

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Monday, May 26, 1975

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 207 The Auditor General Act

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 207, being The Auditor General Act. This legislation, Mr. Speaker, would establish the position of a provincial Auditor General. In addition to having the powers for scrutinizing public expenditures which the Provincial Auditor has, it would introduce the new concept to determine if reasonable value for money has been obtained in the expenditures of public funds.

[Leave being granted, Bill 207 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill 201 The Companies Amendment Act

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Companies Amendment Act. The purpose of this bill would be to compel all public companies registered under The Companies Act to include in their annual report to shareholders, and in their annual report to the director of the Companies Branch, any payments made to any director of the company.

[Leave being granted, Bill 201 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill 6 The Department of Advanced Education Amendment Act, 1975

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Department of Advanced Education Amendment Act, 1975. The purpose of this bill is to implement changes in the name and function of the Department of Advanced Education resulting from the recent reorganization of the government.

[Leave being granted, Bill 6 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill 17 The Department of Consumer Affairs Amendment Act, 1975

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being Bill No. 17, The Department of Consumer Affairs Amendment Act, 1975.

[Leave being granted, Bill 17 was introduced and read a first time.]

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, a distinguished group who yesterday witnessed an historical event at Renfrew Park in the City of Edmonton on the official opening of the little league baseball season.

I would like to introduce to you, and if I may, Mr. Speaker, take a moment to elaborate a little bit about the event that took place yesterday. The fact that a ball game was played -- it was a challenge game between the members of this Legislature and the city aldermen. The members of the Legislature -- and if I may refer to their names, a very gallant crew indeed sir: the Hon. Al Warrack, Bob Dowling, Julian Koziak, Bill Diachuk, Les Young, Tommy Lysons, Winston Backus, Gordon Taylor, and yours truly -- came out on the winning end of a 7-6 score, after going into the last inning trailing 6-0.

[laughter]

AN HON. MEMBER: How much did it cost you?

MR. ADAIR: [Inaudible] one of the things that has resulted in these fine gentlemen being here this afternoon is the fact that a phone call from the Mayor of the City of Edmonton to the Premier this morning was a challenge issued for another game. But in that particular game the Premier must play, and also His Worship the Mayor must play. Mr. Premier, I'll leave you to respond to that.

But I would like now to introduce to you, His Worship the Mayor of the City of Edmonton, William Hawrelak; Tom Forgrave, the intergovernmental officer for the City of Edmonton; Peter Kmech, the public relations officer for the City; and the gentleman in the members gallery by the name of Bill Wilson, a freelance photographer. Bill, would you just wave at us?

Mr. Speaker, we retain the trophy for another year.

[applause]

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, if I may just add, we accept the challenge, with the condition that's placed.

[laughter]

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you, and to the hon. members of the Legislature, the students from Grades 7 and 8 of the Rumsey School, together with their principal, Mr. Doug Maishment; the bus driver, Mr. Bud Upton; and Mrs. Upton. I would ask the students from Rumsey to stand and be recognized by the Legislature.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a real pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you, and to the members of the Assembly, a group of young people from the Canadian Union College, a private college in the constituency of Lacombe. They're accompanied by their teacher, Gary Brendal. I would ask that they rise and be recognized by the Assembly. They're in the members gallery.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of introducing today to you, and to the members of the Assembly, 21 young men from the 123rd Boy Scout Troup, from the districts of Lake Bonavista and Willow Park in the Calgary Egmont constituency. They are accompanied by their leader, Mr. Bodon; Mr. Davidson, Mr. Cameron, and Mr. Lloyd. They are in the members gallery, and I would ask that they stand and be recognized.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and to the members of the Assembly, three representatives from the Barons Eureka Health unit. They are Helen Wentz, councillor from the Town of Taber; Steve Slemko, councillor from the County of Lethbridge; and Earl Foxall, Secretary-Treasurer from the health unit and from the Town of Coaldale.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I'm particularly pleased to introduce, for the third year in a row, students from my constituency from the Father Leo Green school -- 75 Grade 4 students with their teacher, Mrs. Ritter. If I may, Mr. Speaker, through you, and to the Assembly, say that I had a most interesting 60-minute question and answer and discussion period with them during the last session. I'd like to ask the teacher and the students to stand and be recognized by this Assembly.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

## Office of the Premier

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members are aware, on May 2, 1973, in a statement to the Alberta Legislature I outlined requirements for public disclosure by ministers of their land holdings and other business interests.

These requirements included the filing by each minister, for public inspection, on or before July 1, 1973, with the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, a statement showing:

- (1) a legal description of all land in Alberta, including mineral rights, [in] which they or their families have any direct or indirect interest, whether as owner, lessee, mortgagee, unpaid vendor, shareholder of a private company, or otherwise;
- (2) the names of all private companies doing business in Alberta in which they or their families have a financial interest;
- (3) a description of all proprietorships and partnerships doing business in Alberta in which they or their families have an interest.

It was further required that the statement should be kept up to date by filing amendments at the time of any additions or deletions. Families were defined to include the minister's spouse and minor children.

All ministers, in fact, filed such statements for public inspection in late June of 1973. I have again requested that all ministers sworn in as members of the Executive Council of Alberta on April 3, 1975, file for public inspection a new or initial statement, as the case may be, prior to June 30, 1975, with the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly.

The requirements for ministers, Mr. Speaker, further provided that ministers shall not own, directly or indirectly, shares in any public company whose business might be materially affected by the decisions of the Government of Alberta. Ministers have, however, the option of establishing a trust upon the condition the minister exercise no influence whatsoever over the investment or management decisions of the trust, with all such decisions to be in the discretion of the trustee. If that is done, there should be no restriction on the trustee's right to purchase shares.

In addition to such a public disclosure statement and prohibition on owning shares in any public company whose business might be materially affected by the decisions of the government, the ministers, as members of the Legislative Assembly, are subject to other prohibitions and restraints contained within The Legislative Assembly Act. These include the prohibition of a member of the Legislative Assembly undertaking, directly or indirectly, any contract with the government under which any public money has been paid to the member for any service, matter, or thing. This prohibition, or requirement for continued eligibility, is subject to only specified exceptions contained within The Legislative Assembly Act.

Taken together, Mr. Speaker, that is, the statement for public inspection by ministers of their land holdings and business interests; the prohibition against a minister owning shares in a public company whose business might be materially affected by decisions of the Government of Alberta, unless established through a trust; and the prohibitions and restraints set forth in The Legislative Assembly Act; are such that I am satisfied the public interest is served insofar as members of the Executive Council are concerned.

In my earlier statement to the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, I said that the arrangement regarding the senior public service was only an interim position, and that I was not fully satisfied with the situation. However, I did not wish to delay the matter regarding public disclosure of interest for elected ministers.

It has been my intention, Mr. Speaker, for many months to alter and tighten up the situation respecting senior public officials after the election, and as the deputy ministers and others were entering into new employment relationships as part of a larger reorganization of government.

I've come to the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that all deputy ministers and other senior public officials of comparable management responsibilities, such as chairmen of certain Crown agencies, boards, and commissions, should make full public disclosure of their land holdings and business interests, in an identical nature to those being made by elected ministers. These new arrangements will also include the prohibition of owning, directly or indirectly, shares in any public company whose business might be materially affected by decisions of the Alberta government, unless placed in a trust in the same manner as that provided for by ministers.

These statements for public inspection will be filed by the deputy ministers, and other specified senior public officials, with the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly on or before August 30, 1975. A list of the positions in addition to deputy ministers, will in due course be tabled in the Legislature.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, it is our intention that senior public management officials should also be bound by similar prohibitions and restrictions in dealing with the provincial government, as is the case with elected ministers as members of the Legislative Assembly -- in short, that senior public management officials should be precluded from having any business dealings with the government unless specifically exempted by the

regulations. The government intends, in due course, to bring forth appropriate regulations or legislation to meet this objective.

Mr. Speaker, it is recognized that such provisions as outlined today may restrict or hamper the government's ability to attract to senior management positions. However, on balance, it is my view that such public disclosure, and prohibitions against certain business activity, will substantially reduce the possibility for conflict of interest by senior government officials in the carrying out of their duties.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in responding to the announcement by the Premier with regard to public disclosure, as far as cabinet ministers are concerned, this is a continuation of the government's policy for the last four years, and I commend them for this.

I would say that as far as senior public management officials are concerned, in light of recent developments in Alberta, and especially the circumstances surrounding the former Deputy Minister of Agriculture, it's indeed appropriate that these kinds of guidelines come forward at this particular time.

I think it's important, Mr. Speaker, that we recognize nevertheless that the announcement by the Premier today does not lessen the need for the report from the Provincial Auditor regarding the activities of the former Deputy Minister of Agriculture to be made public, and at the earliest possible date.

I would also hope, Mr. Speaker, that in the course of this Legislative Assembly, we would find it appropriate to look at the whole Legislative Assembly Act from the standpoint of relationships between members of the Legislature and their particular responsibilities there.

The last comment I'd like to make, Mr. Speaker, dealing with this question of senior public officials: it's one thing to have guidelines such as this, but I would hope in this province that those people who take on responsibilities of deputy minister status and chairmen of a variety of government boards would have the good common sense themselves, in fact, to stay well clear of areas affected by these guidelines and certainly not be involved in the kinds of dealings centring around members of their immediate family or close family, and involvement in the public service.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

##### PWA -- Trucking

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Transportation and ask what progress is being made with regard to negotiations between PWA and its employees or others on the question of sale of PWA trucking?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, the situation at the present time is, having regard to the nature of Pacific Western Airlines and its relationship to the Canadian Transport Commission, that any sale of its trucking arm has to have the approval of the Canadian Transport Commission. That approval is being sought at the present time.

MR. CLARK: When did the government change its position all of a sudden and need the approval of the Transport Commission?

DR. HORNER: That isn't the question at issue, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Are the government and PWA considering selling the trucks themselves and the trucking rights, or just the equipment?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, that's a matter which is being handled by the board of directors in normal business transaction. I'm sure that information can be made available once the sale is consummated.

MR. CLARK: A further supplementary to the minister, or perhaps to the Premier. Has the government had discussions with the chairman of PWA regarding the sale of PWA trucking?

DR. HORNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I've been apprized of the decision of the board of directors of Pacific Western Airlines through the chairman of the board, having regard to their decision on a business basis that they should sell the trucking arm, and that they would like to sell it to their employees.

MR. CLARK: A further supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. When the minister said "would like to sell" PWA trucking, was he, in fact, also alluding to the running rights, which I understand deal with running rights not only in Alberta but in British Columbia and the Territories?

DR. HORNER: Well, that would be part of the business transaction, Mr. Speaker.

---

Industrial Land Banks

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a second question to the Minister of Business Development. Does the province plan to make loans available so that towns can set up industrial land banks?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is undoubtedly referring to an article that appeared in the Edmonton Journal some time ago as a result of discussions, both of a private and a governmental nature, that took place with various planning officials in the Province of Alberta. Those discussions and meetings are held quite often by members of the Department of Business Development and Tourism in a rather thought-provoking, stimulating atmosphere in order that possible effective methods of developing rural Alberta might be hit upon.

The meeting the hon. member is undoubtedly referring to was held in Jasper, and several proposals were put forward. These proposals don't necessarily represent government policy, nor have they been discussed at either a caucus or cabinet level, but are matters that the department discusses at various times on a continuing basis.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of his answer and of one of the recommendations contained in the industrial corridor concept, the information tabled in the House last fall concerning industrial land banks, are we going to have a statement from the government during the spring session concerning the question of industrial land banks as discussed in the industrial, energy corridor concept?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I would hate to put that kind of time constraint on a statement regarding any land banking proposal that might possibly come in the future. I think the time constraints on all of us are such that it will be some time down the road before anything comes forward.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Does the government favor the concept of a land bank for industry as proposed in the energy corridor proposal?

MR. DOWLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, without knowing at all the implications of that sort of philosophy, I would have to say we're not in a position to make a comment.

## PWA

MR. TAYLOR: My question is to the hon. Deputy Premier. Have any interveners filed objections with CTC regarding the purchase of PWA, which closed on May 24?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, the time for interveners ended on May 24. It's my information that the only intervention was by the Province of British Columbia.

I've had an opportunity to peruse their intervention. My preliminary examination would reveal they are matters that could probably more properly be dealt with between British Columbia and ourselves in direct negotiations.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary. Would the intervention of the Province of British Columbia lead us to believe that B.C. was very anxious to acquire PWA?

AN HON. MEMBER: Not on your life.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, in fairness, the nature of their intervention is to assure service and employment in the Province of British Columbia.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is it the government's intention to immediately contact the B.C. government to see if this matter can be settled by negotiation? Or will there, in fact, be hearings by the CTC as a result of the intervention by the Province of British Columbia?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, it would be my opinion that we should enter into discussions with the Province of British Columbia in conjunction with my colleague, the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, and notify the CTC to that effect.

MR. TAYLOR: One further supplementary. Due to the fact that there is only one intervener, and that one is questionable, would it now be realistic to say that CTC could properly drop this nonsense?

DR. HORNER: I would certainly agree with the hon. member.

---

Rapid Transportation

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Deputy Premier and Minister of Transportation. What is the present situation regarding Alberta and Ontario co-operation re transportation research? Has our government, in co-operation with the Ontario government, invested funds in this area?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I can't give a full response to that question at the present time. There are ongoing negotiations, and I would hope that later in this session either my colleague, the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, or myself might make a much fuller statement on the matter.

## DREE Grants

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. In cases where Department of Regional Economic Expansion grants are provided to industries, is consideration given to the effect such grants may have on competitive industries?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, under the General Development Agreement which, I believe, was concluded in March 1974, the subagreements which may be entered into do require that cognizance be taken of other industries already operating in Alberta. However, the fact that an industry may be operating in Alberta in a competitive situation would not preclude assistance through the DREE program provided that in all cases the Alberta priorities are carried forward first.

## Manpower Training Grants

MR. SHABEN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Is similar consideration given in cases where manpower training grants are provided to industry?

DR. HOHOL: Generally yes, Mr. Speaker. I should like to point out that our concern in government is that the circumstances in a particular geographic area rather than the boundaries which surround it, as the DREE agreements provide, make the conclusions between us and Ottawa.

Accordingly, the agreement which expired at the end of March 1975 with respect to training programs in the North, specifically Slave Lake and the community vocational centres -- typically one-room schools for adults, without a specified curriculum -- is being replaced by what we are calling an Alberta North Agreement. This is an unspecified area which would go well beyond the Slave Lake area into the northeastern and northwestern parts of Alberta. I would like to suggest that from our dealings with the federal government to this point, it appears we will have a successful agreement in a few weeks.

## Drivers' Licences

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Deputy Premier in charge of transportation, or the hon. Solicitor General. The question is: with the increased load limits on our highways announced just recently, how are they going to classify the Class 5 driver's licence which now limits drivers to 24,000 pounds? There are increases to 27,000, and the limit now is that a Class 5 driver's licence can only operate a 24,000-pound unit.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could respond in this way. As we change our weight limits, pretty obviously we're going to have to review the question of driver qualification as well. I would expect that over the coming months that's exactly what we will be doing.

## Industrial Relations -- Complaints

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Labour, and it is this. What is the current status of a complaint filed before the Board of Industrial Relations on February 6, 1975, by the Christian Labour Association Local 63 and Ralph Eerkes Painting and Decorating against the International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades Union 1016, alleging unfair labor practices?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for indicating to me in advance that he was going to ask a question on this subject.

There are two situations at issue. The board has no up-to-date information on why there is some job activity in process there as of today. But as to the complaints which were filed, the matters brought to the board in February, those will be made the subject of a ruling which the board will publish to the parties probably during this week.

MR. YOUNG: A supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise then whether, in view of the response, the Board of Industrial Relations has commenced investigation of the harassing situation which is alleged to have occurred on Thursday and Friday of last week?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, those are the recent developments that I understood were taking place as of today. The hon. member says, as of last Thursday and Friday, and I'm sure that's the case. The board did not have information on those more recent developments, but I would be glad to look into them and report to the hon. member.

#### Oil Pricing

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. It concerns reports of a speech last week by the Minister of Energy concerning the price for oil of \$9.50 to \$10 a barrel. My question to either the hon. Premier or the Minister of Energy is: does this figure represent the official position of the Government of Alberta as to the price requested for Alberta petroleum?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the way I presented the case for the \$9.50 to \$10 price was that it was a guideline suggested by the Premier of the Province of Quebec. The Government of Alberta considered it to be a good guideline in that it was the average price for oil in the largest market in which Alberta competes and serves.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. What kind of discussion took place on this particular price at the recent energy conference? Was there any official discussion as to price, not during the open session, but the closed session?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it was the official position of the Province of Quebec, which they later discussed publicly themselves. Other than that, I think it was probably discussed generally amongst the various participants in the conference. But no particular decision was reached, as was acknowledged by the Prime Minister.

MR. NOTLEY: A further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the Government of Alberta given any consideration to the concept of a differential price between old oil and new oil, as was discussed during the open sessions of the federal energy conference?

MR. GETTY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. That was one of the options considered by the government over some period of time in trying to develop sufficient incentives for future exploration and development in our province. However, the conclusion we reached, as has been expressed in the House, was that a new oil and old oil royalty system was probably a better method with which to handle it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the government made any final determination yet with respect to supplementary royalties, assuming a price increase in oil? Has that been finalized as yet?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, this matter of pricing of oil and natural gas is presently subject to negotiation between ourselves and the federal government. The hon. member recalls, the Premier, in his ALPEP statement in December of 1974, mentioned it was the government's intention that should there be a price increase above \$6.50, the 65 per cent supplementary price would not necessarily be continued. Since, obviously, a price arrangement has not been decided upon yet, there is no decision as to what the supplementary royalty percentage will be.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. What is the government's unconditional target date for an increase in the price of oil in Canada?

MR. GETTY: The government has not arrived at one, Mr. Speaker.

#### Greenbelt

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Environment if he can indicate to the Legislature approximately how many areas were affected by the increase in the Edmonton greenbelt area?

MR. RUSSELL: The most recent extension to that, Mr. Speaker, was a strip about seven miles long and a half-mile wide, plus some additional odd pieces down at the south end -- so about four square miles.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister indicate to the House how many public meetings were held before this land was taken into the greenbelt area?

MR. RUSSELL: There were no public meetings with respect to this particular extension, Mr. Speaker. But I think, looking back over the history of this particular project, that it has been well publicized. It's a well-known fact that it's the objective of the government to extend the greenbelt around Calgary and around Edmonton.

Insofar as follow-up with the affected landowners is concerned, of course I propose to follow the very excellent procedure adopted by my predecessor, the hon. Mr. Yurko, and discuss any land or ownership or use problems that any of the affected landowners may have.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister indicate to us that fine procedure the former minister, or the department, used? Was that just the mailing of a caveat saying it had been frozen, and that was it? Was that the consultation?

MR. CLARK: That was the first part of it.

MR. RUSSELL: No, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that any landowner who has a proposed change of use for his affected land discusses it with the department. If there appears to be some problem, or disagreement, with allowing the development to go ahead, the landowner has the option of offering his land for sale, and an agreement is entered into along those lines.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. Can the hon. minister indicate to the Assembly what prior consultation there was with the people in the area before the original greenbelt was established?

MR. RUSSELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think maybe the hon. member is overlooking something, and that's the very important aspect of confidentiality the government must maintain in a project like this with respect to major land zoning and preservation. Naturally it's very difficult, as the hon. member can probably appreciate, to keep the location of the restricted zone away from the knowledge of certain speculators and developers. This would effectively hamper the success of the greenbelt. But certainly, once the zone is declared, there's full and ample consultation.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, just one final supplementary question. Can the hon. minister indicate how many public meetings were held in the affected areas, before the greenbelt was put into effect?

MR. RUSSELL: [Not recorded] I've outlined the chronology of discussions that are held with affected landowners, and the timing with which the particular location is made known. If the hon. member wants more detail on that, if he'd put it on the Order Paper, I could check the dates of meetings with any particular group or groups of persons.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, he could save the taxpayers some money and just tell us there weren't any.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member knows the answer, perhaps he doesn't need to ask the question.

MR. CLARK: It's more important the public knows.

#### Irrigation Funding

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Over the weekend, the federal government announced an increase of \$9.8 million towards headwork projects on the Bow River between Calgary and Brooks. My question is: has the minister made representation to the federal government for increased funding to individual irrigation districts for rehabilitation?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, no. Since I've been in office, I have not made representations to the federal government for increased funding in that regard.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. Would that be one of the items on his agenda for the summer, or at an early date?

MR. MOORE: I haven't completed my summer agenda yet, Mr. Speaker. It may be.



MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. To retain the principle of equity among the irrigation districts, what steps has the minister taken to have the federal government pick up any escalating costs of projects on other main waterways, such as the Oldman River?

MR. MOORE: I really think, Mr. Speaker, that those are questions which should be directed toward the federal government. Certainly, our position of having made an announcement to spend some additional \$200 million over the next 10 years on irrigation districts throughout southern Alberta is a commitment that will be carried out in such a way as to be as equitable as possible, from our point of view.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Supplementary to the minister. My understanding is that these projects are under a Canada-Alberta irrigation agreement. What part will the minister play in initiating the expenditure for capital works or negotiating with the federal government for priority of various projects, under that particular agreement?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I would think we will be able to play whatever part is necessary to ensure there is some equity with respect to the various irrigation districts involved.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. Is the minister then prepared to meet at an early date with the federal government to ensure that, if there is an escalation, any funds available for escalating costs are secured by the Province of Alberta under this agreement?

MR. MOORE: No, Mr. Speaker. I'm not yet aware that there is, in fact, an escalation as the hon. member describes. I will make a commitment to pursue the questions he has raised with respect to escalation in costs and, as well, with respect to any representations we may or may not make to the federal government with regard to its input.

#### Firearms Ban

MR. TAYLOR: My question is to the hon. Solicitor General. Was there some hint of a Mafia fight-out that led the hon. minister to declare that machine guns and fully automatic rifles would no longer be sold to the public?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, there was no hint of a Mafia shoot-out.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary. Was there some particular reason that this order was given all of a sudden?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, there was an attempt, a successful attempt, to import six machine guns into Lethbridge. It was not considered to be in the public interest to have them either possessed or transported within Alberta.

#### Alberta Hospital Escapees

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Attorney General, in regard to the incident at Alberta Hospital in which five youths escaped in a stolen car. Could the minister advise why these youths were kept in the Alberta Hospital, waiting for court action after law-breaking in the County of Parkland?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not personally aware of all details of persons who have been brought into custody by the RCMP. However, I'd be very happy to inquire into the matter and discuss it with the member.

#### Environment -- Public Hearings

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Environment. It concerns the ammonia plant at Raymond. In view of the previous minister's commitment to hold formal public hearings on environmental matters, has the minister requested the Environment Conservation Authority to hold such hearings?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the former minister in responding to such requests suggested to persons who had written to him that a public information hearing, which may be conducted by the Department of Environment rather than the Authority, might be useful to those interested parties, and it would be held only in the event the application might be approved. So until the application is considered and perhaps approved by Executive Council, the question of public hearings in any form remains an academic one.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Does the government not consider, especially in light of the motion passed by the Lethbridge city council requesting formal hearings by the ECA, that the cabinet's deliberation would be assisted as a result of public hearings which would look into not only the environmental questions, but the social impact as well?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, it's true that public concerns naturally would be a matter of interest to Executive Council. I'm sure that will be taken into consideration at the time the application is discussed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. In light of the minister's answer, is the cabinet giving any consideration then to holding the hearings before the decision is made? Hearings after the decision is made are rather academic.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member has perhaps missed the point I'm making, and that is: the possibility that the application may be rejected at this time would solve the problem of public hearings. It would only be in the event the Executive Council saw its way to perhaps approving the application that they would discuss the matter of the public hearings.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question for clarification. What impact or influence could public hearings have after the application is accepted by Executive Council? Would Executive Council be prepared to reconsider the matter in light of public hearings once the application is accepted?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I'm not explaining it very carefully. I am saying that if the decision not to proceed is reached, the matter of public hearings would be academic. If the application was judged to be worthy of consideration or a further review by Executive Council, at that point we would ask that these public information hearings be held.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one further supplementary question for clarification. Surely the minister would agree that to have input from the public, it makes sense to have the input . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member's clarification is going from him to the minister rather than vice versa.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister not agree that the public . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order. Order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member is going to generate a debate in which he himself will be handicapped for lack of a reply.

MR. NOTLEY: Let me rephrase the question and ask the hon. minister whether, in light of the motion passed by Lethbridge city council, the cabinet would not reconsider its position and agree to have public hearings by the ECA or some other appropriate body before a decision is made?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I've tried to point out as clearly as I can that the commitment earlier made with respect to public information hearings would be made at the time the decision is made on the application.

Perhaps it's important to point out at this time that public hearings have already been held -- substantive public hearings -- by the ERCB. We've responded to the City of Lethbridge council and other interested parties. The commitment of the previous minister still stands. But up to a certain point it remains academic, because one has to assume the project will be proceeding, and it would only be if that direction were taken that we would proceed with the hearings.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is it the government's view that the hearings held by the ERCB, which did not deal with environmental or social concerns, constitute a substitute for full-scale hearings by the ECA?

MR. RUSSELL: [Not recorded] they constitute a substitution, but certainly they are open to any interested interveners or parties who wish to speak on a variety of subjects. The ERCB report does, in fact, deal with those matters. It's not necessary in all these cases that the ECA hold a fullfledged public hearing, which we traditionally associate with major projects and which the ECA holds under those conditions.

---

Edmonton City Boundaries

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and ask the status of negotiations or discussions with the City of Edmonton regarding the boundaries of the City of Edmonton?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the question of the boundaries of the City of Edmonton is being reviewed right now by the Edmonton Regional Planning Commission. We expect to have a reply by 1976, I believe.

## Edmonton Municipal Government

MR. CLARK: Further question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister responded to the suggestion from the City of Edmonton concerning a unitary form of municipal government here in Edmonton?

MR. JOHNSTON: It's under consideration, Mr. Speaker.

## Boundaries Commission

MR. CLARK: I didn't even get time to sit down.

Supplementary question, to the minister, Mr. Speaker. With regard to the boundaries commission presently looking at boundaries in rural Alberta, when does the minister expect the report to be in his hands? Or when does the minister expect to be able to table the report in the Legislature?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, as you know the order in council required that the boundaries commission file a final report by the end of 1975. It's my information they are proceeding toward that deadline.

MR. CLARK: Further supplementary to the minister. Has the minister asked or specifically discussed with the boundaries commission whether they will be on target for the end of 1975?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I've had a meeting with Mr. Leslie, who chairs the boundaries commission. He has assured me he is working toward that end.

## Local Authorities Board

MR. CLARK: One further question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister give us some indication whether the government plans for the Local Authorities Board to continue to function?

MR. JOHNSTON: The Local Authorities Board will continue to function within the parameters it now operates.

## Trucking Permits

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation. Is some consideration being given to a residency requirement before issuing trucking permits or running rights to out-of-province trucking companies operating in Alberta?

DR. HORNER: The short answer, Mr. Speaker, is yes. We are considering a residence clause for truckers. That will be reviewed with both the Alberta Motor Transport Association and the Independent Truckers' Association.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

## CONSIDERATION OF HIS HONOR THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

Mr. King proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That an humble address be presented to His Honor the Honorable the Lieutenant-Governor of Alberta as follows:

To His Honor the Honorable Ralph G. Steinhauer, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Alberta:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honor for the gracious speech Your Honor has been pleased to address to us at the opening of the present session.

[Adjourned debate: Mr. Mandeville]

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak on this debate. I was going to use the term "pleasure", but I don't think I will. I think it's more or less an obligation.

First I do want to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on being re-elected as the Speaker of this House. I think you have shown that you have earned the confidence of all the members in this House as you sit in this Chair.

I'd also like to congratulate the Deputy Speaker. I'm sure he will be able to keep the House in hand. If he can't, he'll just have to raise that voice of his, and I'm sure we will all come to tune.

As for my condolences, I think I'm going to have to reserve them for this little corner over here. I realize that we're a minority group and we're going to have a position that's going to be hard to fill. Sometimes I think you're going to wonder what role we really play.

MR. NOTLEY: We're like the whooping cranes.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Yes, we're something like the whooping cranes. But maybe we could take note from that. The whooping cranes are starting to come back, and if they don't land on muddy waters they just might survive.

But as an opposition minority group as small as we are, it is going to be hard to function, and to function properly. Many times we're going to have problems brought to us from the people of this province -- and we do represent quite a few people -- in the vote there was 37 per cent, but they're not the only people whom we've got to represent. We have to represent everyone who comes to us and wants to get through to the government. I think everybody should have a pipe into the government or into the Legislature.

So sometimes you'll see us on this side of the House supporting some Albertan who has gotten in touch with us, and we might not necessarily agree 100 per cent with the views of the person who comes to us to seek them out.

As one of the members of this minority group, I can assure everyone that I'm going to be as objective and as constructive as I can possibly be. I'm looking forward to working with the government. I'm looking forward to working with my colleagues here on the opposition, with the people of this province, and last but not least, with the constituents who put me into this Legislature and who are responsible for my being here. I realize that as it is, it's going to be hard for me to give them the attention I did in the past. I'm going to have to change my role. In the past I spent most of my time in my constituency, working with cabinet ministers and civil servants to get my work accomplished. But, as I say, it is going to be a different role at this point.

I recall in 1967, when I was first elected to this Legislature, hearing the term, "coming in on coattails", or there's a possibility you "come in on a coattail". I really couldn't deny that at that point, but on this last election in 1975 I don't think I could accept the term. I think if we had a term, we would have to say that we came in on a wand.

Mr. Speaker, in all fairness, as I said, my concern is good government for the people. I'm not so concerned about who gives the good government, and I would have to say, in the past four years the people of this province have been blessed with pretty good government.

However, I'm going to have to . . .

DR. BUCK: Compared to what?

AN HON. MEMBER: Thirty-six.

MR. MANDEVILLE: . . . put out a caution to the government. We have to be really cautious. There is lots of money in the treasury. There's lots of money coming in now, and we've got to be really careful where we're spending this non-renewable resource, the money that we're getting from it. I'm referring to investing in, say, Pacific Western Airlines or

the Syncrude development in the tar sands. These areas take big portions of money to finance.

I really support going ahead with developing the tar sands, but I do caution the government against getting involved too deeply in these areas. I think what will happen somewhere down the road, we're investing in Syncrude now, they're going to come back wanting more funds, or they're going to want to supplement their operation up there. There are also going to be other companies which want to come in. They're going to want us to invest. So I want to caution the government against getting involved in too many of these types of investments. I think we should leave it to private industry to finance projects such as this wherever possible.

I also think it's incumbent on the federal government to participate. The reason I say that, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that they are taking money out of this province which they're getting out of oil on the export tax. I do think it's up to the federal government to invest and help us to develop our synthetic crudes. I certainly think this is an area where we need development so we can leave some of our conventional crude in the ground for future generations.

Another natural resource that gives me concern, and I am pleased with the promotion we have, is the petrochemical field. I think this is an area we have to support and keep going in the right direction. As far as our natural gas is concerned, in the past we have been exporting it out of the province. As well as exporting our gas, we have been exporting our labor. We send our gas to some other country, and they develop and manufacture it down there. I say, let's keep our labor, and manufacture our gas right here in the province. I applaud the movement this province has made towards promoting our petrochemical plants. We have an application from the Brooks area for one plant that is going to employ 950 people in the construction stages. This is a great boon to an area such as Brooks, to get this many people in the employment field. When they are finished, there will be 106 people on permanent staff, which I say is a great asset to a little area such as Brooks.

However, I think there are some issues we do have to be concerned about and have to watch. The complaint I get is that we are using too much of our gas. I understand that with the three permits that have been approved by the Energy Conservation Board, approximately 85 billion cubic feet of gas per year is going to be used. I think we could take a look at using coal. They tell me, and I read in the reports, that a third of the gasoline is used for processing, and two-thirds is used for feedstock. I think at this time we could take a look at using coal for the processing, and at a later date we could look at using coal for the feedstock. Here again, especially in the plant going up in the Brooks area -- they're setting up this plant adjacent to a large reserve of coal. It's adjacent to this coal, and I'm certain it could be used, and used economically, to process ammonia at this plant.

Another area we have to look at is the marketing. Going through the report, I see in the application that PanCanadian has contracted 250,000 tons to the United States. The price of the ammonia to the United States, as I read it in the report, is \$70 a ton with a 3 per cent escalating factor. The ammonia sold to the local EID land association is \$125 a ton with a 4 per cent escalating factor. I really can't see the reasoning, unless it's volume, for selling large amounts of ammonia to the United States \$55 cheaper than it is selling to our local people.

Another area I think needs some concern is the Alberta Ammonia plant in Raymond. They are exporting 95 per cent of the product they are manufacturing at the Taber plant. I think this is why we have so many complaints from the plant in Taber. It's the amount of gas they are using, of course, and again it's the amount of the product exported to the United States. I certainly hope the minister in charge of this will be taking action in the very near future to get these projects approved. I, especially, will say the projects at Brooks and Medicine Hat, because I think there is very little controversy. I think the people of this province are ready to go ahead with those two plants.

Mr. Speaker, there is another resource I feel we don't put enough emphasis on, and that is water. Water is not a non-renewable resource, but it's a resource we are not harnessing. We are not taking advantage of it. Our water leaves our headwaters here, either going into Hudson Bay or the Gulf of Mexico. In the northern part of the province there is 80 per cent of our water, and 20 per cent of our people. It's just vice versa in the south. I don't think at this point, Mr. Speaker, we can divert our streams, our waters, from the north to the south where the people are, but I certainly think we can go ahead and start conserving our water in the basins we have in the southern part of the province.

One example is on the Bow River project. At the present time, the federal government has agreed to go ahead and rehabilitate the Bassano Dam. It's going to cost between \$10 and \$12 million to rehabilitate it. When they get the dam rehabilitated, it's only going to serve the purpose of diverting water. They can store approximately 5,000 to 8,000 acre feet of water, which is a minimal amount of water.

However, I would like the hon. Minister of Environment, who is going to have some voice in this, to recommend to the federal government that we go ahead and put a dam below the Bassano Dam, which they call the Eyremore Dam, that would be a multipurpose dam. They could put in a dam there which would store 300,000 acre feet of water. It would generate power. I'm sure Calgary Power would go along with the construction, or help in the construction of the dam. We would use a dam for an east-west highway. We could also use the dam for recreation. It would be a large area of water under storage. It would back water up over the top of the Bassano Dam.

On top of that, as a result of putting in this multipurpose dam, we'd be able to put many more acres of good arable land in the eastern irrigation district under water. I realize this is going to cost considerably more money. When they had an estimate on this several years ago, they determined that it was going to cost around \$43 million. I would not dare to say that it would cost approximately \$100 million at this point to go ahead with a project such as this. There are other developments which are feasible on the Bow River project. We could store water on the Crowfoot Creek. We could put a dam in at Cheadle which would store water in the Highwood basin and also in the Bow River basin.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see us put more emphasis on the development of our water. Here is an area in which you can't get private industry involved. There is no one concerned or interested in private industry who will develop this, so I think it's up to the government to work on our water resources and come up with a program to store our water on the headwaters.

I noticed the Speech from the Throne didn't have very much on agriculture. However, I do think that as in the past few years there has been an emphasis on agriculture, I would just like to say to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who is not in his seat, that he is going to have a pretty big pair of shoes to fill. Because our past Minister of Agriculture was aggressive and certainly started many programs in the agricultural field. However, I think they might possibly be kind of hard to keep functioning.

AN HON. MEMBER: Broke a lot of people, that's all.

MR. MANDEVILLE: I'd also like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, since our past Minister of Agriculture is now the Minister of Transportation, to say, on behalf of the potato growers in this province, that they appreciated very much the help he gave them when they were in trouble two years ago. They came out of their situation and the dilemma they were facing, and now they're back into a good, viable position. Hon. Deputy Premier, this is very much appreciated by the potato growers of this province.

However, I would like to say, as far as agriculture is concerned, it's an area in which we've had a few good years. When we have a few good years, production goes up. I'm speaking of our cereal grains at this time. We're going to get an overproduction of cereal grains in the world. The price of our produce is going down. However, the input into agriculture is going to continue to go up. I was just reading a report where machinery, in the last 9 months, has gone up 25 per cent. If this continues, with the high input into agriculture and prices coming down, we're going to be facing a dilemma. I don't think we're going to face this dilemma this year. But in 1976 I'm sure agriculture, especially in cereal crops, is going to be on the downward swing.

When we increase the price of our crude oil -- as has been mentioned, it could be increased to \$9 or \$9.50 a barrel -- this is going to revert to the consumer. The farmer is definitely going to have to pay another 12 or 15 cents a gallon for gas if we increase the price of crude oil, and it has to be absorbed by the consumer.

Another area that has hindered agriculture -- hindered it for a long while, and I imagine it's going to continue -- is the grain handlers' strike we had in Vancouver. We have it every year. With all due respect to the unions, I think it's deplorable. No one can tell me that we don't have a lot of influence from the American unions.

As far as the grain handlers' strike is concerned, I can recall that several years ago when we had a surplus in wheat and cereal grains, we had chartered ships coming in to load at Vancouver, but they couldn't. What did they do? They went down and loaded in the United States, and Canada lost a lot of markets as a result of this strike. I think it is incumbent on management and labor to get together to avoid these strikes. I'm not saying that the laborers are altogether wrong in this, but I do feel it's an area we've got to rectify. It's been going on for too many years.

Another part of agriculture that has been in a dilemma is the cattle industry. I can recall in 1951 we had the foot-and-mouth disease. I thought it was terrible. I didn't think it could get any worse. But I've certainly found out in the last 18 months that it can; it can get severe. The cattle feeders themselves for the last 18 months have been losing money: three turns of cattle that they've lost money. And it wasn't a little money, it was large amounts of money. It almost crippled the feedlot operators. I can recall not too many years ago I heard the federal government saying, cow-calf operator, we want you to seed more grass. We'll give you \$10 an acre to seed more grass. We want you to get into cattle production. It's going to be 1980 before we're going to have enough beef to supply the markets of the world. Well, here it is only 1975, and we've already got a surplus of cattle.

I was hoping that the Minister of Agriculture would be in his place. There's an area I think we have got to put emphasis on. That is, having free trade in livestock between the United States and Canada. The United States has from 85 to 90 per cent of our cattle, from 85 to 90 per cent of our beef. Therefore, we do have to have free trade, as far as Canada is concerned, between the United States and Canada.

I would like to see all our stockgrowers associations and this government put what pressure they can on the federal government to see that we have free trade between the United States and Canada, so we can have stable beef markets as far as the North American market is concerned.

When we put the embargo on, it was at an opportune time for us. When our Canadian markets were good, the American markets weren't good. But it's reversing now. What is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, when it reverses in the United States is: Mr. Canadian, Mr. Canada, you keep your beef; we're not going to accept your beef.

I would say that we did. We had an embargo on beef as far as DES is concerned. We didn't need to put an embargo on beef coming here when we had the DES embargo on. We couldn't use DES-fed beef in Canada. Therefore, beef being fed in the United States couldn't come into Canada. So I think we had enough restrictions there without getting involved in putting on further restrictions to tantalize the American cattle industry.

As far as the calf loans which were implemented by our past Minister of Agriculture, they're beginning to look a little better now. But at the time, three weeks ago, they didn't look well at all. What they did was change the flow in our cattle situation. Our Ontario buyers were up in the western part of Canada last year, not only in Alberta. They weren't able to fill their orders. So they brought feeder cattle in from the United States and filled their feedlots with United States cattle. Thus we retained a lot of our yearlings in the western part of Canada, which I think is going to create a surplus this fall. The feeders have been long feeding these cattle as a result of high-priced feed. Right now we have a shortage of beef. But I think, when fall comes and our yearlings start hitting the market, we're going to see another depression in the cattle market. And it's going to be the cow-calf operator who's going to get hurt at the same time.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few remarks and a request of the hon. Deputy Premier, since he's in charge of transportation now. If he's going to be making any changes in the grant formula for municipalities, I would ask the minister to take a really good look at irrigation districts. It has been an age-old problem to construct roads within irrigation districts; it does take more money. We have a water problem. It's harder to acquire land from farmers to get more right of way to put roads in, and the high water table makes it much more expensive to put roads in our irrigated areas than it does in areas where they don't have irrigation.

With those few remarks . . .

[applause]

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, it gives me particular pleasure to have the opportunity to participate in the throne speech debate in this 18th Alberta Legislature. I say "particular pleasure", because it was just a little more than three months ago when it was trumpeted by the leader of the provincial socialist party that Edmonton Norwood would be one of those constituencies that would readily be captured by them in the now past March 26 election. It may well be the conclusion was hastily drawn on the basis that the sitting member was rather quiet in nature.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a saying we are all familiar with, and that is: still waters run deep. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to display any smugness or arrogance about my victory, except to say that there can be no substitute for hard work on behalf of those one represents, and for being communicative. I believe my constituents have found both factors in their representative.

But this alone is not enough, Mr. Speaker. There is no doubt that Albertans must feel secure in the overall leadership and government they have received. Their security and confidence was well demonstrated in the mandate given us on March 26.

Mr. Speaker, I have a number of concerns on behalf of my constituents: concerns about their social needs with regard to all age levels; housing, because of the structure of the constituency; the need for greater understanding and development in the area of delivered education. But, Mr. Speaker, I would choose in this debate to deal with only one topic other than those I have raised. I hope to have an opportunity, through the course of the budget debate, to cover these other very important areas with regard to my constituents. But today I would like to deal solely with the subject of the women of Alberta.

Before I go on to that subject, I would like to join my colleagues in congratulating you on your ascension to the Throne again. Ascension by royalty is inherited; yours is by your display of wisdom, application of fair-mindedness, and the stature with which you hold the office of Speaker in this Legislature. For this, I congratulate you.

With regard to the women of Alberta, and perhaps women everywhere, the United Nations has recognized this as International Women's Year. This is to serve as a focal point for getting things done, for changing legislation and attitudes; a year for governments to set, as a priority concern, the status of their women.

For centuries, the traditional concept of a woman's role has been to bear children and remain in the kitchen. Times have changed, Mr. Speaker. It was said that early cars would run on whiskey. If your engine was warm, and you ran out of gas, you could always get home on kerosene or alcohol, or even on bad whiskey. In the 1900s, an early automotive manual suggested this remedy. But I doubt today such alternatives would transport us very far. And so times have changed.

With the current and future manpower needs of Alberta, there is a need for more women to participate in the professions traditionally held by men. Such participation is essential for Alberta's future, and should be of vital concern to us all. There is no doubt these changes will cause a tremendous upheaval in traditional women's roles. This is a year for recognition of the changing status of women, and the need for equality of opportunity for both sexes. Whether we realize it or not, we are in the midst of a sweep of technological and social change that is rearranging the world around us. The enormous upheaval in societal roles of both men and women is going to place increasing strains on the social structure as we have known it.

Sexual divisions within society once served important functions. They provided the economic benefits of an efficient division of labor, and they clearly defined the place and expected performance of individuals within that system. But society is continually evolving, and the changes the industrial age spurred have thrown the traditional

equilibrium out of balance. An increasingly complex world demands talented individuals to fulfil vital functions.

Society's need for more intelligent, imaginative, and able people has gone beyond the traditional reliance only on the male population. That factor alone, coupled with a growing awareness among women of their changing status, is contributing greatly to the evolution of the female role. Women are now participating in far greater numbers in the work force. It is unfortunate that I could not get more current statistics, so we will rely on those of 1972, inasmuch as I feel that no very significant changes have been experienced since that time. In 1972, there were 2.95 million women working in Canada. Ontario and Alberta had the highest percentage of working women in Canada, with approximately 40 per cent of the eligible women in the province either employed or seeking work in 1972. Effective use of this female labor force will undoubtedly alleviate the labor shortages industrial societies are experiencing in the demand for skilled tradespeople in Alberta, where the skilled-labor shortage is acute, and will, in future, increase.

Clearly, women want to participate in the working world to a greater degree than ever before. But up to this point such ambitions have demanded a considerable pioneering spirit. Women must often contend with the multiple roles of wife, mother, and employee. As our society becomes more fragmented and impersonal, I can envision the woman's role in the family becoming even more important in the future. But if a woman desires to pursue a career, a new concept of professional career seems necessary.

Almost a century of experimentation has been spent attempting to fit women's career patterns into those followed by most men. The results have not been very successful. Women are now seeking to form for themselves a new and more varied conception of career, one which has not existed before and for which there are few patterns available. They have a full-time commitment but don't always plan to work on a full-time basis. They seek a career model which is not success-orientated, but which recognizes their commitment to family responsibilities as an important part of their choice. With the smaller size of families and shorter span of child-bearing, many expect to return to their professional careers at some point in their lives.

To enable women to have this flexibility of career and family options, society and governments must plan superior day care facilities which provide a creative and imaginative environment for the child to develop. Flexible schedules and part-time work must also be a necessary part of the solution. Maternity leave, split jobs and job sharing, educational refresher courses must also form part of this new concept. Such new career patterns might result in more productive and creative work. By developing careers to meet the needs of women today, we may well be pointing the way toward meeting the diverse needs of both the men and women of tomorrow. The most important function of education is to develop the personality of the individual and the significance of one's life to oneself and to others.

I'm sure we will witness a greater emphasis on partnership and family life: equality between husband and wife; joint activities and collaboration in decision-making; and a greater sharing in leisure, political, educational, as well as occupational activities.

What is particularly important, however, is that women should be able to make their choice on the basis of a new personal freedom. They should not be discouraged from realizing their ambitions because of blocked mobility. Success in the professional world should not demand an extraordinary tenacity on the part of women. After all, women make up more than half of the world's population. To ignore their potential for national development as well as their personal aspirations for self-fulfillment will ultimately impede economic and social development.

Let me quote the views of Leonard Read, president of the Foundation for Economic Education, who calls for a new kind of freedom and states that freedom is everyone's business. Why is it everyone's business? Because, he says -- and I would reiterate for myself -- my freedom depends on yours, and yours depends on mine. "We, in our age, are at once social and individualistic beings. And if we fail or refuse to recognize this fact, all will fail together." That was the quote and the view expressed by the president of the Foundation for Economic Education.

Equality of opportunity is far from a reality in women's involvement in the labor movement. Although nearing 40 per cent of the work force, the large majority of women fill the low-status, low-wage labor market. Only a few highly successful women are in the upper end of the occupational spectrum.

In Canada, average industrial wage rates for men exceed those of women in nearly every occupation. The federal Department of Labour has also found that men earn an average annual income that is 107.4 per cent higher than that for women doing identical managerial work. The record is just as dismal when it comes to the question of access to higher-level occupations offering greater challenges and monetary rewards. While women constitute more than 33 per cent of the labor force, only 4.2 per cent of them hold managerial jobs.

The Alberta government, accepting in principle the equality between the sexes, has enacted some progressive legislation. Through our human rights legislation, and through the appointment of the Human Rights Commission, we have taken the necessary first steps toward halting discriminatory practices. The commission has collected compelling statistical evidence that discrimination against women in the province is deeply embedded in society.

The Alberta Women's Institutes has received funds to innovate newer and better ways to organize and involve rural families in planning for their future. The Alberta Women's



Bureau is also continuing to conduct educational and research efforts throughout the province. We are, of course, concerned with the expansion of day care facilities and changes in property laws, as is indicated by the address of His Honor the Honorable the Lieutenant-Governor of Alberta.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that laws can forbid certain kinds of discriminatory behavior on pain of penalty, but we cannot legislate attitudes. Legislation alone will not make the difference. Both sexes need to tailor their attitudes toward a new concept of people's liberation. Altered perspectives now demand that individuals be accepted first of all as people of certain talents and competence, rather than as male or female. Many of the innovations developed to suit women's needs are needed for men as well. They, too, are feeling the impact of new knowledge, new options, and greater personal freedom.

I would suggest, however, that we begin by reassessing our attitudes toward equality of opportunity for women. There are a number of pervasive myths that must be eliminated if women are to assume their rightful share of professional positions. One: turnover among women at management levels is about equal to turnover of male managers. Some women leave to raise families, but most of them will eventually return to the labor force. The majority of male managers change positions at least once every five years. Job mobility is the rule now rather than the exception and applies to both male and female personnel.

Women are not too emotional for management work. We have mistaken the cultural development of women to mean emotional weakness. From our early days, we are taught that boys don't cry, but it is expected of girls. One need only observe the nurses working in a hospital emergency ward to realize that this is a fallacy. Women can cope with roles of wife, mother, and career person. If behind every successful man there is a woman, then behind every successful woman there is a man. The successful woman's family understands and learns to live with added demands on her time.

Social changes in the future will be both perplexing and alarming in their impact and enormity. Joint planning by both sexes is required if we are to effectively cope with these challenges. What will ensue will not be a male-female confrontation, but a co-operative restructuring of role and responsibilities to benefit both sexes.

Mr. Speaker, I feel government must again take the lead, not only in changing legislation, but in changing attitudes. We must provide the necessary mechanism to examine attitudes and procedures followed within the entire structure of government. It is important that the policies of the elected arm are fully understood and implemented by the administration. I have some concern over this latter point. Mr. Speaker, I believe our work has only begun.

Thank you.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure that I open my comments this afternoon by congratulating you on your re-election, and your selection, if I might use that expression, as Speaker of this House. It demonstrates the faith and confidence the 17th Legislature enjoyed in your good office. I wish you well with the 18th Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a word of commendation and congratulation to all members of the Assembly, and to express my best wishes to the Executive Council in the disposition of their responsibilities. We'll do our best, if I may make a personal observation, to assist them.

Mr. Speaker, there are only a couple of points I want to touch on this afternoon, the main one which caused me to rise to speak today, having occurred rather recently.

Before doing that, for the information of new members, since new members regaled the House in many instances with descriptions of their constituencies, I thought it would be useful just to let everyone know that Edmonton Jasper Place takes in the northwest corner of the City of Edmonton to the boundaries, wherever they may be, on the west side. It takes in a rather large industrial sector and the not so well-to-do portion of what was the old Town of Jasper Place. With that come a number of challenges, I guess we could say, to the provincial government and to all governments. It is a consequence of that situation that the first neighborhood improvement program to be nearing completion in Edmonton, is located in Edmonton Jasper Place.

It's also in keeping with the nature of my area that we supply a good number of workers to northern oil fields and other areas around the province, involving particularly the construction trades.

Mr. Speaker, one of my observations during the election campaign was the relative improvement in the position of senior citizens. I say that, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that inflation has ravaged their incomes, as we're well aware. But relative improvement to the point that my priority, at this point in time, is the group of persons which we refer to generally as handicapped persons, either physically or mentally. Handicapped in the sense that they have less opportunity for job seeking and have higher expenses because of their condition.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that over the past three years the government has been involved in some evaluation of what may be possible to assist these people. I personally would like to be advised in due course about the possibility that we may be able to assist in the cost of their equipment, especially wheelchairs and matters of that nature. I know there are some very grave problems in trying to identify and describe in regulations a handicapped person and the requirements of such a person. But I do think if we have difficulty approaching that from the one route, maybe from an administrative point of view we could select the areas of greatest cost, since we're dealing with not that many people, and see if we can remove some of the burden from them. Right now in my constituency, that group of people is probably the most difficult done by in terms of our society.

The next point I wanted to mention relates to housing. Some mention has been made of it, some more will be made of it, and I will take the opportunity later today or whenever it arises to speak to it again. I am prompted to mention it now only because a certain alderman in this city, for the umpteenth time in the last three months, has called for rent controls. Mr. Speaker, I cannot, for the life of me, believe that that is a well-considered suggestion.

I phoned today to the City of Edmonton to get an indication of the building permits which have been issued. I'll confine my comments and statistics to apartment accommodation. In the period January 1 to April 30 of 1973 there were 22 apartment permits issued in the City of Edmonton, for 702 units. In the same period in '74 there were 15, for 280 units. In the same period in '75 there were 9, for a total of 160 apartment units. Now, Mr. Speaker, businessmen generally do not turn a blind eye if there is any opportunity for a return on money. Obviously there is no opportunity, and that is a problem. As one of the people I spoke to at City Hall said, we just cannot find accommodation for people now. I have had contacts from people in my constituency who made the point that we could pay if we could find. Mr. Speaker, if we establish rent control we will have effectively continued the problem that we now have. The basic problem is shortage of accommodation.

There is no question that some people have difficulty affording the rents, but there is also no question that, by and large, the earnings of our population are much higher now than they were three and four years ago. Over that period and until very recently, rental rates did not move. In fact, in many instances the return, in terms of liquid rent cash flow, was not even adequate to maintain the buildings to reasonable standards. The value to the businessmen who owned those properties must surely be in the increased capital value which they could realize if sold.

I want to go on record as being very much opposed to any suggestion of rent control. We may have situations where some people need assistance, need subsidy in terms of their income. But to accept rent control at this stage of the game would simply lock us into a situation in finding accommodation which is even worse than we now have.

Mr. Speaker, the last point I wish to deal with concerns the question which I raised in the Assembly earlier today, the matter of unfair labor practices. Mr. Speaker, I raised the question of a matter of an allegation of unfair labor practice which was brought before the Board of Industrial Relations on February 6 last. The [Alberta] Labour Act says that no trade union and no person "acting on behalf of a trade union . . . shall [and among other things] use coercion or intimidation of any kind [with respect to any employee] with a view to encouraging or discouraging membership in or activity in or for a trade union." It also states that no employee shall refuse to perform work for his employer for the reason that other work was or will be performed, or was not or will not be performed, by any person or class of persons who were or are not members of a trade union or a particular trade union.

Mr. Speaker, we have a situation, as nearly as I can learn, which is a microcosm of what the Cliche Commission found in certain respects in the Province of Quebec. I raise it here because, in my opinion, if it is allowed to continue, it will thwart many of the good efforts of the Department of Business Development; it will deprive certain workers of their choice of freedom in terms of where they work.

Mr. Speaker, I have to give some details about this particular situation. There are basically three main parties involved. The first is The Edmonton Construction Workers Association, Local 63, which was certified on the third day of April, 1969 by the Board of Industrial Relations as a bona fide union. It is affiliated with the Christian Labour Association of Canada. The second concerns a painting contracting firm, Ralph Berkes Painting and Decorating Ltd.; and the union was certified as a bargaining agent for that employer, meaning that union has the recognition to negotiate the wages, rates of pay, et cetera with that employer. The third participant in the particular affair, which seems to be ongoing, is the Painters and Allied Trades, Local 1016, and their business agent is one Mr. Lecuyer.

Mr. Speaker, because of certain statements and activity on the part of that particular union, an application was made on February 6 before the Board of Industrial Relations. Now, I can understand the caution of the Board of Industrial Relations. This is a very difficult area for that board to render a decision. It's a kind of unique area in Alberta. We haven't had much of this. It may be an indication that we are reaching the big time in industrial development. I'm not sure. I hope it isn't necessary for us to have this kind of development as we industrialize. But, in any event, this was unfair -- an allegation was lodged for an investigation and the board has powers to hear it. My understanding is that the board has reviewed the case and they will hopefully render a decision in the near future. Included in the board's powers, I may add, would be, as I read the act, the authority to cause the offending union to cease and desist whatever it's doing, if it's considered desirable.

However, during last week we had a situation, and I guess the best way I can describe it is to tell you where it was and give you some indication of the notes made in the diary of the contractor involved as he recorded the contacts made with him by various people, and the kind of pressure and effort to intimidate, the harassment, the confusion, the coercion, if you will, that was brought to bear on him and on his union. This all takes place, by the way, at Leon's Warehouse Furniture, a large new furniture store which will open shortly, or has opened, I'm not sure which, on the north rim of the City of Edmonton. I won't do any more commercials for them, just so you know where it's located.

On Wednesday, May 21, Mr. Eerkes received a call from a representative of one of the contractor parties, informing him that while he couldn't say where he got the news, he had been advised that there would be a picket line the next morning and that workers would not cross it. At 8:00 p.m. that evening, he received another call to the effect that there would be a picket line and that, because of the difficulties, he may well be subject to suit by other businessmen involved in the construction of that building, because they had deadlines to meet and, obviously, the difficulty that was occurring was construed to be his responsibility, since he had a union which was not acceptable to some people. It should be noted, in passing, that this particular contract did not require that the workers be unionized, so it wasn't what is called "a union contract job".

On Thursday, May 22, at 7:50 a.m., the contractor was on the job site. There were no pickets, but one of the other trades didn't show. At 8:30 a.m. the grapevine advised the contractor that the reason the pickets weren't there was that their signs weren't ready yet -- they were coming. At 10:00 a.m., the electrician's foreman advised our contractor that the electrical union had told their men there would be a picket line, and they were advised to stay home; so no electrician showed up.

There was no picket line, but I want to outline the kind of harassment and the difficulty of nailing it down. At 11:30 a.m., another call was made to the contractor, advising him from another source about the picket line. At 1:10 p.m., the plumbers' union, or somebody alleged to be party to the plumbers' union, effectively communicated that there wasn't going to be a picket line, but there would be the next day and that the plumbers would honor it. So the next day, this past Friday, at 9:30 a.m., only the painters and the floor layers were on the job. In fact, there had been -- and you know what the weather was like here on Friday -- what were reported to be painters carrying picket signs saying that the painters were non-union.

Perhaps I should finish here the recitation of developments. At 10 a.m. our contractor phoned Mr. Lecuyer, the representative, the business agent of the painters' union involved, who was trying to gain recognition to be the representative. There was no conversation because the individual said that he might be charged with illegal labor practice, and so he wouldn't talk.

Mr. Speaker, this is what has happened in the City of Edmonton in the last week. I am advised that it began to occur in 1969 when this union was recognized and treated by the Board of Industrial Relations as a legitimate, fully functioning union competent to represent its employees.

Maybe on that point, Mr. Speaker, I should indicate exactly what is the status of that union versus the International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades. The International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades union rate is \$6.20 an hour for painters, and has been under negotiation for some time. The painters' contract with Mr. Eerkes was \$6.35 an hour while the others were paying \$6.20 an hour, a negotiated \$6.20. It is now \$6.50, and all of the journeymen as such are now making \$6.85 an hour and are negotiating a new contract.

Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker and members of the Assembly, who best represents the interests of its members -- the union with the lower rate, the union which is engaging itself in practices which I would regard as shameful and which ought to bring embarrassment on all unionized labor -- who represents the best interests of Albertans? After all, Mr. Eerkes can pay a higher rate and in a tendering situation gain that contract. Should he not be allowed to continue? Should he and his workers, who are paid more than the other group, not have the opportunity of continuing and of functioning in our society? Mr. Speaker, I leave these little questions with the Assembly. I will watch with interest the decision of the Board of Industrial Relations.

However, before I close, I want to say that during my campaigning I spoke with a number of union people, some very happy, some very unhappy. Some were happy with the government, some unhappy with the government. Some of them said, you know we have reached a situation where many people now are riding on the coattails of some good workers. As one veteran said to me, I didn't go with my buddies and get shot at during the Second World War to protect the kind of thing that's happening on my loading dock. He's a truck driver. He said two out of five do the work, and the other three do the organizing and the complaining. He said we're all in it together, and if we could only work together and everyone accept the responsibilities, we'd have a much better world. He said it in stronger language than I've expressed it, but I'll leave out some of the more colorful expressions.

DR. BUCK: Expletives deleted.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I submit that we have seen some law and order problems in this province, in fact, all over Canada. We have vandalism in our schools, vandalism in the City of Edmonton, to cause us all to be concerned. Is that vandalism any worse than what, I believe, we are encountering here by grown-ups, of mature age, who are conducting themselves in a manner which is intended to intimidate, to embarrass, to harass, and from a statement which I have seen, either to put our independent businessman out of business or else force him to accept a different union?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to offer a few comments on the throne speech debate. It's a real pleasure, Mr. Speaker, for me to have the opportunity today of participating in this debate. As the Member for Drumheller suggested, it offers a wide, wide range of opportunity for discussion.

Before getting into the wide range of topics I may wish to cover, might I offer you, Mr. Speaker, my congratulations on your re-election as the Speaker of this House. I think it serves just as a tribute to the expertise with which you have managed this House over the past four years. Mr. Speaker, I'd also offer my congratulations to all the new members of the House. I'm sure, from the speeches we've heard in the past several days, that each will make an outstanding contribution to the Assembly, during the four or more years they're here.

Also, to the six opposition members opposite, might I extend my congratulations to you on being back here . . .

MR. NOTLEY: . . . the survivors.

MR. MCCRAE: That's right, you are the survivors. As survivors you're going to have a very difficult task indeed. I wish you some degree of success, limited success, in your endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, on coming to this Assembly in June 1973 by way of a by-election, I outlined the geographic area of my constituency and some of the problems that concerned them at that time. I won't go into the geography again, except to say that there are now in excess of 27,000 voters up there -- very wise voters, indeed, I would suggest -- about 8,000 more than we had in June of '73.

Mr. Speaker, when I made my first speech in this House, I believe in October of '73, I listed a number of concerns of my constituency. I'll just go back to four of them at this time. One of them was a freeze on new school construction for elementary students. Another was the concern that the University of Calgary had not, at that time, had a law school announced for the university there. Also many of my constituents, and indeed all Calgarians, were concerned with the health and viability of the oil industry. I think we all remember the extreme concerns abundant in Calgary at that time, recognizing that at least one out of three jobs in Calgary was dependent on a healthy oil and gas industry. Another question I raised at that time, sir, was the shortage of pheasant for hunting friends in Calgary. I raised this in conjunction with some of my southern Alberta friends.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to note that each of these four problems has been in large measure resolved. We have elementary school construction in the new communities of Silver Springs and Dalhousie in the Foothills constituency, and indeed, new school construction in several other areas of the city. Also, a new and innovative law school has been announced for the University of Calgary. In the oil and gas sector the situation is much healthier, much, much more buoyant, and there's a good deal more confidence down there in the oil patch now than there was some months back.

I think we can attribute very much of that, sir, to the efforts made by this government to see that we get a proper return on our depleting resources, a proper and responsible price for the product when it's sold. The ALPEP program which was announced in December of '73 channels a good deal of money back to exploration companies active in the oil and gas sector. These measures did much to restore the confidence and viability of the industry at this time.

I'm happy to note also that there's a new pheasant hatchery under way, or to be under way very shortly in the Brooks area. Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether it was necessarily the quality of the representation made by myself, or/and others, on these many, many questions, or the acumen of the ministers in responding to what they knew were problem areas. But in any event, these areas have been resolved.

Mr. Speaker, some of the problems that concern my constituents right now, and I'm sure many others, are as follows. One is a problem of law enforcement. In some of our communities in the northwest quadrant of Calgary, we've had a rash of break-ins. We've also had a series of rather serious traffic accidents. The tragedy in these areas is that in many, many cases, it is juveniles who are involved. I'm sure there's nothing fundamentally wrong with the juveniles who get mixed up in these things. It is just something that seems to happen. Whether it's the direction their lives are taking or whether they're not kept busy enough, I don't know, but these are problem areas.

Now the concern of the people is, of course, first, the security of their person and property. This can be resolved by such things as neighborhood watch, zone policing, and youth programs as announced by Chief Sawyer in Calgary. The other concern is the direction of our lives. There seems to be a very clear lack of discipline, lack of responsibility, lack of respect for authority. I don't know how we'll resolve that, but with the young I think part of it is to keep them occupied. I think our Project Co-operation, an announcement by this government of a \$200 million fund to be spent over 10 years in conjunction with municipalities, is a good start. It's a very sensible and wise dynamic program. It will put a good deal more recreational and cultural facilities before our young, to keep them occupied. But it isn't the whole answer, sir. It's the right answer in that area, but I'm afraid there are other problems.

Driver problems -- in my opinion there isn't a conscious enough dedication on the part of new drivers as to their responsibilities on the road. I think it's accepted these days as a privilege and a right, whereas maybe we have to get down to the point of emphasizing that it isn't a privilege, and it has some very all-embracing responsibilities. Perhaps we have to go further in restricting the licensing. Maybe we have to have driver training in the schools. I wouldn't have supported that a few years back, but I think I'm reaching the point of believing our young drivers have to have more driver training before they are entrusted on our very, very busy highways with the high-speed vehicles we have today.

Commenting again, sir, on Project Co-operation, the very imaginative program to put cultural and recreational facilities before our people: as significant and worthy as that is, there are still some problems in some of the newer communities where, with inflation and increasing building costs, the newer communities are having difficulty finding the funding to put together their share of a matching dollar contribution to a community building. I'm hoping that at the municipal level some means will be found of getting money to them so they are not faced with raising, say, 50 per cent of the cost of a \$100,000 or \$200,000 community building. A community building is generally identified as the basis for community activities. Without the community building, it's tough to get going the programs which would assist in raising funds. It's sort of the chicken or the egg routine, which do you have first? So I'm hopeful that there will be opportunities of further funding for newer communities to assist them in getting their community halls together.

Another concern in my section of the city and in many areas of Calgary, but particularly in the northwest which is one of the faster growing areas, is the boundary question, or the problem of annexation or growth. Much of the proposed growth in the next several years is anticipated in the northwest quadrant of the city. The people there are concerned with expanding growth, further housing out to the northwest, at the additional stress and strain it will put on the existing transportation corridors and the other facilities there.

If we look to the western boundary in my riding, we have the old Highway 1A coming right to the boundaries of the city. The old Highway 1A is a pretty fine highway right now. It's been newly surfaced and widened so that it properly serves the community, and the area to the northwest that it should service. Within the city boundaries, old Highway 1A is almost a trail. There are countless accidents at the intersections. It is a complete and unnecessary hazard to the citizenry up there. I'm looking forward to efforts by the city, hopefully in conjunction with the province, to upgrade that highway within the city boundaries.

Annexation, sir, as I have said, is one of the several problems facing my constituents. It is hoped, when growth programs, annexation programs, and policies are developed, that they will show due regard and concern for existing communities to see there are not too many additional strains and stresses put on them, and that the transportation and other services up there are properly related to the areas they are going to serve.

Last week, sir, was the occasion on which the municipal council in Calgary brought down their new budget. I suppose what has happened there is not much different from what happens in other communities. The home-owners there are faced with an average 25 per cent increase in taxes, some more and some less. But it's a blow to all of them. I think it simply emphasizes that the municipalities, as well treated as they have been, and they have been well treated by the provincial government -- we have taken over a good many of the social programs and assisted them very healthily with extra moneys each year to assist them in their budgets -- they are, in fact, restricted almost totally to property taxation to fund the programs which it is their responsibility to service. It is to be hoped that the provincial government, upon receiving the recommendations of the Provincial-Municipal Finance Advisory Council, will respond in considering making other sources of revenue available to them, or taking over some of the services that are presently handled by the municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the government on the throne speech. There is a good deal of meat there. It isn't necessarily lengthy in words, but in quality of what is there, I think it's a very meaningful document indeed. It will no doubt be rounded out and fleshed out by the budget speech, which we will see late Friday night. I would like to compliment them particularly on the 28 per cent reduction in income tax, something all citizens will welcome, and something that will assist them in paying their heavier personal property tax bills.

I would also like to compliment our government on the increased worker benefits, announced through amendments to The Workers' Compensation Act; on the assured income plan for senior citizens, which is so important to those on fixed incomes. I would also like to compliment the government on the new departmental organizations, which I think will do a good deal to make our government run even more smoothly and responsibly than it has in the past.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, I'd just like to offer a few words on my responsibilities as Minister Without Portfolio with special responsibilities in the Calgary area. I think all members would accept that a ministership without portfolio does require some definition, although the definition is difficult to come by. In my estimation, and in the government's estimation, it is a challenging opportunity to study and participate in the special problems urban areas have these days. Remember, sir, that Edmonton is the seat of government. Calgary is some 200 miles from here. All urban centres have very special and very complex problems at this date in history. It is with this recognition that I expect to embark on my responsibilities as Minister Without Portfolio working with the other ministers on the complex and difficult problems that face Calgarians.

It isn't necessarily only at the elected municipal level that we will be working. Certainly we'll be working with the appropriate ministries on this side, and the mayor, city council and the other elected officials down there. Also, sir, I plan on being operative with the business organizations, industry organizations, community institutions and groups, and individuals. Any area where there are unresolved problems or overlapping

responsibilities between one ministry and another is where I hope and expect to be involved.

Annexation, growth, municipal finance, transportation, freeway corridors, housing, the concern of many Calgarians about the heavy reliance of the city on the health of the oil and gas industry, and the amount of exploration that goes on in the oil industry for its viability: those are areas I'll be concerned in.

Mr. Speaker, I've outlined some of the problems facing the City of Calgary and, I'm sure, many other urban areas in Canada. I would like to say that all the things going on in Calgary are not problem areas. This year we are celebrating our 100th anniversary as a city, our centennial year. It's a big thing for Calgary, and there are many, many things going on: the restoration of Fort Macleod, tree planting on the downtown streets, history books being written, renovations to McMahon Stadium -- just a host of activities of which your senior government here has assisted in the financing. So I invite all hon. members from outside the Calgary area to come down and join with us, on occasion, in some of the celebrations.

Coming back briefly to my responsibilities as a minister, I think we'll agree that I cannot, at this point in time, define the particular problem areas we'll be working on. Today's problems are not tomorrow's problems, and tomorrow's problems are not today's problems. The problems will come and go as we work on them. I can simply assure the House that I expect it to be a very, very active portfolio. I expect to be busy at it. We expect to do some good at it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[The motion was carried.]

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS  
(Second Reading)

Bill 21 The Unfair Trade Practices Act

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe the hon. Member for Drumheller, Mr. Taylor, adjourned debate on that bill. The Order Paper suggests that was Bill No. 22, but I believe the Member for Drumheller adjourned debate on unfair trade practices and therefore should be called upon at this time to commence his remarks.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on Bill 21. First of all, I'd like to emphasize the fact that, in my view, the Department of Consumer Affairs came into being to protect the consumer against unfair prices and against price gouging. If that wasn't the purpose of creating the Department of Consumer Affairs, I really don't know what the purpose was. I think that is a logical and proper purpose. While free enterprise is a system where we expect various prices for various goods, when competition is not there and when some take advantage of the situation and charge exorbitant prices, it certainly isn't fair to the consumer. The very fact that there was unfair pricing going on in the country, I believe, must have been one of the major factors in bringing the Department of Consumer Affairs into being, both in Ottawa and the Province of Alberta.

Consequently I find it difficult, when I read the section dealing with the purposes of the act -- under Section 4, I notice that one of these unfair practices is where a person is charging too little and then getting people, I suppose, into the store and charging too much on other items. Charging too little is listed as an offence. But I can't see anything in Section 4, which I believe is the primary principle of the bill, which lists as an unfair practice charging too much or gouging. Consequently, I find it difficult to follow, because if that isn't there, what is the purpose of the entire department?

The department must be spending considerable money now in monitoring prices. I find the price lists which come around to our office regularly from that department quite valuable. I find the information contained on the various goods which are checked quite valuable, and it is interesting to see what the trend is in regard to prices. Probably the prime purpose of monitoring is to act as a deterrent to those who would charge too much, and consequently take unfair advantage of consumers.

The other day the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview referred to this matter of antifreeze. Some retailers in this province were known to have charged the price three and four times. Well, I don't think there is any doubt of the price that could be secured where there is proper competition. I don't think there is any doubt at all that that was gouging. I understand the difficulties referred to by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo in The Unconscionable Transactions Act which deals with rents or loans, and how difficult it may be to establish what is or what is not a fair rate of interest. It's difficult, but it's certainly not impossible.

Where right-of-way buyers in the Department of Highways, or other departments, go out to buy land for the government, in many areas there is a number of prices. It's not too difficult for the right-of-way buyer to make a check of all of the prices in that area, and to establish a price that a prudent seller would sell for, and one at which a prudent buyer would buy. That becomes the reasonable price for the land in that particular area.

I haven't seen this upset by any court rulings or any arbitration boards or any departments. It seems logical and sensible that a person who is giving up part of his land should get a fair return, but not an exorbitant return. The Department of Highways can't become Santa Claus to one person simply because some of that land which is going to be acquired is going to be used for the public good. But neither should the owner of that land be expected to be Santa Claus in donating. He should get a fair return.

I think the same principle goes over into the matter of the selling of goods, the selling of the everyday needs of people. Generally where there is competition -- because competition is the lifeblood of free enterprise -- this thing looks after itself, and properly so. That's one of the virtues of free enterprise -- competition. Without competition, you've got monopoly of one kind or another. But if you have competition, effective competition, you have the factors working in a competitive society, in a free enterprise society, which makes it unnecessary for government to intervene. The only reason government has to intervene is when some of those factors are not working for one or other reasons. If competition is working, there is certainly no reason for government to intervene at all.

There are cases in this province, and in this country, where the factors of competition are not working. Consequently, some of the people are being gouged. I don't think there is a better example of that than what happened a few years ago when there was no highway to Fort McMurray. I think the hon. member for Fort McMurray will remember this well. There was a railway and some transport, but only a very minimum amount of air transport at that time. So the people of Fort McMurray were paying right through the nose for freight, on the everyday necessities of life. The cost to the people in Fort McMurray was out of all reason when it was compared to the price people were paying for the same product in Edmonton. It was simply because there was no competition in regard to that competitive freight rate.

So that big jump wasn't being made by the producers, it wasn't being made by the retail industry. It was being made by the railway who, when we checked with them, said: well, there is no competition, so we charge what the market will bear. That was supposed to be quite fair. I didn't think it was very fair for the people of Fort McMurray, and I didn't think it was very fair in the long run for the railway to be doing that. Subsequent events have proven that the railway built up so much ill will that they took a beating after there was competition. Many things that would probably still be going to Fort McMurray by rail are now going by truck, because once the highway was completed to a point where trucks could travel over it, there was some competition. Before that, through no fault of the people of Fort McMurray, there was no competition. So they paid right through the nose. They paid all the market would bear.

There are places in Alberta with similar factors, where there's no competition, where there's no other merchant within a reasonable distance. That has been changed to some degree by the increase of paved roads and so on, so there is some type of competition freightwise, and there's some competition if a person wants to drive 50 or 100 miles to a shopping centre. But the competition in that community may not be there at all, and there's an opportunity for gouging.

Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to pinpoint the fact that, in my view, one of the major items of Consumer Affairs is to watch gouging, particularly where the factors that bring about proper competition are lacking in some form or other. Because when that happens, somebody, and it's generally the consumer who can least afford it, pays right through the nose.

I think the hon. minister should take another look at this matter. I don't want the department to become a police force continually hounding every merchant in the province, but where it is brought to the attention of Consumer Affairs that a price is completely exorbitant, where there's no doubt at all about whether it is conscionable or unconscionable, then the department should have authority to take action.

This list looks to me like it's almost all-inclusive. There's no omnibus clause at the end. The very least I would suggest to the hon. minister is that there be an omnibus clause to take in some of the things that may have been forgotten, some very unfair pricing or unfair tactics which may not be included in that particular list. That's one of the difficulties in setting out a list where you try to enumerate every item that is an unfair trade practice. Perhaps if you included every one, the list would be so long it would fill the law books unnecessarily. I believe there's an omnibus clause to cover at least some of the things that may have been forgotten by even the best minds or the best drafters. If an omnibus clause is not in there, in my view the bill's going to be ineffective in some cases where even the minister will want to take action and will find that he hasn't got the necessary authority to do it.

Last year I heard of a very unfair practice. It may have happened once or many times; only one instance of it came to my attention. A car was wrecked and the owner was a member of the AMA, but the AMA garage in that district had its truck under repair, so the RCMP phoned another garage. This car was hauled less than half a mile. The AMA charge would have been around \$12 or \$13. The garage which was called charged \$50 to take that car less than half a mile. They simply towed it there, did no work on it. If that's not gouging, I don't know what gouging is. But the consumer could do nothing. There are no teeth in the Department of Consumer Affairs so they could take action. He simply had to swallow it and dig up the money. But, in my view, that person should have been nailed for gouging. And if once or twice it has happened in this way, it doesn't happen too often afterwards.



Without laboring this any further, I'm going to ask the hon. minister if he will consider doing something about the unfair prices. Make it doubly unfair if you want to, before you call it gouging, but let's have something to cover the gouger who's out to get every pound of flesh and every jot of blood that's possible, without any concern for the damage he's doing to the people who are forced to buy. That type of person is no credit to free enterprise and no credit to the country. They are making money at the discomfort of others. In my view, they should be prosecuted. If we can't get something that will satisfy the law people in that regard, then surely at least an omnibus clause, so that when something outstanding comes to the attention of the department they will not say, well, we would like to but we haven't got any teeth in the act. There are times when this department is going to need teeth, sharp teeth, teeth that will bite.

I recognize many of the things the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo mentioned the other night. It is possible that this act could become a detriment to the consumer if it's not administered carefully. But by the same token, it can be useless to the consumer if there aren't reasonable teeth to bite when a bite is required, when there are definite instances of gouging, charging very, very unfair prices.

The other thing that I'd like to deal with for just a moment is the matter of penalties. Maybe the minister has an explanation for this, maybe the penalties are set out in another act, but I would think that anybody who reads this act should have some idea what the penalties for these offences of unfair trade practices would be. I agree with the mediation. I think this is excellent. The more things we can keep out of our courts, the better it will be. If we can settle this quietly, I think that's the way to do it. But sometimes it can't be settled quietly. Sometimes it has to go to court. One of the things that would help some, at least, to be more reasonable in settling quietly with the department would be to know what the penalty would be if they didn't settle quietly, if they didn't rid themselves of this unfair trade practice, whatever it was, and try to work in harmony with society and with the Department of Consumer Affairs.

I would like to see something in here about penalties because at the present time, as I read the bill, I don't see anything along that line at all.

I would like to ask also, in connection with the third item in regard to exemptions, under Section 14, where an exemption can be given -- I'm hoping that isn't going to be an exemption for the purpose of permitting an unfair trade practice. I hope the department will never put itself in the position of granting an exception to someone or other, or some group or other, to commit an unfair trade practice. They must have had something in mind in putting that section in the act. I would appreciate it greatly if he would deal with that when he's dealing with the bill in closing the consideration of the principle in second reading.

I believe those are all the points I had in mind with regard to Bill 21.

MR. KING: I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### Bill 24 The Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act, 1975

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move second reading of The Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act, 1975, in matters relating to the principle of the bill, I think it may be advantageous for members of the House to understand some of the background behind the bill in order that they might understand the urgency for the amendment that is presently before the House in Bill 24.

Although it's an amendment to The Landlord and Tenant Act, Mr. Speaker, what in fact we are dealing with in this particular amendment is the impact of condominium housing particularly upon our main cities in the Province of Alberta.

Condominiums are somewhat new to our environment here in this province. Last year in the City of Edmonton, some 322 condominiums were sold as units within the city under MLS listings. However, the advent of condominiums is rising, due to a very tight rental market, a drop-off of construction, and rising rents that are being experienced in our cities.

The confusion relating to the aspect of condominiums within Edmonton and Calgary is readily exemplified by the difficulties that the planning commissions in both Edmonton and Calgary are experiencing, as many existing buildings are coming before these planning commissions with the suggestion that they be converted into condominiums from prior rental accommodation. The planning commissions and the province are concerned that it is removing normal rental accommodation from the market, and it is causing great concern both in Edmonton and Calgary. As a result of their concerns, the planning commissions have endeavored, in an innovative way, to place restrictions and inhibitions upon the conversion of existing apartment blocks into condominiums, all of which are probably unlawful, and all of which are probably beyond the control of the planning commissions. But it seems that they are doing it, in any event, in order to try to deal with what they regard as a very difficult problem.



Mr. Speaker, I think if one were to analyse the difficulties our cities are experiencing now with respect to housing, and if one were to examine the recent reports of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, one will see the difficulty our housing markets are facing in Edmonton and Calgary, which brings the requirement from the point of view of a bill of this nature.

The housing starts -- the apartment starts -- have dropped off tremendously in the last year. Rents are rising, and as a result, landlords are now looking very seriously to the conversion of their apartment blocks into condominiums. This has a very serious effect upon the tenants in the buildings. The effect is that they, of course, are receiving notice from the landlords. The notice is telling them they must be out of their suites in 30 days. They have 30 days to find additional accommodation in a very restricted market, not because they have done anything wrong, not because they have been in breach of any of the conditions of their rental agreement with the landlord, not because they have not been paying rent or the like, but merely because they happen to be in a building which the landlord has decided shall be converted into a condominium. As a result, they are receiving notices requiring them to vacate the premises within 30 days.

It is the view of the government, Mr. Speaker, that this is an unreasonable position in which to place tenants in a very tight rental market. As a result, Bill 24 is presented to the Legislature for consideration. It requires landlords to provide 6 months notice to tenants, in the event that it is their desire to convert a building from a normal rental-type of accommodation into a condominium.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very reasonable approach for the interim. I am not suggesting for a moment that restrictions should be placed on landlords from the point of view of stopping them from converting rental accommodation into condominiums, because I would personally regard that as being a very short-run approach to a much more complex problem.

For those who contemplate suggestions that we should be putting these inhibitions upon conversions and restricting them, all one need do is look to the disastrous example, again in the Province of British Columbia, where the municipalities placed controls upon conversions, and placed a moratorium upon the conversions of existing apartments into condominiums. The result was less construction and many unhappy landlords and tenants. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the inevitable solution to problems of this nature is more construction of all kinds of rental accommodation, of condominium accommodation, and of housing. I know the hon. Minister of Housing is seriously involved in embarking upon new programs in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, may I suggest that the principle of Bill 24 is really what I refer to as a stop-gap measure to be dealt with because of an existing problem that has risen very quickly in the province. I am happy to report that the study group appointed by the hon. Mr. Dowling, and now the hon. Mr. Harle through Consumer Affairs, is actively at work examining all aspects of condominium legislation, in the hopes that some recommendations will be forthcoming to the government, certainly later this year. It would be hoped that within these recommendations will be many other factors and problems that exist relative to condominiums, as they have come upon our society so quickly, particularly in Calgary and Edmonton. I certainly would not profess to suggest that this amendment is anything more than a stop-gap measure to meet an emergent need. I state it in the hope that in the not too distant future a much more comprehensive landlord and tenant act will be forthcoming for consideration by this Legislature, and in other than the form presented by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands last year which was . . . [laughter] My emotion restricts me from stating my views on that one.

It is also to be hoped in the not too distant future, Mr. Speaker, that we will be considering as well a much more comprehensive and up to date condominium act. Indeed, I think all members agree that what is needed now are complete revisions of both pieces of legislation to meet the urgent needs of our community, and I hope that all hon. members will consider this present amendment as being merely of a stop-gap nature to fill a difficult situation, in contemplation of much more comprehensive legislation which I hope will be forthcoming in the not too distant future.

[The motion was carried. Bill 24 was read a second time.]

#### Bill 7 The Department of Manpower and Labour Amendment Act, 1975

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in moving second reading of Bill 7, The Department of Manpower and Labour Amendment Act, 1975.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have to draw to the hon. members' attention that one of the principles of the bill is that it gives effect to some of the organizational changes that follow upon the post-election reorganization of the Executive Council in the Province of Alberta. And, it might be said, that with a companion piece of legislation that my colleague, the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower will deal with in due course, this achieves the transfer of the responsibilities for manpower out of the Department of Labour where they had been since 1972. Mr. Speaker, speaking for myself, I'm looking forward to an opportunity to concentrate on a more specific area of the field of labor than my predecessor might have had with the many responsibilities that he carried at that time in respect to manpower, and I think to his and my satisfaction, he still has.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the thing that means a great deal to me in this bill is that it will give the opportunity to do extremely important work in the area of industrial safety and health. I wanted to look at that aspect of the bill next, for a few minutes if I might. My impression of the role played through the Department of Health and Social Development, as it then was, in regard to the industrial health division, was that maybe the original concept of that division had not been changed over the years as things developed and people began to be aware in industry, and certainly in organized labor, that some of the concerns were not only health in the sense of -- some of the examples we had would be people inhaling in a particular job, a type of thing that would be damaging to the lungs; this is a matter of industrial health. But you had one agency in the factory dealing with that and another agency, also from the government, dealing with the question of safety. There seemed to be something fractured about the role or the responsibility the government was attempting to assume in its concern for the worker in that particular plant.

One of the things, too, that was said to me from time to time while I had the responsibility of what was the industrial health division, was that the government had made some progress in the concern people have over environment, and whether that is safe for people who are obliged, or have chosen, to live in the vicinity of an industry.

So you had the interesting challenge being thrown to the government: we were looking very well after the people on the other side of the plant fence, with our controls over the smokestack and whatever other things the plant might be throwing off; but lo and behold, the fellow who's inside for eight hours a day, or whatever, might not be getting the same concern or attention, in any event. Once again, it seemed that, however well done -- and I think many things were well done by the division in the Department of Health in regard to industrial health -- maybe there were areas that were not being looked after, not gone into and not brought fully up to date and made contemporary in the sense that they should.

I mentioned earlier the feeling the workman was probably entitled to have: that he had perhaps one government agency regulating the things that related to his health in the plant, and another one on accident prevention through another government agency. Yet he was the same workman in the same location.

These were the sorts of things that were being talked about. As a result, my colleague, who is now the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, caused the important study on industrial health and safety in the Province of Alberta to be commenced in 1974, I believe. That commission reported, of course, in early 1975 if my recollection of the date is right. There was much discussion of that report, and the government has received many expressions of support for the recommendations.

One of the expressions of support, which I think the government is willing to react to early in the stage of reviewing that commission's report, is the recommendation that, in effect, all the responsibility for both health and safety be brought together in one government agency. Now, it's well known that one of the recommendations was that a separate department be established. The government has not felt it was necessary to go that far in regard to the establishment of a separate ministry. However, that doesn't rule out most of the other consequences of what may well be an opportunity for bringing together the three or four government agencies that have interests in this field.

What we are proposing at the present time, Mr. Speaker, and what I think hon. members probably should have by way of a progress report, is that I hope in the coming months to be able to say quite definitively what decisions are being made and, in due course, what decisions have been made on each and every one of the recommendations of the Commission on Industrial Health and Safety.

Now that is stopping short of saying that the decision has been taken to bring together the agencies in the Energy Resources Conservation Board, the agency in the Workers' Compensation Board, and the agencies involved in the Department of Labour's Inspection Services and the former division in the Department of Health and Social Development in regard to industrial health. It stopped short, Mr. Speaker, of saying that those will, in all events, be brought together in one agency.

However, what is being actively pursued at the present time is the list of expected difficulties, if any, in proceeding in that way. What we are going to be doing, before coming back with final proposals with respect to the bringing together of those agencies, is something that will require a little bit of time. I, myself, have every hope it is something that can be done during this year and that a great deal of it can probably be done during the summer months.

That would leave us in the position where we would have the best forecast we can get of any difficulties there might be with respect to bringing matters to a single agency, presumably within the Department of Labour. Then I would hope that, regarding the matter at that time, everyone would be willing to look carefully at the question of disadvantages if there are any, so that our judgments are reserved in that respect. But if it is possible and advisable [the agencies] would, in fact, be brought substantially together within a reasonable time.

I hope there would be advantages in doing that, which would outweigh any disadvantages. I hope that the willingness to make change, where it is shown to be justifiable, will be sufficient to overcome any feelings that perhaps we could still get along with some of the disadvantages there may have been in having divided responsibilities. But as I say, Mr. Speaker, those are the issues that do require some further examination, and they will certainly have that examination.

So what we have in Bill No. 7 is a partial but very important step. The intention of what is put forward there is that the very significant part of the industrial health division of the former Department of Health and Social Development should, in effect, be transplanted with all of its authorities and powers to the responsibility of the Department of Labour. That's a very significant step, and it really brings together two of the four areas into one department.

Most of the language in Bill 7, insofar as it relates to industrial health and safety, is directed at assuring that the actual powers of the former agencies, which included some of the powers of the Provincial Board of Health in regard to the making of orders, would be brought into this bill in such a way that the same work could be done through the Department of Labour. It was not intended at this stage to begin to expand upon what was the previous base. But it is intended to move quickly to bring it into an area where co-ordination might be better -- it might be possible to do it better.

Much of the language, therefore, Mr. Speaker, is similar to the sort of language in The Workers' Compensation Act in regard to their responsibilities, and therefore the roles of accident prevention and industrial safety on the one hand, and the role of industrial health on the other hand, are being matched up more and more.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps one other principle of the bill deserves some comment. The consequential amendments as they appear throughout involve several other statutes, but those mainly make language corrections. No corrections of great substance are involved in them.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, making one or two comments with regard to Bill No. 7, I'd like to say, first of all, that one of the most disappointing things that's occurred in this session to this point is the fact that we have heard in a document that was just accepted -- a short one just a few moments ago, in this Assembly -- and in other remarks, about the reshuffling and changing of different departments of government. But one of the things we have not heard from anyone, neither from any of the ministers nor from the Premier as the leader of this government, is an overall purpose and direction the government is going to take. We have heard not one single word about the reason for reshuffling every one of these departments.

To me, if the departments are going to be reshuffled, if civil servants are going to be shoved here and there without even knowing what they're doing . . . Over the past month I've had the opportunity more than once to phone civil servants and say, look, give me some information on this thing. I don't know who I'm working for today. I phoned another civil servant. We needed a transaction completed, just a routine transaction. I remember he said, I don't even know which minister to give this transaction to. He said, I haven't even got a deputy minister.

There is just no purpose at all; it's laid out. We have a minister standing before us this afternoon saying, look, here are some of the things I'm shuffling around. I happen to have grabbed this thing out of the old Department of Health and Social Development, and I'm going to do something about it. That's wrong too, because he also said, it's going to take me a long time, maybe into fall, when I start to do something about industrial health. And a report has been set before us. We've all got that report. We've got recommendations, a lot of recommendations. He's going to take some time to look at them.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of problems in the industrial health area that have to be looked at today. There's a lot of work that has to be done. All we're talking about is reshuffling, and we're going to do this, and we're considering, and we're going to take till fall. That's not the way it's got to work. I think if the Premier were in this House at this time, he should be speaking on this bill and saying, the reason this bill is here is that it fits into our overall plan as a government for the best of Albertans. We've heard nothing about that -- exactly zero in this Assembly. The people of Alberta have heard nothing about it.

In the last election we talked about guidelines and directions, just for a little thing like the heritage fund which amounted to \$1.5 billion. We never got them. We came to this Assembly expecting some good news, some directions, some aggressiveness -- nothing but milquetoast attitude. The new members came here all excited, and all full of energy and aggressiveness, to see the members who were old-timers really act, see the cabinet ministers show some direction. We've only got about 4 or 5 out of 22 here this afternoon.

MR. NOTLEY: Twenty-four.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Out of 24. Sorry, 2 slipped in while I wasn't watching. All of these here [interjections] just that few people.

What's Alberta going to do in the next 5 or 6 months? We're just going to shuffle along, shuffle the departments here and there, move a civil servant, have a nice summer holiday. Maybe in the fall we'll do something.

MR. CLARK: If there are no objections.

MR. R. SPEAKER: If there are no objections. That's the way this government is going. As I've said, we have the minister again going on for 10 or 15 minutes telling us about a Department of Manpower and Labour. He hasn't even established one principle upon which that department is built, not one principle that co-ordinates with what is supposed to be an overall principle -- not one. He talked about a couple of piecemeal things which are

going to be added, and how the previous minister had done something that might be carried on; we're not sure.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's good enough. I think as legislators we had better get down to business. We have been here for a week and a half. We have tried to see some direction from government. We've seen none. We wait for the first act to come in and to talk about the principle of a direction of departments -- nothing. Exactly zero. Practically a waste of our time, Mr. Speaker.

I think it's time the government started doing its homework. There may be only six of us on this side to tackle them, and question them to get them to do their work, but I think they had better remember they are not responsible to the six of us sitting on this side of the House. They are responsible for their job to the people of Alberta. That's what we want them to do. I think, as Albertans, we deserve better than this, talking about shuffling, talking about passing things back and forth, the little things they are going to do. I would say they don't really know what they are doing to do. Maybe in the backwoods or the back room there is some American consultant who is telling them what to do. Maybe that's what's happening. Maybe they are waiting for the next word to come out.

Mr. Speaker, it doesn't seem like any minister, or the Premier, really knows where they are going. I don't think any of the new members have told this government where they want it to go. Maybe we will have to wait for four or five years so the people of Alberta can give them the word. But, Mr. Speaker, that's the thing we want to talk about in principle; the direction of government, the direction of labor, what they are going to do in union relations, what they are going to do about labor relations. What are they going to do about the many hours of time lost in the Province of Alberta because of labor stoppages, people off the job, and things like that?

We heard the Prime Minister say the other day that Canada is second only to Italy in the amount of time lost. I don't think Alberta is that much greater that we can just move along and cautiously roll along, put it off, procrastinate. That's what this government is becoming, one government of procrastination. Nice, easy going. But somewhere along the line, Mr. Speaker, the arrogance that goes with that kind of attitude is going to catch up to them.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it's time we got down to business. We have the rest of this month and most likely June to do it. I think as members of this Assembly that's what we want. I certainly think that's what we on the opposition side want to hear from government; direction from the Premier, and that direction followed and emphasized by the cabinet ministers so we know what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

[The House recessed at 5:30 p.m.]

\* \* \* \* \*

[The House reconvened at 8 p.m.]

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS (continued)  
(Second Reading)

Bill 7 The Department of Manpower and Labour Amendment Act, 1975 (continued)

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, as I continue my remarks with regard to Bill 7, I would like to re-emphasize that I feel it's very, very necessary that in order to judge and decide the legitimacy of the principle of each one of these bills before us with regard to shuffling and reshuffling departments, putting civil servants in different areas, giving ministers different responsibilities, we should know the overall purpose of this government. I think that is the most important thing at this point in time. How can we judge the principle of this bill when we really don't know where the government is going. How can the government tell us what they're going to do with this bill when they really don't know where they're going.

The only way we can judge whether they know where they're going is if the Premier or the Deputy Premier, who is representing the Premier at this time, stands in his place. I think the opportunity to start is on this bill, because this is the first bill to talk about departmental reorganization, the first bill in second reading. Certainly, if that kind of information could be given to us, we as members of this Assembly could judge, could vote with a lot more objectivity, sincerity, and, most likely, a lot more excitement about the great direction this government is going to take us in the next year or two. I think, Mr. Speaker, that's very, very important.

So to conclude, I'd certainly like to encourage the Deputy Premier to give us the information as to where he would like to see this government going if he were sitting in spot number one.

However, at this point in time, I see the Premier is coming into the Assembly, and I think I'd just like to recap those remarks, if I could, for the hon. Premier.

AN HON. MEMBER: Go ahead.

AN HON. MEMBER: Start over again.

AN HON. MEMBER: They've all come to the Assembly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Premier, in speaking to Bill 7 before us, I felt that in order to judge Bill 7 and other bills of similar nature with regard to health, social services, culture, youth, recreation, and transport, what we should understand and know a little bit more about, as members of this Assembly, is the overall thrust, if I can use that word, that the Premier has in mind for the government in the next year or two as he reorganizes these departments. I feel it's very important that we understand that, because each one of these departments is part of the whole. In order for the minister to describe his direction, his principles, what he wants to do with the department, he has to describe how his ideas fit into the overall direction this government is taking.

I would certainly like to call on the Premier at this time, if he could, to give us some remarks with regard to that. As I've said, since this is the first departmental bill before us, I certainly think those kinds of remarks would be very opportune.

Thank you.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to respond to the hon. Member for Little Bow with regard to the reorganization. My only concern in responding is whether the Chair and the members would allow me to go beyond the particular bill before the House so I could deal with all the matters of reorganization that are implicit.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think it's easier to handle the matter in terms of the nature of the various departments by running through them in a brief summary by way of the changes and the highlights of those changes in terms of our approach to reorganization.

I believe what we have in mind in terms of the new Department of Transportation is fairly clear. It's been our feeling for many months now, essentially from the Western Economic Opportunities Conference, that transportation is the key to the future industrial strategy of this province, and that a reorganization of the transportation aspects of the government is required. We took the view that the Department of Highways essentially was involved with the construction operation and should fit as a branch, or a division if you like, of a larger and broader structured Department of Transportation, which would bring within its ambit not just the construction of highways, but all aspects of transportation. This would involve, of course, matters of urban transportation, which involve both rapid transit and alternate transportation uses by way of mass transportation; also, of course, the matter of parkways or potential access to or around the metropolitan areas.

We felt as well, in the areas of transportation, that we should incorporate under one department the whole areas of rail and air transportation. This brought us to the policy matters that arise out of the nature of freight rates, freight transportation, and economic analysis. Therefore we brought together a new Department of Transportation. It took from the former Department of Industry and Commerce the research and analysis section that was involved there. The Department of Highways established a policy organization, as the estimates will show. The minister is charged with responsibilities for Pacific Western Airlines and the Alberta Resources Railroad and, in total, a transportation department for the Province of Alberta on an overall encompassing basis. We felt that would be a useful improvement.

The second department which was involved was essentially a merger of the former Department of Lands and Forests and the Department of Mines and Minerals. Here, we looked at the question of resources. We found ourselves, on many occasions, with a situation involving resources where the renewable resources evolving from our forest products and arising from our land tended not to be given the same weight as our non-renewable resources, important as they are today and for the future. Hence we felt it would be very useful if we could merge the forestry and the lands sections from the Department of Lands and Forests with the mines and minerals and have a Department of Energy and Natural Resources, which would look at the resources of this government and of the people in an overall way.

We took from the former Lands and Forests Department certain aspects that I will mention later on. But it is the merger of energy and natural resources of the former Department of Mines and Minerals and Department of Lands and Forests that's implicit in that particular operation of that department. Hence, we have in essence a merger of two former departments.

There was no change in the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. In regard to the Treasury Department, we are involved there with moving a number of various aspects from Treasury, into Government Services. We felt it was very important for the Provincial Treasurer to have the time to concentrate on financial management, on economic

forecasts, and on the economic future of the province, and to be relieved of those responsibilities that were formally under the Provincial Treasurer. I think, in particular, of areas such as the purchasing agency, the data processing, and others of that nature which were essentially services to other government departments.

The only change with regard to the Attorney General that I'd comment upon at this time -- and I might add in passing that I will miss some in this overall brief review in response to the matters raised by the Member for Little Bow, but they will no doubt come up through the estimates and the review of the estimates because they'll be set forth in the estimates -- was a shift in the administrative responsibility for the Public Utilities Board to the Attorney General. We felt that although there is a Minister of Utilities and Telephones who is very much involved in this area, to a large degree you have [in] the Public Utilities Board a quasi-judicial function, and it would be important, because of its judicial nature, to come under the responsibility of the Attorney General [for] whatever administrative requirement is involved for the provincial government, although we do our best, as the previous government did, to assure that it's an independent body and makes its independent decisions.

The act involving the Minister of Labour that I understand is before the House and is being discussed, has the aspect of looking at matters of labor in a way that -- we felt this was a portfolio [in which], to a very large extent, the minister should be free from the longer term planning function involved in manpower; it is a planning function -- the Minister of Labour should be involved in today's problems involving matters of industrial relations and, of course, put heavy emphasis, as the Commission on Health and Safety suggested, on this area of occupational safety. He would have the time to do that if he was relieved from the responsibilities for manpower. For that reason, we have shifted to the Minister of Labour, as has been noted in the bill, the responsibility, formerly under the Department of Health and Social Development, involving occupational health. The essence there is to have charged with the responsibility a Minister of Labour who can be on top of the evolving industrial relations situation in the province, [who] will have the time to concentrate on occupational safety, and [who] can leave the planning function of manpower to another minister.

With regard to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, that essentially involves the same responsibilities as the former Minister of Health and Social Development, with one important change. No longer is that minister charged with the responsibility for the administration of hospitals and responsible for the Hospital Services Commission that is such a large amount of our provincial budget. There is a need, therefore, to restructure the name, and that is the need for the concept of having a name of Social Services and Community Health. Members will be aware, as we proceed with the estimates, of the important co-ordination that will be needed between the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care and the Minister of Social Services and Community Health in the community health area, because there is a great deal of overlap.

Frankly, we looked at the question, and I am sure the previous government looked at it very carefully before they merged the former departments of welfare and health under one minister. We looked at it very carefully. We discussed a number of options. Although the former minister did an outstanding job under great pressure, it was our judgment that it would be better, in terms of the ability of a minister to handle that portfolio, to do a reassignment of responsibilities and make it more manageable for one person.

Certainly the mail that I receive in my office indicates it is a fair comment to say that 40 per cent of my referral mail in the 17th Legislature went to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Sixty per cent of it went to all the other ministers with portfolio. For that reason, we felt it would be important, because of the very significant areas members will discuss as we debate the bill regarding a Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, to have a minister charged with that direct responsibility to improve the quality with some careful attention to cost and cost control, in the future to have a Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. That minister is responsible, therefore, for the administration of both the Hospital Services Commission and the medical care commission. We felt that was an appropriate dividing of very heavy responsibilities that formerly fell on the shoulders of the Minister of Health and Social Development.

We felt, and we said during the course of the campaign, there was a growing need for housing in the province to have a separate ministry. That was the reason for having a Minister of Housing and Public Works who would have the president of the Alberta Housing Corporation and perhaps, in due course, as he will be discussing in the House, an Alberta mortgage corporation, responsible to him. We felt, because of the heavy construction impact involved with that particular minister, it would be useful to divide the former public works department in parts, and take one part of it, being the construction portion of the former Department of Public Works, and fit it with the Minister of Housing and Public Works. We felt that was the logical tying together of responsibilities.

The next minister on my list is the Minister of Environment. The only thing I could mention there is that it is under review by the government through a number of task forces and cabinet committees. As to whether the land division of the Department of Lands and Forests should be transferred, in part or in total, from the Department of Energy and Natural Resources to the Department of Environment, and perhaps to the Department of Agriculture, that decision has not yet been made. It's one of the few outstanding decisions of the reorganization.

The Minister of Agriculture -- there are a number of changes reflected, in due course, in the estimates, but the only really significant change was that the co-operative activities branch was shifted to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

We felt that the Minister of Advanced Education could well handle the planning manpower aspects that were formerly within the Department of Labour. For that reason it was in the portfolio both in terms of workload and its function in terms of advanced education to tie together the manpower function. We recognized the concern in the university community that there would be a feeling of overemphasis on the manpower or vocational aspects and a de-emphasis of the academic. I think it's clear, both by the selection of the minister and the attitude of the government, that that's not so.

With regard to the Minister of Education, there was little or no change. With regard to the Solicitor General, there was the assumption of the responsibilities coming out of the former Department of Highways that dealt with the whole area involving automobile licensing. This was a difficult decision. There are still some details to be worked out in the reorganization between the Department of Highways and the Solicitor General. Essentially we felt the Solicitor General should be involved in the licensing function, involving vehicles, that was formerly carried on by the Department of Highways. In addition to that, the responsibilities, again because of the licensing function with regard to the Liquor Control Board, came under the Solicitor General.

The Minister and Department of Business Development and Tourism was essentially a merger, a recognition by the people in the travel industry in the province that we should give greater weight to the opportunities in tourism than we have in the past; perhaps not leave it with a minister without portfolio, tie it in not as a separate department or under a separate minister, but in the total business development of the province. We therefore had a fairly significant restructuring of the former Department of Industry and Commerce. Most of the functions are with the present Department of Business Development and Tourism, with the responsibilities for Travel Alberta also with that minister. That minister is charged with the Alberta Export Agency, and it would be our view, and our hope, that a heavy emphasis by that department would be the development of small business opportunities through responsibility for the Alberta Opportunity Company in rural Alberta, and in our industrial strategy which we outlined in the Legislature last fall.

The Minister of Utilities and Telephones is little changed from the former situation except for a name change to give greater emphasis to the utilities function over the telephones. I don't intend by that to imply that the telephone one isn't very important, but we felt that it would be necessary for public communication to deal with the emphasis on utilities and telephones.

We then felt the need to set up a Government Services Department. That department, of course, will be responsible for a multitude of services to the public generally and to the other departments. It will involve, from the public works area, the whole area of the maintenance of public buildings, the provision of office space when the office space is not involved in recreation, the data processing centre, which is essentially a service to other government departments, the purchasing agency, the Bureau of Public Affairs, the Queen's Printer, and a number of others. It's a new department, but the concept is to bring together those items of government services that would fit better under one umbrella.

We have felt for some time now that recreation, parks and wildlife made a logical combination. Certainly, it has been our view that parks, under Lands and Forests, and wildlife, under Lands and Forests, and recreation and the youth aspect of the former Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation could well be brought together because of the importance of recreation in the life of our people. Therefore, a merger of these various aspects, putting culture aside and leaving it under the responsibility of the Minister of Government Services, who has handled it so ably and so well for the government in the past number of years, and then having a Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife would make good sense to our citizens.

A very interesting thing that is developing there -- I'm not sure I'm ahead of the Estimates on this one -- is the bringing together of the whole question -- I think it was raised in the House previously by the Member for Little Bow -- of the matter of the campsites and the campgrounds under one ministry instead of separated in part by the former Department of Highways and former Department of Lands and Forests. We've seen the various matters, which the hon. member raised in the House, of the disparity, at times, that's occurred.

The Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has had transferred to its jurisdiction the Securities Commission and other functions of a similar nature, as well, as I mentioned, the co-op activities branch. Essentially though, it is a follow-through of what has been developed over the past period of time.

This has permitted the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Department of Municipal Affairs in the future to be concentrating on the matter of provincial-municipal financial reform and the area of municipal government without having the very heavy added burden, which the former minister had, involved in housing.

The other things I could mention, in general summary, involve The Disaster Services Act, which remains under the Deputy Premier, the responsibility for native affairs, which is a charge on a minister without portfolio. The other two ministers without portfolio are involved in general responsibilities assigned from time to time by the Executive Council.

Mr. Speaker, I may have done that too rapidly, but perhaps it's helpful as the hon. members pursue the debate in the House with regard to the various matters of legislation in the reorganization.



MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two in connection with the general matters mentioned by the Premier, if that is permissible, and in connection with this particular bill.

As far as this bill is concerned, I certainly agree with the principle of it. That principle is, to prevent accidents. I don't think there can be any better objective for the Department of Labour than to prevent accidents. It saves a lot of human agony. It saves a lot of dollars and cents. Every accident that can be prevented is not only money saved, but family lives saved. Accidents sometimes break up homes where it becomes an economic matter, because the husband is no longer able to work. So, I think the further we can go in preventing accidents, the better it's going to be.

This fits right in with the general objectives of the compensation board also. I like the program where inspectors are able to go into any plant and look it over from a safety point of view and point out the potential dangers of chains and so on. Nobody will ever know how many lives it will save or how many hands or eyes it will save, but I'm sure most of us are satisfied that the more that is done in that regard, the more money that is spent on prevention, will mean far less that will have to be spent on trying to salvage human lives that have been crippled because of faulty machinery or potential dangers.

There is one other thing I would like to say in connection with the overall set-up of the government and the change of ministers. During the election campaign, I had people raise this during question periods because the hon. Premier had made it known before, which I think was a good thing. I misunderstood the matter when I first started to campaign. I thought there were going to be only a few portfolios changed. But at one meeting, several agricultural people were quite up in arms because they had heard that the hon. Dr. Horner was being moved out of Agriculture. I told them I didn't think so. In my view he was the best Minister of Agriculture we had ever had in the province. I say that because he's earned that through hard work and through the policies he initiated, and the people generally agreed. However, before I went back to that community a second time, I found that there was going to be a complete change of portfolios. So I had to apologize to the people about some misinformation I had given them. There is still quite a bit of concern.

Another point that was raised at another public meeting was the load that the Minister of Health and Social Development was carrying. This was raised by several women in the constituency. I don't know why it was always women, unless they know more about social development and health, and maybe because there is such a nice-looking minister there. But, anyhow, they wanted this thing changed. They said nobody should have to carry a load like that. I'm very happy now to be able to write to some of those people and tell them that some of the load has been taken off the Minister of Health and Social Development, even though the minister has been changed. I think it was a good idea to put hospitals and medicare into a different portfolio. These are very, very important items. They affect the lives of thousands, well, of our entire population, so I think that's a good point.

Now, one or two things I would like to say. I was glad to see freight rates and economic analysis moved back into Highways. It took me several years to persuade the previous government to put freight rates and economic analysis into Highways, and we had it there only a relatively short time before the government was -- well it changed back either before or just after the change of government, I believe. But I felt that freight rates and economic analysis had a very definite bearing on the building of highways, and certainly on other modes of transportation. So I commend the Premier for putting freight rates and economic analysis back with the Department of Highways. This is going to be good for the province, and it ties in with the building of highways. The economic analysis and the matter of freight on one line might very well have something to do with where a highway will be built and to what specifications you build that highway.

The other thing about highways: where we had conflict for several years between Lands and Forests and the Department of Highways, and I mean conflict between the ministers and between the departments themselves, was over the building of roads and bridges. The Department of Highways had the set-up for building roads and bridges, yet there was a minor branch in Lands and Forests that was building roads and bridges too. Sometimes we were able to build the bridge for Lands and Forests, but many times there was departmental jealousy, and they insisted on building structures themselves, much to the chagrin of many of the highly trained engineers in the Department of Highways as to the standard to which they were being built.

Not only that, but it cost the people money. Sometimes we had two contracts being called in the same area about the same time, and two different contractors, one getting a contract with Lands and Forests, the other a contract with the Department of Highways. As a result, both had to move their equipment into the area, and there was a loss of public money on that account. In my view, the present set-up should save thousands of dollars over the years -- well, maybe millions of dollars over the years -- by having the building of roads and bridges in one department. I think this is a sensible thing. We could never get that arranged, although some of us in the previous government strongly urged it. We were never able to persuade either of the Premiers that that was a good move. I think it's wise that this is done. So this type of reorganization, I think, should be commended, not condemned. The present Premier has caught on to some of these things very, very rapidly in the matter of three years, because some of these changes should have been made years and years ago.

There are three other changes I want to suggest while we're on this line of thinking. I think the changes made in government should do two things: they should provide for the



most efficient service to the public, and secondly, they should give the best value for every dollar, spent, so that you get closer to 100 cents value out of every public dollar irrespective of what department it's spent in. With those two items in mind, the changes made in the department of Highways and Transport, I think, are not only going to give better service, but save the taxpayers of this province many, many thousands of dollars.

There are at least three other areas which, I think, should require some study and changes too. They may have been included in this change, but I'm not sure. One is the purchasing of right of way. In the previous government, we had at least three departments buying right of way. Each had their own set-up of right-of-way buyers. Public Works, Highways, sometimes the AG's department, as well as the liquor board, and so on, each buying right of way, and each using different criteria. Many times our right-of-way buyers from Highways would go to an area to buy right of way and find that a previous right-of-way buyer from another department had been there and paid what he thought was an exorbitant sum for a small area of land. Then it created bad public relations when two or three departments in the same government were all paying different rates for land in the same area.

We tried to organize and tried to persuade the Premiers, both Premiers of the day, but mostly Premier Manning that we should have the right of way buying in one section, a right-of-way buying section with a chief appraiser and the others working under him. In my view, this would have saved the people of Alberta thousands of dollars, but it was never carried out. What's been done about it in this change-over, I haven't yet had a chance to check. But I think having a right-of-way section, is well worth looking into, irrespective of what department it's in. I'm not too concerned about that, but with one chief appraiser who's going to set the policy. All departments which are buying right of way will then be working under the same criteria and under the same premises.

Another area where it's somewhat similar, and where I think a change could be made by amalgamation, is mapping. Mapping is done very extensively by Lands and Forests. Mapping is done quite extensively by the Department of Highways. I believe those are the only two departments that are doing mapping. The amalgamation of these two sections, too, was looked at at one time with a lot of favor, and then fell through. Getting these two sections together, again, I'm not particularly concerned with which department as long as they're working under the same head, where they're following the same criteria, with a staff that's able to become diverse, and do the various detailed types of mapping required in this province -- this is an important section. I think the public tremendously appreciates the maps that are made by the Lands and Forests, and Highways, in this province. They are used extensively. The highway map alone is used by thousands of our people and thousands of the people outside the province. I think the Alberta highway map is one of the best on the continent. It's done almost entirely, if not entirely, by personnel in the Department of Highways. Some of the mapping done by Lands and Forests is very, very splendid indeed, equal to anything you will find in the world. I'm not saying there is anything wrong with either department this time, but I always felt that if they were together, you could have amalgamation that could create a better set-up and perhaps even save money, although I'm not too sure about that right at the moment.

There's one other thing too, and that is surveys. Surveys are required in several departments: the Department of Public Works, several of the boards, like the liquor board. The Department of Highways certainly has a tremendous amount of surveying. The chief survey, of course, is in the Department of Highways. The Land Titles Office depends on surveys to a very great degree. Town planning, municipal affairs all depend on surveys. Here again, I think, the surveys and mapping might very well go together and create a very excellent set-up under one minister and under one man such as the chief surveyor of the province today, who is a very able man.

Well, these are just some suggestions. I don't think we should ever think we have a perfect set-up in each department. I, for one, am very happy with the way the departments have been reorganized. I see merit in them. I see things which are going to give more efficient and more effective service to the public and make better use of every dollar of public money. Of course, that's one of the objectives of the government. So, if we find something wrong in some of the set-ups, if we find some things are creating conflict, well, of course, it's a case of taking another look and trying to correct that. At this time I'm very happy with the new set-up. I think it's going to serve the province well and is going to save money. That means every dollar saved will go on to do another service for the people of Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, while we're in the process of handing out after-the-fact advice, I'd like to make a few comments too. With respect to the overall cabinet reorganization, certainly we have two important features here. One is the reorganization of the departments, which is a major step in itself and one which, I suppose, would logically come after an election. The other, of course, is the cabinet shuffle, where all the cabinet ministers are changed to different departments. In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, the final responsibility for this rests with the hon. Premier. As to whether it was a wise decision, we'll have to wait and see.

There are, however, certain questions I have, and several comments. With respect to the new Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, I can see a good deal of sense in this particular proposal. There is clearly a connection between recreation, our provincial parks -- the Premier noted the campsites -- and the fish and wildlife branch of the former Department of the Environment. So bringing them all together into one

department, particularly under a minister who is as recreation conscious as my confrere from the North, is in my judgment a good decision. So I applaud that move.

The next change, which hasn't been mentioned by any of the opposition spokesmen, is the shift of the Public Utilities Board from the Department of Utilities and Telephones to the Attorney General's department. I would like to know a little more about the reasons. I can understand the argument that it is quasi-judicial in nature, and that justifies the change. If, in fact, we are going to see the continuation of the Public Utilities Board, especially in that semi-judicial role, this shift is a reasonable one and merits support.

What would concern me, Mr. Speaker, is the review which I understood was being undertaken by the former Department of Telephones and Utilities in conjunction with the private utility companies. At least it was my understanding that there was a survey by M & M associates to review the role of the Utilities Board. When we get to the debate on that particular bill, Mr. Speaker, I'll be asking more questions about it, because I would hate to see any change made in the function of our Public Utilities Board. It seems to me that if you're going to have private monopolies in the utilities field, there should be the safeguard of hearings conducted by a public utilities board which is impartial and which is in a position to balance the pros and cons of any application for a rate increase.

The hon. Member for Drumheller has already touched upon the new Department of Transportation, and I concur in his comments. Certainly, if we're going to develop rural Alberta, one of the most important aspects is a transportation system, and bringing together the various aspects of transportation into one ministry seems to me to make a great deal of sense.

I would hope the minister would take on the federal government with the same zip and enthusiasm with which he takes on the opposition in Alberta and try to extract some concessions from the federal government on the freight rate question and not at the expense of a quid pro quo, that is, we'll get a few concessions on red meat freight rates if we give up the Crowsnest Pass rates -- not that kind of thing. I'm talking about an equitable freight rate system which has been, Mr. Speaker, the goal of western Canadians for a long time and still, notwithstanding the western economic conference of 1973 in Calgary, remains an objective yet to be attained.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of comments and questions which I have with respect to the other department changes, for example Hospitals and Medical Care. I have to say that I like the idea of a new Department of Social Services and Community Health. It seems to me that that emphasizes the preventive role in medical care and in health delivery systems. I think that's long overdue, and it seems to me that that is an excellent proposal. What concerns me a bit, however, is that we now have another department, Hospitals and Medical Care, where the major objective seems to be cost control. It seems to me that a better approach would have been to have put the whole concept of community health, hospitals, and medical care into one department so that we would have had the emphasis placed on preventive health. It seems to me that would have been a wiser approach.

As far as social services are concerned, Mr. Speaker, that is always going to be a large job. I agree again with the comments that the Member for Drumheller raised about the workload of the former Minister of Health and Social Development. I can't think of two more difficult departments to bring together, and certainly with an enormous workload. Any MLA, I'm sure, has just scores of cases, especially dealing with the Department of Social Services.

Mr. Speaker, as far as Housing and Public Works is concerned, I didn't really follow the Premier's argument that because there is a construction role in public works, somehow we could put that in with housing. It occurs to me there is a serious enough problem in housing today in the Province of Alberta that that department could well stand on its own without bringing in public works. It seems to me, with greatest respect to our Minister of Government Services, that we could have shuffled in public works as a responsibility for the hon. minister there and left housing and the enormous task that any minister has in this field on its own.

Advanced Education and Manpower: the Premier perhaps moved to raise the point that clearly has been discussed throughout the province, and the concern of academics that the shift will mean that advanced education will be tailored to manpower requirements rather than the more classical concept of learning for the sake of learning. I would second that concern, although I do agree with the hon. Premier that his choice of the minister in this regard is one that tends to counteract that argument because the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower has certainly established credentials in the field of higher learning for the sake of learning.

Agriculture: again, we had the Premier say it is essentially the same department with the transfer of co-op activities to Business Development. He forgot to point out what seems to me to be the most important transfer, Mr. Speaker, and that is the Export Agency, which I gather will now come under the purview of the Minister of Business Development and Tourism. I really wonder whether or not that's a wise move.

Dealing with Business Development and Tourism, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect, it seems to me the assignment we are going to give this minister is really an enormous one because, as I listened to the Premier, this is the minister who is going to have to be in charge of developing the diversification strategy for the Province of Alberta. I would suggest that that is really a much bigger job than anything the former Minister of Industry and Commerce had to handle. When we add to that, Mr. Speaker, the role of

tourism, it strikes me that we are going to see one aspect or the other suffer as a consequence.

Similarly, I am a little troubled by the linking of Lands and Forests and Mines and Minerals. I listened to the Premier, and certainly at face value it seems reasonable that you combine both the non-renewable resources and the renewable resources in one department of government and that way you retain a balance between the two. I really wonder whether that, in fact, will be the case, and if it wouldn't better if renewable resources of lands and forests had their own minister to fight the case on an ongoing basis in the cabinet. It strikes me that unless the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources has the wisdom of Solomon, he is inevitably going to be drawn into the non-renewable portion of the department to the exclusion of the renewable portion simply because there are so many contentious issues, Mr. Speaker. Unless things change rather dramatically in federal-provincial relations, these problems and contentious issues are likely to remain, and perhaps even grow worse. So it seems to me that the minister, just by the force of circumstances if nothing else, is going to be drawn into spending most of his time on the energy portion of his portfolio.

Mr. Speaker, having made those general comments about the cabinet shuffle, I would like to make a couple of comments about Bill No. 7, before the Legislature. I am pleased to see the emphasis on industrial health and occupational safety. However, it troubles me that we are not going to see an early decision on the proposal of the commission that we integrate under the umbrella of one department or agency all the various branches doing work in the field. We needn't bring it under one department of government, although I personally think it would make more sense to bring it under the Department of Labour, as things stand. It is my understanding that the Alberta Federation of Labour, in their brief to the cabinet in the winter, suggested that all the industrial health and occupational safety mechanisms be brought under the Workers' Compensation Board for administration. That is one option. But it seems to me that the recommendation of the commission, at least as I understand it, was to overcome the split jurisdiction, and to integrate the various programs that deal with industrial health.

I would hope too, Mr. Speaker, that we would see in the estimates this year -- and this is perhaps looking to something we will know on Friday -- a substantial increase in the budget for the broad range of industrial health and occupational safety programs. Because, Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's a more important area for the new minister.

The final comment I would make is just that I hope the minister, in his new-found free time, does not take it upon himself to meddle in every certification or collective bargaining dispute which arises. Because I can't think of a more disastrous result, both for him and for the collective bargaining process, than to have these things settled as a result of intervention. From time to time there may be a case for intervention, but I'm sure the minister would agree with me that those times and occasions are very rare. Once a minister of the Crown becomes a fireman in the collective bargaining process, he will need an entire fire department of all 69 members of the government behind him to resolve all the problems of collective bargaining in this province. So I would hope what that means is that we're going to upgrade the department's mediation role. But in terms of intervention by the minister, it seems to me that that should very rarely occur, and only under the most unusual circumstances where the essential services provision of The Alberta Labour Act would authorize him to undertake arbitration.

Having said those words, Mr. Speaker, I just conclude by saying that as to whether the cabinet shuffle in total, coupled with the reorganization of the government, is in the best interests of the province: it seems to me the jury is still out. We'll have four years to see how it works. I would simply express the hope that this change-over, both in terms of organization of the government as well as the shuffling of ministers, does not lead us to the position where every time questions are posed, we're going to study it. Because it occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that with four years in office now, the time for studying is past, and the time for action, notwithstanding the reorganization, is now.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a comment or two on the bill and on the government reorganization.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say that a member in this Legislature must sit here with the assumption that nothing is so good that it can't be improved. I think too often we do not look closely enough at legislation brought before this House. We do not question it, and it goes through. So we, on both sides of the House, must remember that nothing is so good it can't be improved.

I'm not quite as enthusiastic as some members of the Legislature about the cabinet reorganization. I favor the reorganization of the departments, but I think it's irresponsible on the part of the government to play musical chairs when it takes three and a half to four years for some of the ministers to really find out what's going on in their departments. I think that's irresponsible. I was very upset the other day, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Premier said that the former Minister of Municipal Affairs was not responsible for something that went on in his department. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the former minister is not responsible, I would like to know who is.

I could certainly go along with this musical chairs with ministers if this was after the second term. But after a three and one-half year period, to hand an important portfolio such as Municipal Affairs to a rookie, capable as we may find him to be -- to give as large a department as that to a new member I think is completely irresponsible.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you want it, Walter?

DR. BUCK: Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm really pleased to see the appointment of the Member for Peace River to the department that's concerned with recreation. In all fairness to the minister who was previously responsible, with his enthusiasm, et cetera, I don't think he knew what was going on in the field of recreation.

[interjections]

The hon. members may laugh. That's a privilege. It is also my responsibility to bring what I think to the members of this Legislature, and the people of this province. They're certainly going to get that.

As far as the changing of the Department of the Solicitor General, I would like to say for the people I represent, they greet that with enthusiasm, because they weren't too enthusiastic about what was not happening in the Department of the Solicitor General before. That's no reflection upon the former minister, because I think she's very capable. It's just that it takes that long for cabinet ministers to find out what's going on in their departments and then to get something going. Just as soon as they find out what's happening in their department, they get shuffled out.

I'm really pleased to see they have a minister responsible for Calgary affairs. Now that's very interesting. Why don't they have a minister responsible for Lethbridge affairs, Grande Prairie affairs, and Red Deer affairs. I think, Mr. Speaker, the cabinet and the members of the government . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: St. Paul.

DR. BUCK: We have somebody looking after St. Paul.

The responsibility of the government is to look after all the people. I just can't buy the argument that because the provincial parliament happens to be in Edmonton, it gets preferred treatment over Calgary. I just can't buy that. If that's what is happening, the government is not doing its job.

The one cabinet minister I really feel the sorriest for is the new Minister of Agriculture. I appreciate the former minister's enthusiasm. I agreed with the hon. Member for Drumheller when he said, I don't think we've had a cabinet minister, a Minister of Agriculture, who has worked much harder than the hon. Deputy Premier. But at the same time I say that, Mr. Speaker, I think there are just as many farmers in this province who think they've been had as there are farmers who are so pleased with some of the new programs of the minister. I am trying to say that in all fairness. When a minister of the Crown goes into a department as enthusiastic as the hon. Deputy Premier was, he's going to pull some boobos at the same time as he is doing a lot of good things. But that's part of the political game. I don't mean it to be malicious, but it's just one of the facts of life.

Mr. Speaker, I also have another concern. I do not think the ministers of the Crown are reporting as fully to this Legislature as they should. Before the election we kept waiting for the ministers to get up in this House and report what they are doing in their departments. But we waited in vain, because that was never done. Now, I don't know if that's tradition that is being thrown by the way, or the ministers of the Crown don't feel they have to report to the Legislature. I hope that's not their attitude.

So Mr. Speaker, in the fall, after the new ministers have had their interval of retraining, after this little game of musical chairs at the expense of the taxpayer, I look forward to a progress report from the hon. ministers as to what's happening in their departments. If not in the fall, Mr. Speaker, I hope we see that in the spring.

Thank you.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make perhaps a half dozen comments with regard to some of the things that have been said, and then more specifically to Bill No. 7, which is before us. First of all, I think now might be as appropriate a time as any to make some comments as far as the upcoming estimates are concerned in light of the cabinet changes and the reorganizations of departments.

I think, from our standpoint over here, the discussions on the estimates will go a great deal quicker, whether they are in subcommittee or on the floor of the House, if we can start off the estimates from each department with some sort of statement from the minister involved, setting out his own objectives as far as the department is concerned, and some indication of what his priorities are for this year. I think it's fair to say to the members of the government that unless we can have some kind of indication like this from the ministers individually when we are doing the estimates, in fact the estimates will, of necessity, have to take much longer than, perhaps, they need to.

I would also say that I was very pleased with the comments the Premier made, especially as they relate to the lands branch of the former Department of Lands and Forests. I think members will recall that one of the concerns I expressed when I spoke on the Speech from the Throne was what was going to happen to the lands branch in the new Department of Energy and Natural Resources. I'm not relieved, but I feel a little better that at least the matter is being reconsidered, because it does seem to me that there is more than just a possibility, there is a very real danger, that the lands branch will get completely lost in the hubbub and shuffle in the Department of Energy. Whether it should go to the Department of Agriculture -- I likely would prefer it going to the Department of Agriculture. Certainly either Agriculture or Environment would be a vast improvement over leaving it in the Department of Energy.

Dealing with this particular piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, I notice under Section 4 of the bill there seems to be a principle that is found in several other bills that have

come before us, and I commend the government for it. It deals with the fact that the minister is authorized to make grants, or the minister may make grants if he is authorized to do so by regulations under a certain section.

Hindsight is a great vehicle. I can go back and check some legislation the former administration brought in, I believe in 1966 or '67. Legislation was passed, there were provisions to make grants, and there were no regulations passed. Yet the Provincial Auditor tells me that, in fact, grants were made under that legislation. The same kind of situation has happened in the last three years under the former Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation, where he was given the authority by the Legislature to make regulations, and then, in fact, to make grants available. This was not done.

I interpret Section 4, and similar sections which I see in other government or reorganizational legislation that is before us, first of all to say that there must be regulations. Secondly, I would hope the Government House Leader or the Premier would see that, in fact, there are regulations before grants are paid out, because the Provincial Auditor tells me that this has happened on more than one occasion over the past number of years.

Then, Mr. Speaker, my enthusiasm is somewhat tempered by the next section in the act, where it says that these grants may be paid out: "moneys are appropriated by the Legislature for [the purposes of the grant] or . . . authorized to be paid pursuant to a special warrant". I would hope we are not getting into a situation where, by tagging on that particular section of "or pursuant to a special warrant", in the fall or next spring, we are going to have members or ministers get up and say, well, it wasn't approved in the budget, but we had the approval, when the legislation was passed, to spend special warrants on this particular project. I would be extremely disturbed if we are going to use a portion of that section to lessen rather the importance of the appropriations and the importance of the legislation, or lessen the importance of the study of the estimates. I think that would be a retrograde step at the very outset.

The last point I would like to make deals with the reorganization of the Department of Labour. I raised this point with the minister's predecessor, and I wasn't very successful there. I would hope I'll be somewhat more successful here when I say to the new Minister of Labour that, in my judgment anyway, it's certainly an appropriate time when we should look at some sort of restructuring as far as the Board of Industrial Relations is concerned.

We're becoming more industrialized in this province all the time. I'm sure many members in this Assembly expect to see several additional plants in the tar sands over the next number of years. The Board of Industrial Relations now, and especially some of the people involved in the Board of Industrial Relations, plays a very vital role in the mediation procedures in the province. I pay credit, very frankly, to Mr. Bob d'Esterre, as one individual, but there are other people involved. It seems to me that industry in this province and for the sake of labor peace, we're getting to a point where we should, in fact, have a Board of Industrial Relations, and it should do its thing, or look after its responsibilities. We should not be taking people who are performing that function on the Board of Industrial Relations, changing their hats, and taking them out and sending them across the province as mediators. It seems to me that we've now reached the stage where the Board of Industrial Relations is a full-time venture in itself, and is of enough importance that those people involved in the operation of the Board of Industrial Relations must make it their full-time venue. If that means we're going to have to beef up the mediation staff, albeit, we'd better do that.

I can make some suggestions as to other areas where we can cut people in various departments. But I would ask the minister to look rather seriously at this duplication of roles of some of the very competent individuals he has there, and suggest to him most sincerely that in the course of the next number of years in this Assembly we are all interested in labor peace in this province. One of the things that could augur well for that would be to stop this duplication of responsibilities by individuals under the Board of Industrial Relations and the mediation staff.

[The motion was carried. Bill 7 was read a second time.]

#### Bill 21 The Unfair Trade Practices Act (continued)

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I'll defer to other interested members of the Assembly. I adjourned debate this afternoon only because of the absence of the minister who had wanted to hear what members had to say about the bill. I have some comments I wish to make at committee stage, but not at this time.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Member for Edmonton Highlands for the courtesy of allowing me to meet an engagement.

With regard to the debate we've had on Bill 21, The Unfair Trade Practices Act, I would like to try to cover some of the points which were mentioned by some of the members who participated. Particularly, there were a series of questions raised by the Leader of

the Opposition, the Member for Olds-Didsbury. He asked whether it was the intention to have lawyers in the department or to use the assistance of the Attorney General's department. There are some legally trained administrative people in the department; however, at present, direct legal service is provided in consultation with the Department of the Attorney General. It is not at this time envisaged that there would be a staff of solicitors within the department. However, it may well be that there are lawyers on staff, and it may well be that we will have someone appointed from the Department of the Attorney General, particularly as a lawyer, to advise the people in the department itself.

The hon. member also raised the subject of additional staff needs as a result of the implementation of the bill. I would say that at the moment it's anticipated, of course, there will be a person who will become the director and he will have probably at least two investigative staff under him. He will be tying in his services and his skills with the regional offices and the whole structure of the regional office system, so that he will be using their competence in investigation and relaying to him the problem areas which arise for consumers.

There have been no regulations drafted as yet. Again I appreciate the interest of the hon. member who, of course, served on the regulations committee and I appreciate his comment in regard to this very vexing problem of seeing an act in its final shape with the regulations.

He raised the issue of Section 20(c) and (d). With regard to the exemption which is in clause (c), Mr. Speaker, this, of course, is a new type of legislation, and it was Legislative Counsel's office which recommended that there be an exemption section contained in the act. Because the wording in the act itself is quite broad in places, it could conceivably happen that something would fall within the terms of reference of this particular act and yet really be covered by other legislation. Rather than have a duplication, it was felt that with a provision for an exemption by regulation, we could, in fact, avoid this unnecessary duplication.

With regard to Section 20(d), this type of clause, of course, is not unique in the legislation. I would merely point out that it is regulations for the purpose of "carrying out the purpose and intent of this Act," which is included in the wording of the clause.

I anticipate, Mr. Speaker, that the act will come into force approximately on September 1, 1975, but I wouldn't like to be held to that. It is the aim to try to get it into place as soon as we can have a director and the staff necessary, but I don't think it should be brought in until we do, in fact, have the staff complement in the department to handle it.

The Member for Spirit River-Fairview raised the issue of the use of the words "shall" and "may", particularly in Section 7. I think the problem here, Mr. Speaker, is that if we are to have a judicial system, there must be discretion in the hands of, in effect, the prosecution. To put it into "shall" means that he may be having to take action in situations where, using discretion, he would perhaps not have acted. It would quite obviously raise a problem in the administration of laws which we don't have in other areas. Attorney generals have been used to working with the discretion of whether or not to charge, and it is anticipated that with the tie-in between the Department of the Attorney General and the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, there will be that discretion which should be exercised. "Shall" would leave no alternative but to take some action.

The Member for Olds-Didsbury also raised the very important point of the skill which should be exercised by a director under this act. This was also, of course, the point of the debate of the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo. I think, perhaps, the role of the director would be one of monitoring the market place, obviously of a liaison with the consumer and business groups in the province, hearing of complaints under the legislation, mediation, trying to get the suppliers' undertaking and therefore acting in the capacity of a negotiator, and, of course, that very important liaison with the Department of the Attorney General.

He must, of course, have a very practical and commercial understanding of the market place, and be possessed of communicative and at least some paralegal skills. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that no decision has yet been made as to whether, in fact, the director should be a lawyer. It may well be that he have a law degree but not have practised as a lawyer. But he must certainly have some paralegal training.

The more difficult matters perhaps, with regard to this problem of price fixing and unconscionable pricing, were raised by the Member for Drumheller and the Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Dealing with price fixing, it was felt that as this particular matter was included in the federal Combines Investigation Act, which of course is a quasi-criminal investigation and prosecution, it should be left, at this stage, in the hands of the federal people. Getting away from the jurisdictional problem, the question of whether price fixing should or should not be included was considered. It was felt, as most of the bill relates to representations which are made, that price fixing as such is sufficiently different from the other segments of the bill that it perhaps should not be included at this time. I would think, as time goes on and we see how the bill is working, that at some stage there may well be an amendment to this legislation, including price fixing.

One difficulty with price fixing, of course, has been that in order to find that there has been an agreement to fix prices, it has usually taken several years of investigation. The problem is: the remedies under the bill are remedies which are to be given to consumers not only to stop an unfair trades practice, but to be recompensed for the damage done. It gets more and more difficult to do that on anything like an equitable basis

because of the number of years that transpire before you are able to find some evidence of price fixing and can do something about it.

The other part, the unconscionable pricing -- I would like to be able to say that some price is unconscionable. The difficulty, of course, is that that is really a matter of opinion. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the consumer must still determine whether or not a price is competitive. A consumer must still rely on fundamental comparative price shopping and traditional common-sense principles. We can have a legalistic approach, and we can have an economic approach. I would submit that an economic approach to the problem of pricing is much more effective than the legalistic approach of saying that something is, in fact, unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, I was rather interested to see the comments of the hon. Member for Drumheller. He described, for example, the situation of Fort McMurray and railway prices. As he pointed out, the solution was to have some competition; it wasn't to have legislation which would say that a certain price is unconscionable. I think the answer is to separate entirely the effectiveness of what might be called a legalistic approach, which might suit me, but which, I am afraid, is very difficult to administer. Perhaps an economic approach to the problem, making sure that there is competition, is in fact the way to solve that very problem.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[The motion was carried. Bill 21 was read a second time.]

#### Bill 16 The Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Act

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 16, The Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Act.

If I might have a moment or two to say a few words about the reorganization of the department -- quite a number have been said this evening. This bill will create the new reorganized department, and I feel it will provide the necessary structure to meet the many needs of our citizens in the expanded area of recreational needs in this great province. I think the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife will be more than an amalgamation of the former Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation -- I should check that, that's youth, recreation, and field services branches of the former Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation -- and more than the parks, fish and wildlife divisions of the former Department of Lands and Forests. I feel the new department's primary emphasis will be to ensure that programs and services in areas relating to recreation and leisure activities will be given top priority. Now, these will be viewed in both the long-term effect and, of course, the immediate needs as requested by our citizens.

One other point I think we have to make very clear is that the recreational facilities and services must be available to all, particularly to those Albertans who have had little opportunity in the past to enjoy or participate in the many recreational or wildlife programs established by this government.

I'd be a little bit remiss if at this time I didn't take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to commend the outstanding work of the two former ministers of the respective departments, the Hon. Allan Warrack and the Hon. Horst Schmid, for the tremendous jobs they have done in the past. I feel they have established firm foundations in the areas which now become the responsibility of my ministry. I will do everything in my power to build upon what has already been accomplished.

I made a little note at this point, Mr. Speaker. There were three speakers who made some kind remarks. I was not sure whether that was three strikes and I was out; I was waiting for the fourth to see if I could get a walk.

AN HON. MEMBER: Just hit it.

MR. ADAIR: I'm sure I will. I am also aware of and deeply appreciate the rich heritage the people of this province have in the land and the healthy, progressive, and promising relationship our citizens have to this land of ours in Alberta, to its wildlife resources, and to all who are part of this great relationship.

As the department will be concerned with leisure, with recreational matters, it will do everything possible to consult and to continue the open-door policy by meeting with groups, committees, and the various associations which have an interest in this portfolio.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, this department will attempt to interest and inform every citizen in this great province of the activities, programs, and plans of this new department, I think, too, to ensure that it's not just for a privileged few but for a great number of citizens, each and every one of them if that's possible.

Mr. Speaker, the bill does not list the functions of my ministry in specific terms. I think such specificity is not without value. But to my mind the objectives of the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife must be arrived at in common, arising from our experiences and expectations as Albertans, ultimately leading to a spirit of understanding and co-operation in which the people of this province are known not only for their hard work and ingenuity in the fields of commerce, industry and agriculture, but as people who have a commitment and a belief in the concept of man at play. Too, of man at rest, man in harmony with nature and of course, man as the protector and conserver. I think such objectives are only meaningful if they are generally held.



It will be the policy of this Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, Mr. Speaker, to work co-operatively with all Albertans toward managing and establishing effective recreation, parks and wildlife management activities. Really no grant or regulation will achieve the result that so many of us have in mind. The department will be dedicated to helping achieve a better and a fuller life for all Albertans; a life, Mr. Speaker, of which recreational activities are an integral and very necessary part. The department will continue efforts toward wise planning, appropriate support for recreation and physical fitness, improved new and unique park facilities, and extended and improved wilderness and game management programs.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this bill will provide the basis for bringing this new department together.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a comment or two. I would like to say to the hon. minister that I enjoyed the first and second parts of his speech, because that was the hon. minister speaking. But the middle part of the speech was somebody else's because it didn't sound like him. He's a down-to-earth type of man who calls 'em as he sees 'em, as they say in the business. So, Mr. Minister, just delete that central portion. It didn't sound like you. Just give it to us from your heart.

I would like to say one or two things, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I like the realignment of the department. I say that in all sincerity. I think that's what we're here for. If it's good, don't knock it. If it's not good, knock it. That's what we're here for.

One or two points have disturbed me in the past about the department of recreation, and it seems to be the lack of any regional planning. It disturbs me in my own constituency. It disturbs me in neighboring constituencies when we have arenas 9 miles apart in this day and age when the former Minister of Highways built some great roads in this province and the minister before that marked a little time, built a few more roads. To me it doesn't seem reasonable -- but we're going to get a lot more roads now that we have a new minister.

Mr. Speaker, it doesn't seem reasonable to me that we would have 2 arenas within 9 miles of each other and not have, let's say, a swimming pool. To me, this is not planning. This is not planning. It's good for votes, as the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview says. But that's not basically what we're here for. It sure helps to keep you around, but it's not really what we're here for. So I would like to see a little bit of planning go into co-ordinating recreational facilities on a regional basis.

Another small point I would like to make is that our wildlife in this province is not unlimited. I was a little disturbed at the advice we got from our so-called specialists that we were going to have to thin out the moose population in this province. Well, we thinned it out all right: it's going to take another 20 years for it to come back.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the pheasant?

DR. BUCK: Same thing with the pheasant. We do not have an unlimited amount. I'm glad to see the minister's philosophy that hunting and fishing should be for everyone at a very minimal cost. I compliment him on that, and I hope he sticks to the philosophy.

I would also like to say something to the so-called sportsmen in this province, the sportsmen who will take 60 to 100 fish, or 60 to 100 ducks a year and have the guts to call themselves sportsmen. That, in my humble opinion, is not what I call a sportsman. You know who they are going to blame when we don't have any fish and we don't have any ducks? They're going to blame the lousy government. That's who they're going to blame. They won't put the blame where it should be, on the shoulders of those so-called sportsmen. So if there's any way we can discourage people like that from taking too much game, too many fish, I would certainly support the minister in anything I can do.

I would like to see the minister consider more fish hatcheries so we can not only have them as tourist bait, but for our own Albertans so they can fish. At the same time, let's have a look at the multiple usage of land, because in many areas the land can be used for more than the purposes it's being used for. It can be used for certain purposes in the summer, grazing and so on. In the winter it can be used for skidooing, hiking, chasing kites if you want to -- whatever you want to do. But there are other uses for land. It doesn't have to be restricted just to one. Mr. Minister, let's have you look at the eastern slopes. I think possibly you will have to take charge and make sure that we're going to leave something for our children and their children.

The last point I would like to bring to the hon. minister's attention, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. minister and members of his department should look at some type of assistance to youngsters who are specially gifted in the lines of figure skating, things such as this. There are many children in not such well-to-do families who cannot afford professional skating instruction, professional dancing instruction, and some of these kids have the talent to possibly go someplace.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are the few comments I would like to make at this time. I will make more when we go through the minister's estimates.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STRONBERG: Mr. Speaker, in regard to the minister's remarks, I missed it, unless he did not bring up a very important part of rural Alberta, Alberta's 4-H clubs. I believe this to be a very important part of the rural scene. I'm not sure of the number of rural youth presently in the 4-H system, but I suspect it's quite substantial.



4-H, at one time, was under the Department of Agriculture, under the responsibilities of the DAs of rural Alberta. Then it was shifted to the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation, taken out of the DAs' hands and moved into the regional offices. In our own case, where we had a very ambitious DA who understood the 4-H members in his area, understood their background, it seemed to work very well. When it was moved to Red Deer, 60, 70 miles away, the supervision seemed to be lacking. I realize there were problems with some DAs. Some would work and some would not.

Now it's being moved into the new department. I would like to have the minister enlighten us on what his plans are for 4-H, especially with the branching out that's been done in the last 3 or 4 years in, say, the junior wardens, the horse 4-H clubs.

I would also like to bring up the point on fish hatcheries that was brought up by the Member for Clover Bar. This is about the only time we've ever agreed on something. Mind you, I can catch fish, he can't. But in my experience catching fish, I've never been able to catch any in Alberta. I've had to go to Montana. I've inquired about their fishing in Montana. There are members of this Assembly who have been in that state. They have quite a number of hatcheries. They fill their streams and there is no bag limit -- take all the trout you can catch. Believe you me, the fishing is good there. Perhaps we could have your views on that, if you are planning to expand that tremendous sport in the province.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to congratulate the hon. Mr. Adair on his new position. I think he did an excellent job in the role he carried out prior to this most recent shuffling of the cabinet. I know he will handle himself wisely in the area of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife.

I would just like to remind him and the members of the Assembly of the importance of recreation in our own constituency, and the role the government played in the potential development at Gull Lake, which is probably one of the better known recreation areas in the province. Under Hon. Bill Yurko and other cabinet ministers, we were able to redefine the role of Gull Lake, find funds to eventually stabilize the level of the lake, and to expand the park facilities there. At the present time, the parks department is working on about 300 trailer outlets on the south end of the lake. We are looking forward with great anticipation to the time these will be opened. That particular lake is a very popular place during the summer. I think this last weekend, as cold as it was and as poor as the weather was, it was oversubscribed. It has limited facilities. So I hope your department will continue to expand and promote parks, this one in particular, because it is a contribution to the constituency; it does play a role in the economics of the area.

I've had arguments in the past with the former Minister of Agriculture with regards to 4-H. The Member for Camrose touched briefly on this. I have never been able to resolve in my own mind why it was removed from the Department of Agriculture. Strange to say, I've yet to hear anyone at my constituency level resolve in his mind why it was removed from the Department of Agriculture.

4-H has a tradition and a background in agriculture. Probably because of some of the outstanding men in agriculture, district agriculturists, it became a very important part of the social life and the learning process for farm people. In that respect, I think it was important also to the learning process of young people. I can't resolve in my own mind why it should be classified as recreation.

I just might relate a little story. This morning before I came up to the Legislature, I rolled out early to feed two animals being fitted for the 4-H show in two or three weeks, and spent a fair amount of my time scrubbing them down in preparation for the sale. Of course, this is what happens when you get children into 4-H; you get involved yourself. Usually you do the work, they do the showing, and they end up with the money. But it's part of a learning process. I think it's very important. I think, Mr. Speaker, if you look around the province today, you'll find that a good many of our leaders, both in and out of government, took some of their basic training through 4-H. It has to do not only with the learning process of handling animals and working with livestock, but it also develops pride and confidence in a young person. As I say, many of these young people are leaders in the province today and have ability not only to think, but also to speak.

Having said that, I'd just like to refer to Section 6, which gives me some concern. Perhaps, Mr. Minister, you might refer to this in closing the debate. I have some concerns about sections that make provision for a minister to administer grants. I have concerns in this respect: if we aren't able to tie them to some kind of formula -- and maybe this is tied to some formula. I referred to the former minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation this concern, that we have a tendency to start issuing grants willy-nilly wherever political expediency is important. [interjections] This is a concern I shouldn't be raising, that the Member from Clover Bar should be raising as a member of the opposition. [interjections] It's pretty obvious that he's a little bit asleep, because that's the issue that I would pick to be concerned about if I were a member of the opposition.

These grants should in some way be tied to some kind of formula applicable all over the province. It resolves itself to the point where the first to come are the first served. In other words, those who have the greatest political pressure or those who have the constituency with the lowest vote count in the prior election may be able to exert some forms of subtle pressure on ministers to issue certain kinds of grants or whatever to reinforce their particular constituency.

I don't think we want to go in this kind of direction, Mr. Speaker. I think we should be very careful about how grants are issued. I would like to think, Mr. Speaker, that if we proceed in this direction, we have some kind of assurance that if \$10 per capita goes

to the City of Edmonton or the City of Lethbridge or the constituency of Camrose, we'll also get \$10 per capita. That's the way we have to function if we're to treat the whole province fairly.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make just a very few remarks with respect to Bill 16, The Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Act.

I think we all appreciate the change taking place in the combination of responsibilities under this ministry, which I think, perhaps, will move in the right direction of being able to manage the, I might say, mammoth task that awaits us in the development of our parks, our recreational programs and facilities, and wildlife management in this province.

I hope the new minister, in the development of programs, will continue with the same kind of vigor, and will incorporate into his philosophy the consideration and development of provincial urban parks, and give consideration to provincial parks out in the rural areas of the province, and the total development these parks require in order that Albertans and those who visit us here in Alberta might get the greatest benefit and enjoyment. Because, after all, I think the purpose of developing parks in the province is to accommodate all our citizens of all age levels in the kind of recreation and enjoyment that each would most appreciate.

I think our parks need a great many more facilities developed within the land area of the parks, as they are designated, for more total family enjoyment and recreation. I think it's necessary for us to continue with some speed in the development of facilities within these parks, and to a greater extent where there is such a concentration of our population. I think we have looked far and wide from corner to corner of this great province, and we are certainly giving due consideration to the urban areas at this time. But it seems to me that with the concentration of some half a million people in one major centre, and very close to that number in another major centre, the parks being provided are very, very quickly going to be overpopulated and overused in relation to the leisure time that is very quickly being made available as a result of our changing work ethic and work schedules.

I think we need to move with perhaps the same kind of speed in the development of facilities within our provincial parks as we are moving with our tourism program. We certainly find that tourism is a great booster to our economic position. I think it is necessary that we move very quickly in recognizing that we must provide not only attractions within the major urban centres, but the kinds of holiday recreation people look for when they want to get away from their own concrete jungles.

I think it's important that we recognize it is necessary as well to develop and maintain the transportation routes to these various parks. I think we can cite numerous examples where the highways leading to these parks close to the major urban centres, particularly where there are water-based recreational areas within the parks, have been neglected to a very great extent, perhaps in some respects not totally within our jurisdiction. Then I think it necessary for us to pressure other levels of government where the matter of upgrading the highways leading to these recreational areas and park areas ought to be given some more serious priority.

I wish to say again that I am very pleased we have this new act and the realignment insofar as the combination of recreation, parks and wildlife, because I think recreation and parks go very much hand in hand. Today we not only recognize recreation as something in the ball field or on the race track or within urban settings, but family recreation in a leisurely kind of atmosphere.

Mr. Speaker, those were a few comments I wished to draw attention to for the minister to take into consideration. Thank you.

MR. ZANDER: Mr. Speaker, may I make a few comments on Bill No. 16. First of all, I want to congratulate the hon. minister on his appointment to that position, because I believe, as a man from the North, he has at least the welfare and consideration of a sportsman. Knowing him as well as I do, I believe he will also call a meeting of the MLAs in the forested areas, and maybe some of those from the urban areas, to draw from the input of these MLAs -- not like has happened in the past. I can probably recall about two years ago we were called in to have a meeting with Mr. Kerr, the chief game officer of the province. After listening to some 30 MLAs who were present, their reaction and assessment of the quantities of game, the regulations as they should be throughout the province, and the length of the hunting season, I walked away from that meeting, Mr. Speaker, feeling at least the MLAs had contributed considerably at that meeting. I think it lasted some two hours. After the next year transpired, nothing really too much came of that meeting, because it didn't, at least in my area -- the assessment I took that the game regulations and the length of the season were not really as much curtailed as we wished at that time. I wish the minister would perhaps take aside a couple of hours and take some of the input of the MLAs, both urban and rural, to come up with some type of input regarding the length of the seasons and the game regulations as we know them now. I certainly hope some of them will be shortened, at least in my area, and that the requests for more game sanctuaries along the eastern slopes of the Rockies, whether they be small or large, at least some of the areas should be set aside because our game is running -- we're running out of game. As the hon. Member for Clover Bar mentioned, pretty soon our children will not know what an elk or a deer looks like unless we go to the park to find one.

The other point I wanted to touch on briefly, Mr. Speaker, is the provincial parks facilities west of the city of Edmonton, as I see them. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, I have

tried to get into the Wabamun Park on Sundays or long weekends. The provincial park at Evansburg is the same way. It's overcrowded in every stage. You can well expect that because if you have a city of 500,000 people to the east, a park of this nature is well overcrowded before the sun begins to set on a Saturday evening. In my constituency we haven't got a provincial park. We have all the amenities for a provincial park, most of the area is Crown land. But we have yet, Mr. Minister, never reached first base in trying to obtain a park. We are 60 miles removed from the centre of the concentration of population, and at least 60 miles removed from any provincial park within the constituency.

I would certainly hope, Mr. Minister, that you will take off from your busy schedule -- and I think you have promised me this -- to have a flight over the area. I will take you to some of the finest fishing west of the City of Edmonton. And I'll take the hon. Member for Clover Bar along if he's never caught a fish. I'll certainly give him instruction on how to do that.

DR. BUCK: Stromberg said that.

AN HON. MEMBER: He'd have to be smarter than the fish.

MR. ZANDER: Oh, is this what the hon. Member for Camrose said? Well anyway, Mr. Speaker, I think we'll even take him along and maybe even the hon. Member for Camrose also.

Bearing this in mind, Mr. Minister, I do believe that as elected members of the Legislature we have the feeling of our constituencies, whether they be urban or rural. I think at least a meeting of the nature I described a few moments ago will lead to a better understanding among ourselves, the ministry, and the operation of the ministry, because this certainly affects every man, woman, and child in the Province of Alberta.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two comments on this bill. I would like, first of all, to thank the minister for outlining the objectives he has established, along with his department, for this new Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. I believe the hon. Member for Drayton Valley made the initial point I want to make. I think it is most important in light of the past three and one-half years because I can think of other instances where, if we had listened to the people just a little closer, taken some time to meet with groups and taken their advice, we would have solved a lot of problems. If a decision had been made in the early stages of discussion with regard to pheasant when the public was concerned, I think we would have a better situation than we have today.

Provincial parks. A number of communities wanted to meet with the minister with regard to understanding -- just plain understanding -- what was happening in their local provincial park. We had to put pressure on. Finally, we had to bring departmental people in to hear what was going on about the provincial park. There was clarification and everyone was happy after that.

Game laws. I can think of the very same type of process going on where there wasn't real response from the minister. There could have been a lot of difficulties for the government, a lot of complaints and misunderstanding. Mr. Minister, I think along with the good objectives you have established -- and I am sure from your past performance we are going to have that kind of openness -- is an openness and willingness to meet at the community level, to take some of their recommendations and carry them through this Legislature, because that is what democracy is all about. If we can't get that kind of penetration at the ministerial level, there is no way good changes or people changes will certainly come about in this province.

There are three things I would like to press again with the minister, with these initial comments in mind. With regard to the classification of parks, adding a new classification, as I mentioned a few days ago, where we have a minimal provision of items for parks sponsored by the province -- items such as the camp kitchen, bathroom facilities, water, and maybe one man with a truck and a few tools. A class of park such as that across the province would meet the needs of many, many local people in their area, because basically they are weekend campers. They want to come in with their boats and get onto a lake. They want some place to park and camp, some kitchens with a few facilities. Many people have trailers today, and they don't need this highly sophisticated amount of back-up.

The other two areas: certainly a municipal park type of program, which we have at the present time, then possibly the further consideration of a local grant to people who just wish to initiate a small park of their own and work more on a community level. That's the first item.

The second item is with regard to operational grants for the various capital structures across the province. We all recognize the pressure that's going to be on us for the province to assist in operating a number of these new facilities. I think the minister should be aware of that and certainly have someone doing a running analysis of what is happening. I think it would be a very difficult and a very unhappy situation if we had a number of these facilities in debt over their heads and they all came to government, a bunch of pressure, and we had to do something about the problem. So I certainly urge the minister to get into this problem immediately and to have somebody watch it continually.

The third area is with regard to game laws. Across the province there are a number of excellent local fish and game associations which can make good recommendations. Often

they are not listened to. People consider them as people with their own little cause about game, but they have some good ideas.

I certainly urge the minister along with his objectives to keep that open stance he has taken in the last three and a half years and I'm sure his department will be a very, very successful one.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on Bill 16. I have had occasion to discuss this portfolio with the minister and I find the results I've had very encouraging.

My concerns have been and still are our hunting laws, the length of season, and the bag limit that we've had. I have mentioned before that we should have probably a little more gun control as far as out of season guns in half-tons are concerned, along with a change of licensing for the hunting season, one licence for any animal, probably with a little more fee.

I have discussed the need for more parks. Of course, the parks, as mentioned by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley, are crowded. We need more parks towards the west. One only has to go to, say, Carson Lake, in my constituency which was stocked with fish. On a weekend you can't get near that lake because of the number of people who come all the way from Edmonton. The restocking of fish should be greatly accelerated. I think a fish hatchery in our area would be essential.

But the thing I wanted to discuss, which I didn't have the opportunity to discuss with the minister some time ago, was the grants. Our new recreation grants of \$100 per capita over a 10-year period are great, but I think we're placing too much emphasis on capital expenditures. We are forcing the small towns, villages, counties, and communities to go further into debt because they can only get 35 per cent as a grant and 65 per cent towards capital expenditure.

I think we should make this grant available to all local bodies, be they recreation boards, counties, towns, villages, what have you, and let them do what they want with it. Once they've got their \$100 per capita, they've spent it. Let's not force them to go into debt. Some communities already have obligations greater than they should have and if they'd like to use it for debt retirement, by all means let's let them do that because we are helping them. Hoisting another 65 per cent of the \$100 into capital expenditure and more debts, it's like the hon. member mentioned, they'll be coming back to us a year from now, 2 years from now, 3 years from now, wanting to be bailed out because they don't have the funds.

I think debt retirement and operating expenses are one of the greatest things we are going to have to look at in the next few years. All our communities, especially in my constituency, and maybe I'm unique, I don't know, but they're all asking me to bring to your attention they'd like to see the grant structure changed, so that it can be used for debt retirement and operating expenses. Mind you, this would be no different. If some community wanted to use it for capital expenditure, let it be. If they've got the moneys to match it, they've got their grant and everybody's equal. Let them use it the way they want.

Thank you.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just three quick comments. First of all, to the minister, extend him my congratulations and in some regards sympathies too. Let me say that I agree very much with the comments made by my colleague from Clover Bar when he talked about the minister having to be responsible for what's going to happen on the eastern slopes. I think this may be as good a time as any to serve notice that we look to you as being one of the ministers who has the greatest responsibility in that particular area.

Secondly, I would strongly urge the minister to continue the policy I think his predecessor had, and that was a series of advisory committees, especially on this question of fish and game regulations. With great respect to the professionals in the field, it seems to me on occasion they are so busy counting the animals they think are in the field that, in fact, they forget what really is happening as far as people are concerned. Those advisory committees can serve a rather good purpose in bringing the professionals in the field down to earth.

Third and last point I would like to make is that in the County of Mountain View we have a county park which the county council embarked on many years ago. They got involved in a program several years ago, when there were some grants in the province. Later on those grants were cut back. The county council has tried for something like three or three and one-half years, I believe, to get the former minister to come out and have a look at this particular park. On the weekends and during the summer, it's swamped with people from Calgary primarily, but some also from Red Deer. We've tried unsuccessfully for about three and one-half years to get some form of assistance from the province. It is Westward Ho Park on Highway 27 just east of Sundre. I would urge the minister to look at, not just the Westward Ho situation, but I am sure there are several other municipally-owned parks in counties and M.D.s that have a similar kind of situation. If the minister would, sometime when he is in the area, meet with the County of Mountain View, and go have a look at the situation, they'd consider that a great step in the right direction. If you brought some money along they'd consider it an even greater step.

[The motion was carried. Bill 16 was read a second time.]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Assembly will not sit tomorrow evening. I move the Assembly do now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion for adjournment by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 10:05 p.m.]

