some concern the way the budgets are being changed. For example, they say that as of January 1, 1974, the government is going to treat district-owned nursing homes on a different financial basis, in other words, a budget review system with a global budget similar to hospitals. But under the private nursing homes they are going to continue to be treated as a fixed daily rate as it was in the past. This they seem to take as a warning that they are going to have the squeeze put on them. Maybe the hon. member could enlarge on that when he is introducing the bill, but this has been brought to my attention by a number of people.

The other point that I believe is very, very important, Mr. Speaker, is that when you are going to interfere with a privately-operated institution, whether it be a nursing home or anything else, where the government is going to say we are either going to put you out of business or take you over, whatever it is or whatever the problem may be, then I believe that organization or individual should have every right to appeal not only just to the minister but he should be able to go beyond that to make sure he feels he is getting a fair shake. Because I think that if you can say, well it goes from a commission or a board to the minister and that's the final say, well then there should be maybe another vehicle we can put in there where we could have some independent people who could take it one step further, in particular, on any serious issue where the livelihood or an investment could be interfered with. Because I go along with the Member for Highwood and his interest in trying to maintain at least a portion of our private competitive enterprise system.

We have, I think, an excellent situation at the present time where about one-third of our nursing homes, Mr. Speaker, are operated by a municipality or semi-governmental body. Then the religious organizations own about a third of the nursing homes, and the other third are owned by private enterprise. I think we are in an excellent position to have competition. Not competition with the idea as maybe some members might think to try to give as poor a service as possible to our senior citizens whom we are all anxious to do the best for, but competition that will make the other fellows, if they aren't carrying up to a standard to be shown that they can do it in these other fields. This is a good thing and I hope we maintain it.

I do urge the hon. member to consider some of the principles of this bill and, wherever possible, to try to encourage private people within the industry. I can tell myself, from personal experience with the patients, that many of them are satisfied and many of them are concerned that the private enterprise nursing homes could be phased out. They would then lose the choice they have where they may not want to be in this particular type of nursing home but wish to move to a private nursing home. If that is taken away from them then that is one less opportunity for them to be satisfied in their senior years.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that is all I have in mind. There are one or two other things we can bring up while the bill is before the House in committee but the three things that I do urge is that we encourage instead of discourage private people in the nursing home business. I'm all in favour of having Albertans if we can have them, but I see nothing

wrong with Canadians as well. We are all Canadians and I can see nothing wrong. The government still has the power to close down a nursing home or do whatever it wishes if the thing isn't operated according to standard. That's where we should be using our power if need be, if there is a situation that has to be taken care of.

The other thing I mentioned was that the nursing home operators should have every right of appeal. The broader that appeal can be, the more satisfactory and a more satisfactory solution to the problem will come about.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, in making a few comments with regard to Bill No. 43, I think the bill can be basically judged on the fact as to whether it delivers a better health care program to the citizens of Alberta. In doing that I think one of the basic principles and needs, and an item which we must work to preserve, is the matter of local autonomy. Certainly a number of members on this side of the House have questioned that and are concerned about it. I believe the mover of the bill should certainly comment with that factor in mind.

There are some items here that I certainly approve of and support, that is with regard to the ownership of the nursing homes being maintained by Albertans. I think in order to control our health care institutions and to deliver a good service that certainly is a very basic requirement.

One of the other items that I have been very interested in and talked about and attempted to promote at the local level was an overall management board for the various types of health care institutions, the institutions such as the active treatment hospital, the nursing home area, the auxiliary hospital or the senior citizens' lodges. Certainly anything that the minister or the member can promote in this area would be beneficial, I feel, to our health care service delivery system.

I would like the mover to consider two things. I didn't hear all his comments earlier. One of those items relates directly to the amount of contact he has had with auxiliary and nursing home boards prior to the introduction of this bill to the Assembly. What were some of their attitudes and feelings with regard to the amendments or the suggestions? How did they react?

The second thing is with regard to a principle in the act with regard to the commission providing each and every nursing home operator in a district with the submission of a new operator. I am not sure just what principle or on what precedent the member introduces this type of amendment. It seems a bit unfair when you are introducing a business or operation and you are making your submission to the commission that a number of people who will be in direct competition with you in the area have a chance to obtain advance information and to either veto your submission or to spread maybe malicious information within the district that would colour the final decision as to whether a submission is accepted or not. At this point in time, I am not clear about the procedure that would be used nor the purpose in total for introducing that particular amendment.

In total, Mr. Speaker, I feel that our basic concern must be the erosion of local autonomy. If the member can comment on that we'll certainly consider it further in Committee of the Whole.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the debate on Bill No. 43, The Nursing Homes Amendment Act, 1974, I would just like to make a couple of comments. If the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place who is piloting this legislation through the House is desirous of obtaining unanimous support on second reading of this bill, he's sure got some tall talking to do as far as I'm concerned.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh boy.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, this bill looks to me just like a further tendency that this government has had to centralize the power in the hands of the minister and in the hands of the government and at the same time saying that they believe in decentralization.

So I would invite the honourable pilot of this bill to do the best he can to reassure us that this isn't a case of centralizing the power and that it isn't the intent of the government to nationalize the health care delivery system in Alberta and to drive the last vestiges of private sector involvement right out of the health care system ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. WILSON:

...Mr. Speaker, because that's what it looks to me is happening here and by cracky I don't like the looks of it at all.

Mr. Speaker, when we drive the private sector out of its role in the nursing home business, we drive out the innovative aspects of it that have been discovered and implemented today. You drive out the individual interest and you drive out the care, in some regards, from the aspects of volunteers, Mr. Speaker.

Can you imagine a government-run nursing home taking advantage of volunteers to the extent that they are being used and their services are being supplied today in the private nursing homes? Mr. Speaker, there are two private nursing homes in the Calgary Bow constituency and they are doing an excellent job and they are very well received. The patients and their friends and relatives enjoy them and like them and so on.

Now if the government were in the field of nursing homes we probably wouldn't have any because we haven't got a senior citizens' home and the government is in that business. There is a need for one but we just can't seem to get one in there. No, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place has a real role to perform if he wants to get unanimous consent of this House on second reading of this bill, and I invite him to go his best lick.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He always does.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. YOUNG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Away you go.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, in concluding the debate on second reading of Bill No. 43, The Nursing Homes Amendment Act, I have to comment, I gather, upon a number of points if I respond to all the invitations which have been laid out to me.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I could begin by trying to deal with that point which seems to have had the largest number of comments from the hon. members and in which there seems to be a substantial divergence of points of view. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that to the best of my understanding of this legislation and the intent of this legislation, it will affect the existing situation with respect to the ownership and operation of nursing homes in Alberta. Currently, Mr. Speaker, that situation is the following: there are some privately-owned nursing homes, there are some nursing homes operated by religious or other service agencies, and there are nursing homes operated by agencies of local government.

Mr. Speaker, so far as I'm aware this particular legislation will affect that balance - that three-way balance - in only two respects. First, it will prohibit future private operators from owning and operating nursing homes in Alberta if majority control and residence is identified as being outside of the province of Alberta.

Secondly, it makes it clear that in the case of a sale of an existing nursing home to a district board, as defined in the legislation, there will not be any consideration given to the good will that the hon. Member for Highwood, I believe it was, first mentioned. There will not be any financial consideration given to, quote, "good will" in the sale of an asset.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are several reasons for this but it is very difficult to evaluate good will in a financial sense. It's a very subjective type of evaluation. That is especially so, Mr. Speaker, in the instance we have here where permission is given by the province to the operator in the first instance.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a situation which is funded by the province to a very large if not total extent, and one in which the demand generally exceeds the supply. It would be hard to establish that there would be any difference in quantity of trade, if I may refer in commercial terms to the transfer of the nursing home from a private to a private, or a private to a public operator. So I think that the customary consideration of good will which might be a legitimate argument in the case of a hardware store or what have you is not a realistic consideration in the subject under discussion, namely, the nursing homes.

So, Mr. Speaker, on the point of the balance and the arguments for and against private ownership, for and against public ownership and for and against service agencies and service institutions, I think [these] have been well developed. I would call to all hon. members' attention the thought that the hon. Member for Cypress advanced to us, that hopefully the consideration of service will be uppermost in the minds of those people who own, operate and administer nursing homes.

With respect, Mr. Speaker, to a second point which was raised and that has to do with the short-circuiting of the present rather round-about system of an applicant for a nursing home going to a district board and then, if approved there, being passed on to the Alberta Hospital Services Commission, I see very little change and no reduction in local autonomy. If this is the point the hon. Member for Calgary Bow is making, then I don't think he has a very valid one.

The situation currently, Mr. Speaker - and it exists as I observe here in amendments to legislation dating from 1964, so it existed under the former government - was that applications were made to a district board, thence processed to the minister or I think it's now the Alberta Hospital - I know it's the Alberta Hospital Services Commission, for a contract between the provincial government and the operator. That situation will not change. The only thing that changes is elimination of that first step. But the interests of the local board have been maintained through the provision for a hearing.

Mr. Speaker, my third observation, in connection with a point made - I'm not just sure which hon. member raised it - but in any event, with the idea that it may not be useful to have all interested parties aware of the nature and detail of the application by a potential nursing home operator, I would simply say that again I think we're in a rather unique situation where, generally speaking, the government is not desirous of funding nursing homes when there is no demand. I think we can safely assume that demand will at least equal supply, if not exceed supply. I don't think it's a question of any confidential business information getting into the wrong hands. Rather I think it's a question of general information to the community as to the ownership and quality of operation and perhaps the particular emphasis in terms of service that will be provided in the nursing home that we want to make sure is well known to all.

Some points were made, Mr. Speaker, generally I think favourable to restriction on foreign ownership. I've already covered that.

With respect to who requested certain changes, some of them have come through the administration of the nursing home system in the province. We have had, and I think all hon. members are aware of difficulties - some commented on them - difficulties in terms of assuring service, and it is for that reason that some of these changes or a good many of them are proposed. I would indicate to hon. members that it is intended that new regulations will be advanced after these amendments are through and it is our hope that these regulations will provide some indicators of quality nursing home care.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a rather difficult and controversial area to enter into and we shall have to wait to see how successfully the Alberta Hospital Services Commission can acquit itself in this task. There have been uncertainties apparently as to the expectations of operators as to what constitutes quality care and there will be greater detail provided in an attempt to clarify that issue.

With respect to a complementary matter raised by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc in which he was expressing concern about the well-being of residents when public hearings were being conducted - that the government should be able to act more quickly - I would refer him to Section 16(c) I believe it is. I think he will observe that there is authority for regulations to be made and for some rather quick action to be taken by the Hospital Services Commission. In that event I should also indicate that with the new regulations it is intended that there will be a more frequent monitoring of the level of care, and hopefully some of the situations which we have encountered in the past will not arise because the level of care won't be allowed to slide as much as it has.

Several members commented upon complaints which are received, and I think all hon. members in the House have probably received complaints from relatives or friends of people in nursing homes. It's very difficult for individuals who have always been in good health and able to take care of themselves suddenly to find themselves in a situation, for reasons which are beyond their control, where they have to receive some care. Undoubtedly they are going to be unhappy just as a result of that change, and I guess we could refer to this kind of situation as unjustified. From our point of view it is not a justified complaint. I think we have to expect those in spite of our best intentions, and provide a means for checking out complaints to make sure that we've sifted the justified from the unjustified ones.

A suggestion was raised in connection with local boards that advisory committees might be in order. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is a suggestion that could well be considered by local boards. I see no reason why it must be enshrined in legislation and I can think of some good reasons why it shouldn't be. I think that the different administrative structures which we encounter might suggest that what would be a desirable situation for an advisory board in one case may not be so in another. There is a substantial difference for instance, Mr. Speaker, between the nursing home auxiliary hospital board here in the Edmonton area - the number of institutions that it has. There is a substantial difference between the situation of that body and a smaller one in a rural municipality which may have but one home. I think in the instance of the rural case, where obviously we have a small population base, the members of the board are able to give much more immediate and direct attention to the home than they can possibly do in Edmonton.

Some suggestions were made about whether we should have a single board responsible for auxiliary hospital and nursing home. Mr. Speaker, we are, of course, at this stage getting into a debate as to what's most efficient as opposed to what gives the opportunity for the largest number of citizens to become involved and to make their contribution. The amendment is quite broad in that respect under, I believe it is Section 2(b2) definition of "district board". It could contemplate some of a variety of situations which were mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, there were two comments raised which I am afraid I can't discuss right now, but which I will inquire into. One was by the hon. Member for Ponoka in which he expressed some concern about the \$50 or \$60, I presume of pension funds, and the final owner of that money. That's a matter which I would undertake to consider with him outside the chamber in case it should arise at committee reading.

And another comment was made by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican with respect to a possibility in 1974 that the district board homes would operate on a global budget; private homes would be funded on a fixed rate per diem. Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of that possibility at the moment, but I shall check into it and be prepared to deal with that at committee stage.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there was a suggestion by the same hon. member that there should be provision for appeal to the courts. Mr. Speaker, with this suggestion we are again involved in a consideration of the merits and demerits of an administrative or tribunal system of administration and what decisions should be made by whom, and to where should final appeal be left.

It is intended in this bill that decisions as to the actual administration should not be capable of being appealed beyond the procedures set out here. There are, however, situations which the hon. members can, I am quite sure, readily identify where there could be court appeals. But in general, we are not wishing to open the door to court consideration of whether a decision by the Hospital Services Commission or by the review board that X situation is adequate quality of care. That is not something which we feel the courts could decide any better than the procedures set out here. However, whether in fact a decision was made when it shouldn't have been made in terms of the legislation, whether the procedures were not followed properly - that, of course, is a decision, a determination which could be made on appeal to courts.

Mr. Speaker, I am concluding my remarks and recommend consideration for second reading of Bill No. 43 to the hon. members.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 43 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 39  
The Agriculture Statutes Amendment Act, 1974 (No. 2)

MR. FLUKER:

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 39, being The Agriculture Statutes Amendment Act, 1974 (No. 2).

Mr. Speaker, there are four different acts being amended by this act, the first one being The Co-operative Associations Act, the second one being The Co-operative Marketing Associations Guarantee Act, and the third one, The Rural Electrification Long Term Financing Act, as well as amendments to The Rural Electrification Revolving Fund Act.

Mr. Speaker, there are eight different sections of The Co-operative Associations Act being amended. Section 2 is being amended to include the word "registered" in order to allow extra-provincial co-operatives which are presently excluded from the exemption under The Securities Act to be brought into this exemption on the same basis as the co-operatives incorporated in Alberta.

Section 2 is amended to point out that various associations which may have guarantees granted to them are qualified to be incorporated under The Co-operative Associations Act.

Section 19 is amended, Mr. Speaker, to allow as few as six persons to incorporate under the Act where prior approval has been granted.

The change of Section 28, Mr. Speaker, clarifies the one-member-one-vote concept.

Sections 34, 35 and 36 are being removed from the Act and tend to modernize the Act and recognize that business is being done on a credit basis.

Sections 39 and 40 are being amended, Mr. Speaker, to strike out the present expulsion clause which provides that an expelled member has no recourse beyond the general meeting. This amendment will then leave any recourse open so that an expelled member could go to a court of law.

The second Act which is being amended, Mr. Speaker, The Co-operative Marketing Associations Guarantee Act, has amendments to some five sections. The first amendment in Section 3 will allow an increase from \$10 million to \$50 million in the contingent liability so as to allow the additional liability needed to finance the government's rural gas development program.

The amendment to Sections 12, 14 and 15 clarify certain aspects with regard to lien notes and stress that the note is a charge against the land until the total indebtedness covered by the lien has been paid in full.

Section 18, Mr. Speaker, sets out that the total indebtedness becomes due and payable if the member signing a note defaults on the payment.

The third and fourth Acts which are being amended, Mr. Speaker, are The Rural Electrification Long Term Financing Act and The Rural Electrification Revolving Fund Act.

Section 7 of the Act is being amended to clarify the point that if a lien is to be filed against land other than that to which the power is conveyed, the director of the co-operatives has jurisdiction as to whether or not he will allow this action to be taken. This section also provides that a purchaser of land must sign a replacement lien note when required to do so.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a brief description of the various acts and sections which are being amended in The Agriculture Statutes Amendment Act, 1974 (No. 2). In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the hon. members support fully second reading of this bill which is important to the development of rural Alberta.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, there are just a couple of points that I would like to raise on Bill No. 39. First of all I would like to say that I have looked it over very carefully and there is a change made in one of the sections that I will be dealing with when we come to committee study. It deals with the inclusion of machinery. I have looked through the old Act and it seems as though it is already included there. I cannot understand why that particular change is suggested. Maybe the hon. member who is moving it will give us some further explanation on that. But I would suggest that we can deal with it in committee.

The second point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with is the removal of restrictions regarding the issuance of credit. I certainly agree that we have moved from a cash-and-carry society to one where we are dealing almost exclusively in the credit area.

What it does do, however, is to place a greater responsibility upon the board of the co-operatives to run their business in a very, very businesslike manner. It has been my observation, Mr. Speaker, that co-operatives can have difficulty in allowing themselves to rate their help on the basis of friendships they have established over a period of time. I think of one co-op particularly that we became involved with. The board was very reluctant to deal with a matter of personnel simply because they felt the individual was a good person, a member of their community and they did not like to do anything about it.

In the removal of restrictions on credit or the limit of credit, I think it places a much greater responsibility upon the board than it has at any time in the future. I would hope that this is a matter the department responsible for the operations will keep in mind. Knowing the hon. Minister of Agriculture and his interest in this area and his concern about the changes that are taking place, I feel confident that you will instruct your staff to keep this matter under continuous surveillance, because it can become a problem I think with co-operatives much faster than in any other area of operation. But I do accept the statement by the hon. minister who moved second reading that the operations as we know them now necessitate a change. We must be prepared to permit them to accept responsibility and I would hope that it will not be permitted to get out of hand.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 39 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 44

The Department of Industry and Commerce Amendment Act, 1974

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 44, the Department of Industry and Commerce Amendment Act, 1974. Bill No. 44 is basically a housekeeping matter by the Department of Industry and Commerce.

Some of the provisions of The Department of Industry and Commerce Act in its present form are outdated and duplicate legislation of other departments. Also, Mr. Speaker, the present legislation does not provide to the department the means for pursuing its current objectives of designing and managing programs for the stimulation and orderly growth, development and diversification of industry and commerce in the province.

With reference to specific areas of duplication, Sections 2(c), 6(b) and (d), Sections 7 and 8 presently deal with trades, their codes and standards and the regulating of competitive practices, all being functions of this department in the past. These functions are now dealt with by other departments such as the Department of Manpower and Labour and the Department of Consumer Affairs.

As for the proposed amendments, giving the Department of Industry and Commerce means for better pursuing its objectives, I would like to mention two specific provisions. First, the amended act gives a clear statement within itself of the objectives, authority and role of the department. This has resulted in some sections being reworded such as Section 6.

Secondly, the amended act provides the minister with the authority to make grants for certain purposes. Although neither the Minister of Industry and Commerce nor myself are strong believers in providing grant incentives, in our discussions on the issue we realized the importance of having the flexibility to provide grants.

In obtaining this authority to provide grants it is important to note that this section also makes clear that all such grants are to be made as directed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council through regulations.

Bill No. 44 will provide the authority for the guaranteeing of loans. In reading this section three important factors prevail:

One, such guarantees will be given by the government in accordance with regulations made by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Two, guarantees will be in the form approved by the Provincial Treasurer.

Three, guarantees ... may be executed on behalf of the government by the Provincial Treasurer, the Deputy Provincial Treasurer or by any other person designated by an order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, ...

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the Assembly the significance of one of the policies behind the drafting of this bill. I referred to that word "diversification" in my opening remarks. The government is serious about its pledge to spread the advantages of our industrial development to all areas of the province. Now at a time when we are undoubtedly looking at a tremendous and unprecedented boom in major industry and in secondary industry, we look also at the opportunity to diversify, to develop the potential of all our communities, the very different kinds of potential which each region of the province holds.

We need flexibility in the matter of grants. Clearly some centres in some regions have a considerable head start. Diversification provides an ability to locate industrial development which is compatible with best land use. The tax base under this

diversification program will assist municipal governments throughout the province to improve their financial positions.

Diversification provides the vehicle to create jobs for young people wishing to stay in their home communities. Having said that about diversification, I'd like to reinforce one other concept of the government's thinking behind the bill when we provide the flexibility for grants and loans. We have a yardstick to be used in assessing any large or small, major or secondary, industrial development an auditor's yardstick. Incentives and grants can be used to help independent Canadian or Alberta firms share in this industrial boom, but only if by an auditor's yardstick we have a viable potential for success.

When required, the government will assist in providing the financial expertise and research needed to determine the potential of a given project. We retain flexibility to provide grants for yet another reason, the demands for environmental protection now place a financial burden on industrial development not faced in the early development of our country. The giant developers are able to meet environmental standards and have already begun to accept their role in this respect. However, it may be to the government's advantage, in some cases, to assist smaller independent firms in meeting high standards of pollution and environmental control.

In summing up, this bill recognizes that Alberta stands at the threshold of enormous industrial development of Alberta's resources, not just as raw resources, but as finished products. The provisions of this bill, Mr. Speaker, contain the ingredients to convert the philosophy behind it into the practical realization of its intent. We have provided flexibility in the matter of government grants so that large industry and small industry may develop side by side. The flexibility regarding grants recognizes also the demands of environmental protection and land use which can no longer be ignored.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 44 will open the door to a balance of economy long needed in this province. I now welcome the input and the criticism of the members on the opposite side of the House to the passage of Bill No. 44.

Thank you.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with Bill No. 44 I would like to make just two or three rather brief comments. My comments aren't meant really to be critical but to simply point out to the members of the House really what we are doing here.

Under Section 10 in the Act, we are now making it possible to make grants for a wide variety of possible projects as was rather ably outlined by the hon. Member for St. Albert. But I recall the discussion in this House in 1972, when the industrial incentive legislation was battered around and all the screams that came across from the government at that particular time on how the government shouldn't be involved in making grants available to industry. When the Alberta Opportunity Fund legislation was being discussed, one of the questions raised by members on both sides of the House was the desirability and, in fact on occasions, the need for the government to become involved in direct grants to various industries to get them to settle in various areas of the province. And at that time, the government said no, that wasn't what was needed. I think likely one of the reasons the government said no at that particular time, Mr. Speaker, was because the previous administration had put legislation in the year before which moved in the direction and in fact made it possible to make grants up to a certain maximum.

And this is my biggest criticism of this particular bill. I think first of all we've rediscovered the wheel here. But if it has taken two years to rediscover the wheel and we have to go the direction we were going before, all well and good, let's go that direction, let's not belabour it. But Section 10 of the Act seems to me somewhat farce when we're now going to give to the Lieutenant Governor in Council and the minister the power to make grants. The hon. member himself, in dealing with Bill No. 44, talked about using the auditor's yardstick as the means for making grants. He talked about Alberta and Canadian ownership as being part of the yardstick for making grants. He talked about the need for environment protection as part of the yardstick for making grants. And he talked about land use and that being one of the yardsticks for making grants. Well if those are the yardsticks we are going to use, why not be men about it and put it right in the legislation ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. CLARK:

... so that we aren't in the situation of people coming to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, firms coming to the minister, and saying look, you've got Section 10 in your Act



which says you can make grants. It really puts the minister in a very difficult situation. I don't very often find myself pleading the case for the minister, but it does put the minister in a difficult position. If the hon. member is setting forth the government's position on this area, I don't object to making grants in these areas if that's going to be public policy in Alberta. But if it is going to be public policy, then let's include it in the legislation. Let's say what the maximum of these grants is so that in fact these decisions are being made here in the Legislature, at least the guidelines are being made here in the Legislature rather than simply saying let's approve the concept of grants and let's leave the whole thing to the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

I would urge the hon. members not to slight over lightly the kind of pressure the Minister of Industry and Commerce will be under unless there is more guts spelled out as far as the types of grants and the maximum of the grants in the legislation. If you are going to leave all that to regulation, given the tremendous amount of money this province is going to have for the next period of years, it is going to make the job of the minister just all that much more difficult.

And so the point I am really trying to make in dealing with Bill No. 44 is simply this: if we are going to use the yardsticks the hon. member pointed out, let's include those yardsticks in the legislation itself. Let's also put some kind of maximum on it. Let's put some guidelines right in the legislation here so we all know what we are talking about. More important than just the members of the Assembly knowing what we are talking about, let's put it in there so business and other people across the province know what the rules of the game are.

The last comment I want to make is I think we have rediscovered the wheel. It has taken us two years to do that, but that's not as long as it might have taken. It's a move in the direction I am sure not every member wants to go, that is making grants to various business endeavours to have them move along and do the things we feel are necessary in this province. But if this will help in some forms of decentralization, if it is really needed, then I have no objection to going this way. My objection is, let's spell out what the terms are going to be. Let's spell out the maximum in the legislation so we know where we are going.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of comments on this bill, and a question that perhaps the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce or the sponsor of the bill from St. Albert might comment on. I would like either one or the other to give an example of the types of guaranteed loans they are thinking of, as referred to in Section 11(1).

Then, Mr. Speaker, I see a danger in this bill inasmuch as the Minister of Industry and Commerce is responsible for the Alberta Opportunity Company loans. The hon. minister has made it very clear on numerous occasions that most certainly in no way does he have anything to do with influencing whether or not any applicants are favourably received by the Alberta Opportunity Company and their applications rest on their own merit. There is no patronage involved, there is no political influence whatsoever, and that's what it should be.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, what I see possibly happening here - and most certainly the present Minister of Industry and Commerce could certainly handle it, I am sure, but maybe perhaps some other poor fellow down the road may not have the same qualities and virtues as the present minister - and I can see, Mr. Speaker, there would be tremendous pressure on the minister to use this vehicle to make loans or guarantees of loans to people who have been turned down by the Alberta Opportunity Company. Because they have been loyal and faithful party hacks over the years or whatever, and the Alberta Opportunity Company turns them down, they are then going to come and put the heat on the minister under this section. And I can see that it puts him in a very difficult position. I was wondering if the minister or the sponsor from St. Albert would tell us why this cannot be handled just as readily under the Alberta Opportunity Company as it can by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, just two very quick points. First, dealing with the question raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I think the point is well made that if we are going to provide grants for industry, we should have the yardstick spelled out in the legislation and even as important as the criteria used, there should be some indication as to what the maximum ceiling is going to be.

So I certainly agree with the points the hon. Leader of the Opposition has raised and I think they are valid. I would like the member, when he concludes the debate, to advise the Legislature why the criteria are not spelled out in the act, especially, Mr. Speaker, when looking over The Alberta Opportunity Company Act in 1972 the criteria for loans under that Act were, I thought, quite adequately spelled out.

The second point I'd make is just with respect to the principle of grants to industry itself. I think there is perhaps a case to be made in rural Alberta for providing incentive grants, but it seems to me if we are going to make grants available to industry, it's not unreasonable that we should also expect at least some degree of ownership equal to the grant. I don't accept the argument of just handing out taxpayers' money to the private concerns without, at the same time, asking for a share of equity equal to that grant. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that this would, in any way, shape or form, restrict the effectiveness of this Act, but it would safeguard any commitment made by the taxpayers of Alberta.

By and large then, just to summarize, Mr. Speaker, I would urge that the government, between now and committee stage, give some serious thought to specifying the criteria used in determining the grants concept and also putting a ceiling on it before this bill receives third reading.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one or two brief comments which the mover of the bill may, I hope, take into consideration between now and the time the bill goes into committee. The comments are two, Mr. Speaker.

First, as to the principle of the bill - I listened to what the mover said and then I read the bill itself. I am not just too sure that the legislation does what the mover of the bill has indicated it would do. Because, as I read it:

The Minister may, in accordance with the regulations, make grants for the purpose of encouraging the development of transportation and the development of commercial, industrial or economic activity.

Does this mean that it's for promotional work, or does it mean direct loans to industry for the development of a specific industry? "Development of transportation ..." - does this mean you are going to make loans to start an auto manufacturing business or put private enterprise into developing and owning roads, or more railroads, or what is it? Or is it promotional? Because, quite frankly, as I read Section 10(2), Mr. Speaker, it looks to me as if it's aimed at promotional undertakings as opposed to direct industrial grants. So I think the wording of the section leaves some doubt as to the purpose and intent of the bill.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that when the bill gets into committee we'll see a little clause inserted under Section 10(2) which says that details and information relative to all those will be published regularly in The Gazette.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Good idea.

MR. DRAIN:

In reference to Section 10 of this particular bill, Mr. Speaker, my personal views on it are very positive. That gets down to the simple fundamentals that any time you have to lead industry by the hand into the countryside and let largess fall on its head, you are starting out with a basically sick situation. I think this has been shown in the records of the federal government in their regional development program which, in fact, has probably been one of the greatest rip-offs that we have had in the Dominion of Canada.

I regret very much that the Province of Alberta, through this particular legislation, is giving any thought whatsoever to going in this particular direction. With the availability of credit through the Alberta Opportunity Company and the other sources that make the availability of the moneys to develop any particular operation more available than it has ever been, in reality the intention is here, it appears to me, moving in the direction equivalent to repealing the law of gravity for instance, which you can do.

In other words - and I have seen certain experiences in the Crowsnest Pass where an industry started as a result of a grant of this particular type. So there it developed, and when it used up the grant and used up the tax concessions it pulled out. There has been more than one place. This particular company that did this in the Crowsnest Pass was a specialist. It did it in several other places in the Dominion of Canada. They are 30 per cent owned, I think, to get into a favourable tax position with the federal government as a result of a change in the income tax, but they are primarily an American company. This is an example of what I would call rip-off.

In this day and time I can see the making available of credit for inventory and for the development of a business, but having done that I think government has gone as far as it should go in its role. If the industry has to be pushed off into a corner or bribed to develop, the industry is not sound. The location is not right, and the whole thing, in my concept, is a stinkeroo.

MR. HENDERSON:

During my comments on this particular bill, I gather in my speech I used the word "loans" periodically. I was referring specifically to grants throughout. I just wanted, as a matter of privilege, to make that abundantly clear.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I want to just add a word or two in connection with Section 10(2).

The Minister may, in accordance with the regulations, make grants for the purpose of encouraging the development of transportation ...

I think this is a good section and I think it is one that can be used, without any rip-off, for the development of a transportation system.

There have been times in the past, if we could take coal mining as an instance, where the total cost of the construction of a road was placed upon the coal mining company, which was a large capital cost. Yet that formed part of another road, and it was a means of simply saying to the company, since you happen to be developing an industry in this area, we are going to make you pay the total cost of this road as far as your mine site and then the public will take on from there. I don't think this is fair. I think the mining companies have a responsibility, and part of the capital costs should be borne by the industry. But at the same time, I think the minister should have authority to give some assistance to build a road that is going to carry both traffic [and coal] and carry them safely.

I personally support this section very, very much. As a matter of fact, we did do something like this in the Crowsnest Pass, as the hon. member for that area would know, where we shared in the cost of a road that was being used for the general public and at the same time being used as a coal-haul road. The safety on it certainly didn't meet the requirements that I thought should have been mandatory, but in order to carry out those safety requirements it would have meant closing down the industry for some time, which nobody wanted to do.

The principle there, I think, was established where the company had a responsibility even in a public road. The public road was designed to carry a certain weight of vehicle - say a vehicle with an 18,000 pound axle-loading - but the industry required a heavier loading. The road had to be designed to a heavier standard. Bridges had to be built to a heavier standard if they were going to stand up under the traffic of the coal mine. Consequently, the coal company, by negotiations with the government, was able to arrive at a formula where the public paid their proper share and then the company reimbursed the government for the extra design that was required for that particular industry.

I think cooperation like this is free enterprise. I can't see anything against free enterprise where the government cooperates and industry, with the people, shares the cost for the common good. I would like to see more of this in government and more of this in industry. To say always that industry must pay the total shot, or government must pay the total shot, in my view isn't sound. I think in many instances part of the capital cost should properly be borne by that industry and part of it should properly be borne by the public treasury.

If we can do that through negotiation, with any industry that is fair and with any government that is fair, then I think we get a working arrangement that not only builds confidence but that makes the best use of money and builds a public facility that is going to do the job for which it was intended, both for the public and for the industry.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to dispel any of the worries that the hon. members on the other side may have as to fears of not knowing who gets the loans because all loans will be published in The Gazette.

I also would like to emphasize in commenting on this bill that neither the minister nor myself were actually very excited about grants but we must keep ourselves open because of joint federal-provincial programs, and in doing so we feel that we must have that flexibility.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to ask the hon. member one thing. When he made the comment that all loans would be made public, would he comment specifically on grants as Section 10 deals with them?

MR. JAMISON:

I thought I made it perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, all loans and grants will be published.

Mr. Speaker, I fully meant to emphasize on the grants, and in particular the transportation end, there is great need for additional airports in the province and we must keep this avenue open.

I would like to say a few words on the Alberta Export Agency which is the part where the grants will possibly come into effect, and the regional services program assisted by way of grants, with the program on the airports being one of the main emphases.

And so, Mr. Speaker, if there are any other questions that the hon. members from the other side would like to ask, I think we can do this in clause-by-clause study of the bill.

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know if we could work Highway 36, the six miles that we haven't been able to get finished, in there?

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 44 was read a second time.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, on the understanding that members will return tonight for the Estimates sub-committees, I move that the Assembly do now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. Government House Leader leave to introduce the motion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 5:29 o'clock.]