

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Thursday, April 21, 1977 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **PRESENTING PETITIONS**

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Group Against Smokers' Pollution, I would like to present to the Legislative Assembly of Alberta a petition of over 200 names, requesting that legislation be passed regarding smoking in public places.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 40****The Agricultural and Recreational
Land Ownership Act**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Agricultural and Recreational Land Ownership Act. The purpose of this bill is to protect our valuable and renewable agricultural and recreational land resource for present and future generations of Albertans by restricting the future purchase of larger amounts of such prime land by non-Canadians. At the same time, the bill does not place barriers to continued foreign investment which will result in manufacturing and processing developments; joint ventures in the production of jobs and opportunities for Albertans.

A few of the principal features are: first, all Alberta land over 20 acres may be subject to controls, except Crown land, mines and minerals, and land within cities, towns, and built-up areas. Secondly, Canadian citizens and landed immigrants will not be affected in any way. Thirdly, coming under the bill's controls are non-Canadian persons and corporations, foreign governments, and their agencies. Fourthly, the provisions of the bill are not retroactive, nor will they affect land transactions now in progress.

Mr. Speaker, we believe this bill is a balanced initiative in the best interests of present and future Albertans.

DR. BUCK: It took a while, Lou.

[Leave granted; Bill 40 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file a copy of the proposed draft regulations under The Agricultural and Recreational Land Ownership Act, copies of which will be made available to all members.

MR. CLARK: Will you do the same for The Planning Act?

MR. HYNDMAN: No, different situation.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, may I introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 27 grade 8 students from St. Martha school, situated in the Calgary McCall constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Rob Earle, Miss Patfrayn, and Mrs. Bertsch. I would ask them at this time to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 50 grade 5 students from the Brigadier Gault school at the Canadian Forces Base, Griesbach. They are accompanied by their teachers Don Murchie, Lillian Babiuk, and Juliette Richard. I'd ask that they stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you a group of grade 6 students from the Collingwood elementary school in Calgary Foothills constituency. They are accompanied by their vice-principal Patrick Sproule and by teachers John Drysdale and Dora Ingelson. Mr. Speaker, they are in the members gallery. I would ask them to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you this afternoon, and through you to the Members of this Legislative Assembly, two vice-presidents of the Commonwealth Games Foundation, 1978. Seated in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, are Mr. Tony Thibodeau, vice-president in charge of ceremonies, communications and security, and Mr. Hal Spelliscy, vice-president of marketing and fund raising.

Mr. Speaker, I also have another 'person' I'd like to introduce to the Assembly. This gentleman's name is Keyano. He is the Commonwealth Games mascot. Keyano was presented to us last night, Mr. Speaker, to present to the hon. Premier. I would ask one of the pages to come forward and accept Keyano to deliver to the Premier's office.

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the hon. minister that all non-members to visit the Assembly should be in the galleries. [laughter]

The hon. minister and 'Member for Swan Hills' has put the Chair in a somewhat 'grizzly' situation. However, the presentation might be more in keeping with the procedures of the Assembly if the hon. Premier were to share the bear with the hon. Leader of the Opposition, which might give the hon. Leader of the Opposition some 'paws'. [laughter]

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, that's what happens when you can't get into debates.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Health Services — Labor Negotiations**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, on this rather noteworthy day from the standpoint of the agricultural land ownership legislation coming in, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Has the minister had discussions with the Alberta Hospital Association following the letter going out from the Alberta Association of Registered Nurses to hospitals across the province that there is a likelihood or a very real possibility that the 6,000 members of their association may withdraw services to hospital boards across this province at the end of May?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I personally, as well as senior officials of the portfolio, am in touch with the Alberta Hospital Association on a regular basis to discuss matters of mutual concern. In all these meetings the Alberta Hospital Association has advised us of the stage of negotiations from their point of view, and their anticipation as far as negotiations are concerned. With respect to whether or not a specific meeting has been held by me personally with the Alberta Hospital Association since the date of the communication the hon. leader refers to, I would have to check that. But we are in regular communication. I will be having a meeting with the Alberta Hospital Association on a variety of matters very soon now.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Has the minister to date discussed with the executive or elected representatives of the Alberta Hospital Association the specific question of the possibility of withdrawal of services by the Alberta Association of Registered Nurses at the end of May?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, yes. At the last meeting we had, the Alberta Hospital Association briefed me on the entire stage of negotiations with the different professional groups they negotiate with. At that time they were not assuming any particular actions, but they do brief me and keep me up to date on the stage of negotiations with all groups involved.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Have any officials from the minister's department or from the Department of Labour met with the Alberta Association of Registered Nurses, in light of the letter having gone out to the Alberta Hospital Association?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to indicate to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that it's important I have regular communication with the Alberta Hospital Association . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the hon. minister wishes to answer the question, he may do so. I think we're getting off on another tangent.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, in response to the specific question then, I've met with the Alberta Association of Registered Nurses on broad professional concerns the Alberta association has, not specifically on negotiations.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In the course of those discussions with the Alberta Association of Registered Nurses, has the minister specifically discussed with the nurses the contract proposals they've put forward to the Alberta Hospital Association?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, no. As a matter of fact it is my practice not to discuss on other than a briefing basis the matter of negotiations, which in my view are between the Alberta Hospital Association and the Alberta Association of Registered Nurses or any other professional group or agent bargaining on their behalf.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister dealing with the present negotiations with the certified nursing aides. Has the minister met with them, once again from the point of view of the guaranteed continuation of services to hospitals across the province?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, again, I've met with the Alberta Certified Nursing Aide Association and groups of certified nursing aides. I have not specifically discussed the matter of negotiations between them and the Alberta Hospital Association.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, the same question to the minister with regard to the health services association of Alberta, being the X-ray technicians and that whole group of people.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, to this point I haven't scheduled a meeting on broad professional concerns other than mailing a questionnaire to that group. But the answer on the specific is identical to what I gave on the others.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister in a position to indicate to the Assembly whether the Alberta Hospital Association in co-operation with the minister's department is now in the process of developing some sort of contingency plan in light of the fact that in addition to the situation of the Alberta Association of Registered Nurses, negotiations are going on in the other three health service areas. Is some sort of contingency plan being developed either by the Hospital Association or by the Hospital Commission and the Hospital Association collectively?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, the briefing the Alberta Hospital Association gave me was that while they assumed nothing, they are prepared for any eventuality. With the public responsibility that boards have for the operation of individual hospitals, they have assured me they are ready for any eventuality.

Crown Investigation

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Attorney General. Is he in a position to make any announcement today with regard to the exact nature of the investigation of the Royal American Shows question?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, not at this time.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has the minister been approached by the federal Solicitor General and been asked to meet with representatives of the office of the federal Solicitor General with regard to review of the investigation of the Royal American Shows question?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, as I've said earlier in the House, I think it may be appropriate for me to make some remarks at some point. And I think I indicated earlier that if the House is in session when that point arrives, I would be happy to make some comment here. That situation continues. If that statement is made in the Assembly, I'd be happy to respond to the question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. But I don't think anything useful would be served right now by disclosing with whom I'm meeting, what my discussions are, whether they're with police forces, solicitors general, or attorneys general. I'd like to leave the matter stand until I'm in a position to make some comment.

I wish to assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition and members opposite that I will act with as much promptness and dispatch as I can, and endeavor to be as open and candid as I can when the time comes. I'm simply not in a position to say exactly when that might be, but I don't expect it will be too long.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister. Has a meeting been held between the federal Solicitor General and the Attorney General of Alberta on the question of the investigation of Royal American Shows?

MR. SPEAKER: It would appear the hon. leader is repeating, with perhaps a slight variation, a question previously asked. In any event it would appear the subject matter has been so fully covered by the hon. Attorney General as to probably cut off any avenue for supplementals.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the ruling of the Speaker. The question I initially asked was: has the Attorney General been approached with regard to a meeting with the federal Solicitor General? The Attorney General was quite clear in saying he wasn't prepared to answer that question. The supplementary question I pose is: has the Attorney General met with the Solicitor General of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: I don't quite get the distinction. I may be missing some nuance, but it would seem that any prospect of getting information by further supplementary questions would not be there, in view of the very full explanation by the hon. minister of his reason for not answering.

Native Land Claims

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio responsible for native affairs. In light of the government's unwillingness to negotiate a land settlement with the isolated communities, and in view of the precedent of government funding for natives in James Bay [interjections] my question to the hon. minister . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

DR. BUCK: You guys are getting touchy.

MR. NOTLEY: Just let me get to it. Is the government prepared to consider direct funding to offset the legal costs to the isolated communities in their legal case?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, now that the member's gotten through his preamble and to the question, I can answer that. The isolated communities do receive funding from this government for the very important work being done in those parts of the province. During the estimates of the Native Secretariat, I'll be very pleased to go into those in detail. The broad question of funding for legal claims is one I don't propose to get into today. Again it's a question which might be raised during the estimates.

On past occasions we have assisted native groups with specific funding for specific projects. That may be done in the future. However, I believe this particular case is one the Attorney General has adequately outlined in the House. If the individuals involved want to negotiate, an avenue is open for them to do that. But we've basically said they cannot have it both ways. We will not negotiate while something is before the courts.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Have there been any discussions, or does the minister intend to meet with the advisory committee of the isolated communities, concerning this question of legal assistance?

MR. BOGLE: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview is aware, the president of the Isolated Communities Advisory Board is himself a treaty Indian who was born on an Indian reserve. Therefore he has no legal claim to an aboriginal or any other kind of right we're talking about in isolated communities. This is not part of the area on which we expect input from the Isolated Communities Advisory Board.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In view of the fact that the isolated communities represent not only treaty people but non-treaty as well, is it the intention of the minister to seek a meeting with the advisory committee of the isolated communities to discuss possible assistance from the province in view of the legal case?

MR. SPEAKER: Again the hon. member seems to be repeating a question which he put previously.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General. In light of the legal case concerning the caveat, is the Attorney General in a position to give the Assembly a ballpark figure as to the costs incurred by the province in researching its position on the land claim and the caveat case?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, like my colleague the Provincial Treasurer, I'm unaccustomed to dealing in ballpark figures. However, were I so, I think I'd have some difficulty indicating in this Assembly, or anywhere else for that matter, specifically what the Crown might be doing in its preparation for anticipat-

ed or present legal proceedings.

I realize the House may wish to ask me questions during the course of my budget and my estimates, and quite properly so, in terms of how many dollars we may have allocated for legal advice and the like. I'm happy to look at that. But I don't know what might usefully be served by the Crown now indicating what resources are being applied to the solution of certain legal problems. I have great difficulty feeling that's an appropriate response for me to make, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. In light of statements attributed to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor concerning federal requests that he restrain public comments, particularly with respect to native questions, is the Premier in a position to assure the Legislature that at no time was there any provincial representation to federal authorities with respect to statements made by His Honour?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that's an appropriate question to ask in the Legislative Assembly. First of all, there's a presumption in the question that I think has an innuendo to it that I don't know has any basis in fact. Again, the sort of communication that might be made with regard to that office is, in my view, questionable in terms of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. The question contained no innuendo. The question was very direct: was any communication or representation made by the government of Alberta to federal authorities with respect to statements by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'm troubled with that question because of the position of the Lieutenant-Governor in this province, from a parliamentary precedent point of view. The question is one I'd like to take as notice and consider. I have some real, serious doubts as to whether that statement is appropriate within the privileges of the House.

MR. SHABEN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the government undertaking any program to assist the residents of the isolated communities to acquire land for their home sites?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in the last year the Department of Municipal Affairs, in co-operation with my colleague Mr. Bogle, has conducted land tenure studies in the communities of Wabasca and Desmarais. They are proceeding in 1976 with the intention of providing security of tenure to some of the communities and some of the natives in those communities.

Daylight Saving Time

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Attorney General and ask if he can inform this Assembly if it's this Sunday that we spring ahead for daylight saving time.

DR. BUCK: Yes. Saturday night.

MR. FOSTER: I'm hoping someone can help me, Mr. Speaker. I don't know. It's in the act. I'll have to look it up.

MR. PURDY: A supplementary question. It may be a question of law too, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure. Does an order in council have to be passed for daylight saving time, or is it within the statute?

MR. FOSTER: My legal advisor on my right tells me it's the last Sunday in April. I conclude from that that no order in council is necessary. If it is in the law of Alberta, as I'm sure it is, then I am deemed to know it and so is the hon. member.

Mental Patient Escape

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General. I was wondering if the minister could advise the Assembly what progress has been made in apprehending the latest escaped patient from the Alberta Hospital?

MR. FARRAN: I have nothing to report at the present time, Mr. Speaker, except that all police forces have been alerted to look out for the escaped inmate.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Is the minister aware of how much time elapsed between the departure of the patient and the notification that came to your law enforcement officers?

MR. FARRAN: No, Mr. Speaker. I haven't got that information at hand, but I can find out for the hon. member.

Smoking in Public Places

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. I wonder if the minister could advise if a petition has been presented to her or her department by the Group Against Smokers' Pollution, requesting legislation be enacted to prohibit smoking in all enclosed public places except in designated smoking areas.

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Through my Deputy Minister of Community Health, a petition has been received. Whether that's the specific petition the hon. member refers to, I'd have to check to be sure that the wording is exactly the same.

MR. MUSGREAVE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise the House how many names were on that petition her department has received?

MISS HUNLEY: I don't know exactly, Mr. Speaker, but there is a goodly number of names. I would hazard a guess that there are more than 10,000, but I would also want to check that for detail.

Native Land Claims
(continued)

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could now respond to the question from the Member for Spirit River-Fairview and refer to you, sir, the question that has been made to me by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview — to *Beauchesne*, page 149, Section 171(ii), that a question oral or written must not: introduce name of, or contain a reflection on, the Sovereign or the Royal Family, or refer to influence of the Crown.

At least to this stage of the game I would consider that that question does reflect upon the Crown, as represented in the province of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: I would not be prepared — if I'm asked, I don't know whether that's the intention — to make a ruling on this point without giving it some further consideration.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I could just speak on the point of order. The question was not in any way directed to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor's statements. The question was really related to whether or not any official of this government, which is responsible to the Legislature, had made any communication. So I think it should be very clear that in no way was the question directed at His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, who is held in the greatest respect by all Albertans.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, I'd have to take serious dispute with the hon. member, because the question would not be raised if there was not an innuendo requiring some suggestion that direction should be sought with regard to comments made by Her Majesty's representative in the province.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order raised by the Hon. Premier, the Hon. Premier is not entitled to read motives into a question. [interjections] Most certainly not. The question stands, and I ask you to make a ruling on it when appropriate.

MR. HYNDMAN: The question is out of order.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to respond to that by saying that the very nature of the question has in it, in my view, an innuendo with reflection to the Crown. It's for that reason that at this stage of the game, barring further consideration, I am not prepared to respond, because by responding to the question I really confirm the innuendo.

MR. SPEAKER: As I understand the situation, it's a question which is directed toward eliciting from the government information concerning a representation which it might have made to another government, both of those governments, of course, being under the same Crown but having different representatives of the Crown serving in their jurisdictions.

There would perhaps be a suggestion in the question — well it's more than a suggestion, it's quite clear it seems to me that the idea behind the question is the possibility of the government of Alberta having made a representation to the government of Canada in order to obtain instructions, directions, a request,

or a communication from the government of Canada to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

Dental Care

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. In view of the severe shortage of dentists in rural Alberta, has the minister discussed with Alberta universities and the Alberta Dental Association the possibility of using dental interns in rural areas?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, we've had discussions, but not on that specific issue.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary. I wonder if the hon. minister would undertake to discuss that and give it some thought.

My second supplementary is: have there been any discussions on the introduction of special incentives for rural students wishing to enter the dental faculty?

DR. HOHOL: In both cases, Mr. Speaker, I'd respond affirmatively and say yes, I'll discuss with the appropriate principals the notion of incentives and the matter of using interns to some degree more than is the case at the present time.

Citizens' Action Groups

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. This arises from a citizens' action group in Spruce Grove that campaigned to have a council decision reversed — not reversed, but to call for a plebiscite. My question is: are funds available for citizens' action groups such as this to receive some assistance when they are having a campaign against an elected council?

MR. JOHNSTON: Not that I know of, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General. Can the Attorney General indicate if funds are available in his department for citizens' action groups, to assist when they are looking at a money by-law, especially, when you have a certain percentage of people who petition a local authority? In many cases there can be court costs when you're looking at an injunction. Are funds available for citizens' action groups in these cases?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, there are certainly no departmental funds available for that. It's possible, I suppose, that the group might consider applying to Legal Aid. I would be hesitant to suggest that that might be the appropriate route. I cannot recall any such expenditure on the part of Legal Aid in the past, but a small amount of money is set aside for civil legal aid matters. I wouldn't want to rule it out; I think it should be examined. But the short answer to the question about the department is no, there are no such funds.

If a group of citizens wanted to examine a research question, it's also entirely possible that the Alberta Law Foundation might be another appropriate body that could be approached, at least to make a request. Again, I suggest both the Law Foundation and the

Legal Aid Society — not because I think it necessarily follows that they would receive such a request with approval, but I think we should check whether it might be appropriate to apply.

Freight Rates

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Deputy Premier in charge of transportation. In light of the fact that Lakeside Packers and the Canada Packers hog operation in Brooks are closing down this month, will the minister be making representation to Ottawa on freight rates in regard to beef and pork?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, we'll continue to make representations to the federal government relative to the freight rates on dressed meat particularly. But I would point out to the hon. member that other factors are involved relative to both Lakeside and Canada Packers that, frankly, don't have anything to do with transportation.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government received any commitment from Ottawa that freight rates affecting beef and pork prices would be made more equitable if the Crowsnest rates were discontinued?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the hon. member read the speech I made on freight rates. Because I think it's important that he understand that any solution to the so-called Crow/Snavely gap — if in fact the rates on other commodities are higher now because of some so-called catch-up required by that gap, then surely with a solution to the gap the other rates should come down.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government given any consideration to making representation to Ottawa on a possible alternative to the Crowsnest rates? I'm thinking, for example, of an acreage payment to farmers.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, that's the essence of the argument that will go on once we receive the Hall report and Snavely No. 2. We're hopeful those additional reports will be forthcoming early. But the argument will go on as to how you pay the Crow/Snavely gap, and to whom you pay it. The proposition I put before this Legislature, and indeed everywhere I can, is that one of the ways and maybe the best way to do that is for the federal government to take over the railbed, at which time the Crow rates become compensatory and the argument of grain versus meat disappears.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One final supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Is the minister's department carrying out any studies which would indicate declines in the amounts of pork and beef processed in Alberta if the present freight rates continue?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, we've done a great deal of work with respect to the reasons for the decline, particularly in the pork industry over the last two to three years. Without getting into a long comment, I'd

have to say there are six or eight fairly major reasons for the decline in the pork industry. The Crow rate on feed grains is not by any means the top of the list. The most general reason for a decline in hog production in this province over the course of the last three years has been the good prices farmers have received for grain and the other off-farm job opportunities available in Alberta which simply do not exist at that level in many other provinces.

Packing Plant — Brooks

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister been advised that the Lakeside farm industry in Brooks is in fact going to close its doors tomorrow, which would probably lay off 60 employees?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't aware that the date was tomorrow, and I don't think it's correct to say "close its doors". My understanding is that Lakeside Packers will shut down its packing plant operations on a temporary basis because of a lack of margins between the packer and the wholesale price of beef.

Home Improvement Program

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to either the Minister of Housing and Public Works or the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Has the government received any complaints from recipients of the SCHIP grant about being seriously overcharged for works done on senior citizens' home repairs?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, on several occasions the director has indicated to me that there have been apparent overcharges, where the tenant has indeed asked the department to get in touch with the contractor doing the work to see what can be done.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works or the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Is the government considering any procedures, beyond the individual negotiation the Minister of Housing and Public Works referred to in his last answer, to deal with these questions of number one, monitoring and number two, remedying?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, as I remember, the complaints weren't large in number. In fact, where we did receive complaints, my understanding is — but it requires some checking — that all cases were settled without too much difficulty.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, maybe I could supplement that and say I have asked my officials to let me know whether anything unusual was developing in the area involving senior citizens. Nothing has been brought to my attention recently.

Mental Patient Escape (continued)

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. I

wonder if the minister could indicate further details with regard to the escaped patient from Alberta Hospital, Edmonton. Was the patient supervised or unsupervised? Did the patient have ground privileges?

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the complete details surrounding the patient the hon. member is concerned about. I do know he had ground privileges, that he was a formal patient rather than informal, and that he was not from the forensic unit but from the geriatric unit.

Premier's Travel Plans

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. It flows from the question I asked on April 1 with regard to the possibility of the Premier going to Russia this summer. On that occasion the Premier indicated he couldn't give any useful advice to the Assembly as to his plans. Is the Premier in a position today to indicate to the Assembly whether he will in fact be going to Russia at the end of May or this summer, and to the Middle East following his sojourn in Russia?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I should be in a position to deal with that matter Monday, probably during the course of my estimates.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. I raise the question today in light of an article from a Toronto magazine which announces to Albertans that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. Leader of the Opposition will find ample references in *Beauchesne* — I should think about three of them — to using newspaper articles as a basis for questions in the question period.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then I'll put the question this way. Is the Premier in a position to indicate to the Assembly whether he indicated to the editors of *Maclean's* on March 31 that he would in fact be going to Russia in May, and the Middle East oil-producing countries and Geneva in June?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I gave the *Maclean's* magazine writer the same information I gave this House: I was planning such a trip, but the trip was not definite; when it was definite I would announce it in the House.

Rent Increases — Fort McMurray

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. This is a follow-up to the question I asked previously on the large rent increases proposed by Athabasca Realty. I would like to know if the minister has made any decision, as he said he would by [April] 21 — and that's today.

MR. HARLE: First of all, Mr. Speaker, it's not the minister who makes the decision under the act. It's the rent regulation officers. I am advised they hope to have the decision out by April 27. I believe I indicated

to the hon. member when he last asked that it would be April 21. Because of the size and number of units involved, it is taking somewhat longer.

Street Improvement Program

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Transportation. Could the minister indicate whether the five year street improvement program will be continued next year?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, we're in the final year of the street improvement program in this fiscal year. It would be our intention to bring in an entirely new concept for coming years.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate whether a project started this year would be eligible for further funds in a new program?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that question at this time, because the new program has not been finalized. It would indeed be very difficult for the towns to have that kind of expectation.

Utilities Legislation

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney General. The question flows from representation made to the Attorney General by the city of Edmonton with regard to proposed amendments to The Gas Utilities Act and The Public Utilities Board Act. Has the Attorney General had an opportunity to view the concerns the city of Edmonton expressed to him? Secondly, is the Attorney General in a position to indicate to the Assembly if the government plans to move forward on this legislation at the spring session?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, it was always the government's intention to proceed at the spring session of the Legislature with the legislation referred to. But I have not had the opportunity of reviewing the letter from the city of Edmonton, and would like the opportunity of doing so before I make any further comment on it.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Banff revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)

MR. KIDD: Thank you very much, but I don't think my guests are in the gallery, Mr. Speaker. Excuse me, perhaps they are just coming in.

Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, some 30 students from the Cochrane high school. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Bryce

Dixon. [laughter] I may be in error. I'm not in error from what I read in the instructions I have here. [laughter] They're certainly accompanied by their driver, Mr. Greg Parsons. I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of this House.

head: **MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I move that motions for returns 115 and 140 stand and retain their place on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

1. Moved by Dr. Buck:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to increase its support of small business by

- (1) introducing in the current session legislation to enact those taxation and incentive measures designed to aid small business proposed in the Basic Objectives and Terms of Reference for Alberta Business Taxation and Incentives, tabled by the Provincial Treasurer in January 1975,
- (2) introducing in the current session legislation which would strengthen the position of independent service station operators in dealing with the major oil companies, and
- (3) establishing purchasing procedures which would ensure a predetermined level of participation by small business in supply to government.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, the lifeblood of this province is the small businessman. It's been lip-service paid by this government . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

DR. BUCK: . . . that the small businessman is of great concern to this government.

AN HON. MEMBER: How about 35 years . . .

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I realize the government is touchy and will remain so, because their record certainly doesn't back up what they have tried to tell the people of this province.

MR. NOTLEY: True, true.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, as I rise to open the debate, I look forward with great interest to the comments of my fellow members, especially the government members. I'll be especially looking forward to see what the Minister of Business Development and Tourism has to say. The resolution is one I'm sure every member of this Assembly should support. I certainly hope they do support it. But judging by the voting record of government members so far, they'll really find some reason to vote against it. It doesn't really matter how logical it is; if the government caucus has decided to vote against it, they shall do so.

The intention of this motion, Mr. Speaker, is quite obvious and straightforward. We are urging the gov-

ernment to take a number of initiatives designed to aid small businesses and the small businessman of Alberta. They're not radical initiatives. In fact some of them were initially suggested by this government. They are sensible solutions to a problem which is becoming more and more obvious to more and more people.

In a world where big government, big business, and big labor control an ever-increasing percentage of our economy, and are an increasingly large presence in our lives, great numbers of people are starting to fight this trend to bigness. People are beginning to realize the importance of smaller cities, decentralized organization in business and government, more personalized labor relations and, probably most important, small businesses. Smallness has become the slogan of a new generation of young people, economists, and businessmen.

We hear government members talking about free enterprise and the free-enterprise system. Even some members of the cabinet talk about free enterprise once in a while. Well here's a chance to make a commitment to our system of individual free enterprise, because the small business sector is the only place where this system retains real meaning in the modern world.

Much as Syncrude may be important, as we all realize — it has been touted as being important, perhaps even necessary, and I emphasize perhaps — it has little to do with free enterprise or individual initiative. It can generate what some might call a question between three mass organizations, each of which is organized along corporate lines. The real system of competition and initiative is restricted to fewer and fewer individuals and companies which can exist outside this system.

Mr. Speaker, people who fail to understand the difference between big business and small business, between multinational corporations and local corporations, quite frankly are not living in reality. The two types of businesses are structured on different principles. They serve different purposes. In effect they are as different, one from the other, as labor is from government. The two are just not comparable. Because of these differences, they must be perceived to be different by government. That is why the small business sector requires its own laws, its own protective mechanisms, and probably its own government department.

At any rate I don't consider it necessary to discuss these questions at length, since there should be little argument involved. It is the professed policy of this government that small business should be supported. We hear this every day, even though the support until now has not been very spectacular. Mr. Speaker, to quote from the '71 Progressive Conservative platform, which seems to be coming back to haunt this government more and more, we face a challenge:

to offset the trend in Alberta whereby our citizens are becoming forced to choose between the alternatives of being an employee of government or an employee of a large corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the "now" platform goes on to outline a number of ideas for improvement, mostly of a general nature. One is to establish provincial tax incentives, a subject we'll be discussing today. It's still a good idea, even after six years of inaction.

AN HON. MEMBER: Thirty-six years.

DR. BUCK: So I ask the hon. government members: who is going to argue against this resolution? Surely not those government members who are always talking about the free-enterprise system, the members who are committed by their party platform to support small business.

The one thing that might discourage government members from supporting this resolution is that it would commit this government to some action, and action is becoming increasingly difficult for this government. It is becoming a government of drifting. In only six years the Lougheed team has become tired and old, with many of its members ready for retirement, including the announcement that even the Premier may be retiring. Some of the members should retire or be sent down to the farm system.

MR. NOTLEY: When he retires so will a lot of the others.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, let's have a look at the stack of government legislation we have this session. It is probably the most mundane legislation I've seen brought to this Legislature in the 10 years I've been here. The only act that's at all interesting is the election finance act, and that doesn't even go far enough. It just scrapes the surface. After four years of preparation by the waffling Minister of Municipal Affairs, The Planning Act is such an anticlimax that the municipalities can't even figure out if it's good, bad, or just indifferent. Some of the members who worked on that act have said, really it's just a rehash of the old legislation. A lot of the amendments already in that Planning Act were just bringing it into a new act. So really nothing is new.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wonder if the hon. member is able to relate the new Planning Act to the resolution before the House.

DR. WARRACK: He doesn't have a plan.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'm just trying to indicate to the honorable economist from Jasper Place that this government has not done anything about small businesses, and that really it hasn't done anything, especially in this session.

MR. NOTLEY: They've got the Minister of Utilities and Telephones in charge of the agenda this year.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, the Premier recently said he would retire if he felt his government had degenerated into just caretaker work. Well I suggest this is a good time for the Premier to retire, as he announced this morning, because this is just a caretaker government. So, Mr. Speaker, it looks like the government is not too far from retiring, and in the next 18 months we'll try to do everything we can to see that many of the members do retire. [interjections]

For the hon. minister who is about to become an ex-minister, the Minister of Utilities and Telephones, wait until the associations of rural gas co-operatives get hold of the hon. minister. They'll look after him. But I'm sure the people down in the Three Hills

constituency will rectify the errors they've made in the last two elections, and the minister can go back to his ivory tower. [interjections]

MR. NOTLEY: God help the university.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, this resolution is intended to bring back some life into this government, to give the cabinet some direction. I hope the government members will support this resolution on small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution is divided into three parts, each of which is designed to help small businesses deal with the problems they inevitably face because of the economic and social realities of this modern world. These problems are real and immediate. They are widely recognized, and they require some immediate attention. The small business sector — the little guy, the small businessman — needs more than words, but that's all this government has been providing.

When we are debating this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I hope we don't hear a bunch of backpatting from the government members, and we don't hear about all the great achievements of the Alberta Opportunity Company and the Agricultural Development Corporation. Mr. Speaker, I hope the government is finally over its kick about saying what the Socreds, the former government, didn't do. If the government members are honest with themselves, they will realize the former government did many things for the small businesses of this province.

But we're not to live in the past; we're to live in the future. We're discussing what we are going to do now, in case the government members have forgotten what now means. Mr. Speaker, in discussing this resolution I wish the government members would address the issue, rather than just talk about some of the shortcomings of the past government and tell us what great things they have done. More importantly, I want to know what they're going to do.

We've seen this government act like a large corporation, spending hundreds of millions of dollars and getting involved in big business. But at the same time they are doing this, because they have placed their entire political future on large corporations such as Syncrude and the Alberta Energy Company they have ignored the small businessman.

AN HON. MEMBER: You sound like Grant.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, the first part of the resolution simply asks that the government take some action on the taxation and incentive measures that were proposed by the former Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Miniely, over two years ago. When this publication was tabled in the Legislature, the Treasurer indicated the proposals would be implemented by 1977 at the latest. Well we're in 1977 and we haven't heard a word about reforms from this government or the new Treasurer. We in the opposition feel this issue is extremely important, and we hope a little friendly prodding will encourage the government to revive the program.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that you have to prod and prod and prod. I would like to compliment the government on finally — finally, I say — bringing in the foreign land ownership act. But it took a lot of prodding. It took a lot of prodding by the opposition.

It took a lot of prodding by the people of this province. It seems the only way this government reacts is when it's prodded. So I say to the hon. members: stay awake for the next 10 minutes or so; we welcome your participation in this debate. [interjections]

If the hon. Member for Vegreville does as little as he usually does, he can leave and have coffee. We really wouldn't miss him, and neither would the people in his constituency if he wasn't around the next time. So I say to the hon. Member for Vegreville that if he will go and have a coffee instead of beating his gums, the rest of us who are interested in helping the small businessman can stay here and debate the resolution. [interjections]

Mr. Speaker, we feel that the most important proposals, or at least those which concern us today, are those dealing with small business. It seems silly to recite the government's own proposals to back it. But since the document seems to have been forgotten, perhaps it's necessary. First, a reduction of corporate tax from 11 per cent to 6 per cent on the first \$500,000 of taxable income for Canadian-controlled, Alberta-resident corporations. Now there's a nice small family operation, half a million dollars. Secondly, a tax holiday for three years from the date of incorporation until \$500,000 taxable income is earned. To us this seems a particularly good idea. Thirdly, encouraging the formation of investment incentive corporations, or IICs, which would allow corporations a 250 per cent income tax deduction on an investment in a small business for as long as the equity investment is held. Now that's good.

In spite of the fact that all these things are good, Mr. Speaker, nothing is being done. But we're between elections. I suppose we're going to revive this, come the end of '78 or the start of '79, and we'll get a massive headline again saying: government is going to help small business. It's the government's *modus operandi* to recycle old press releases. The government thinks the more often you recycle old press releases, the more often you can fool the electorate.

But, Mr. Speaker, the electorate is becoming a little wiser every time we recycle a press release. So I say to the government that maybe small business is asking for a little more action and fewer press releases.

Mr. Speaker, these proposals may not be perfect. For example, it may be questionable to base a definition of small business on cumulative tax income. The definition suggested by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business may be better:

Enterprises that are independently owned and operated, not dominant in their fields and with not more than 500 employees.

But perfect or not, these proposals at least give us a start, and should be tried out in practice. They can be reformed and improved later. Nothing is being accomplished by letting them gather dust on the shelves.

The second proposal asks that something be done about the increasingly high levels of vertical integration in the oil industry, something to protect small, independent retailers who are being forced out of business at a steady rate.

Mr. Speaker, I think we must recognize the immense good the large oil companies have done for the welfare of this province. Nobody can argue with that. I'm sure both sides of the House welcome large oil companies' investment in this province and the

good they have done this province. But the large oil companies do not get their fair share of the take every time we get an oil price hike. The government is getting the largest share of that revenue.

I previously mentioned the recycling of old press releases. I just find it very, very amazing how the Premier can sit there and shake his head when we ask the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources: when we're negotiating oil prices do we ever start using the leverage we have at this present day to do something about freight rates? The Premier shakes his head. I can understand him shaking his head, because this government has done nothing except talk about what they're going to do about making freight rates more equitable. This may be the last decade or the last five years that we have the leverage we have now, and I think this government has been derelict in its responsibilities by not doing more than just cranking out press releases saying how we're going to do something about the freight rates and we hope Ottawa will do something. But this government hasn't done anything, and it has an opportunity now. The government goes to Ottawa, and it doesn't seem to come back with world prices and it doesn't come back with any equity in the freight rates.

So I would say to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources: he should either leave that portfolio and give it to somebody who is tougher, or do something when he's down there. It's quite interesting to look back when the price of oil was low and the quotas on Alberta oil limited the amount we could export to the United States. At that time, Mr. Speaker, we were getting world prices, and that's quite an interesting fact. But the last few years when we've been going down to Ottawa with our cannons all charged to get what they offered us, not what we wanted, this government has missed a golden opportunity to do something for the small businessmen and the farmers of this province, to get more equitable freight rates. It has been derelict in its responsibility to those people.

So when we talk about the role the oil companies have played in the development of this province, Mr. Speaker, I say the oil companies have been good corporate citizens. But at the same time, the high level of vertical integration in the oil companies, where they have gone into the service stations, is an area I think they shouldn't be in.

I would like to say history is not always bad. I think some hon. members will remember when the breweries of this province were involved in the hotel business and the premier of the province said to the breweries, gentlemen, you have five years to get out of the hotel business. They went, because the premier of the province at that time said, your responsibility is to brew it, cap it, bottle it, and let the little businessman sell it. [interjections]

MR. HORSMAN: [Inaudible] a great deal of enthusiasm.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, this area has caused a lot of concern to many small businessmen. I feel genuinely disturbed that the Minister of Business Development and Tourism, who is himself a small businessman, would not take a strong stand to help the little businessman. We've heard really nothing from the

minister except that he's been monitoring a few gasoline prices — very few. The Provincial Treasurer has been telling us a few fairy tales about how lucky people in Alberta are to get gasoline prices so low. But the man in the street doesn't believe that malarkey. He just has to go to some of the neighboring states. He goes north and finds gasoline is over a dollar a gallon. So the little man, the small businessman, the man we're concerned with, is not getting his fair shake from this government.

Mr. Speaker, the third portion of the resolution asks that the government develop purchasing goals in order that small businesses again get a set proportion of government business. This should be established as policy, and in the long run the proportion should be increased. I hope some government member doesn't get up and ramble on about all the things we already buy from small business. I'm sure I can recite some of those speeches. That's not the point of the resolution, Mr. Speaker. Whatever the percentage of government supplies provided by small business, the government should make a conscious effort to increase that proportion. There is a natural inclination for the government, being a big organization, to deal with other big organizations. It is simpler and perhaps a little cheaper. We are asking that a conscious effort be made to change this situation and that the proportion of government business given to small, local suppliers be increased year by year. This is a suggestion of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business and seems to be a good one.

Generally, the government must make strong, conscious efforts to increase its support of small business, even if it requires stepping on a few toes. This is what has held the government back until now. It was felt that small business could be helped without damaging anybody else's interest. Well that's not the case. Helping independent retailers will, at least in the short run, hurt and anger the major oil companies. But because these people are good corporate citizens, we know they can understand if the government moves in that direction. When the government kept breaking contracts with them, they had a little trouble understanding that. But they'll be able to understand if the government is trying to help the small businessman.

As I said, increasing the level of government business given to small business will restrict the sales of some of the large suppliers. Even with tax incentives, tax breaks given to small business will ultimately have to be paid out of another pocket, although Alberta is extremely lucky in having resource revenues which, for the present, are able to take up the slack caused by such programs.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, helping small business will require some sacrifices on the part of our citizens. The fact is that in many cases small business is less efficient than vertically integrated multinational corporations. In the short term, we may be increasing costs and decreasing productivity. That is why some governments, including this one, have failed to protect independent gasoline retailers. That's why it's so difficult to protect the smaller food retailers from the expansion of the large corporations. Although some people disagree, I think we'll have to accept this fact. If we wait for small business to demonstrate it can be more efficient than the multinationals, it may be much too late to act.

Mr. Speaker, a conscious effort has to be made. A few toes have to be stepped on, and a few sacrifices have to be made. But in the long run we will be protecting the way of life that gave rise to these efficient, vertically integrated, multinational corporations in the first place. They grew out of these small enterprises. I think it will be worth it.

In other words, if this government really wants to help the small business sector, what it needs is courage, the type of courage it lacked when confronted by big labor in the Syncrude/Alberta Energy pipeline tendering. At the same time it did not have that courage, a minister had to be asleep at the switch that all the contracts were not signed when the Syncrude deal was put together. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we are saying this government is not helping the small businessman in Alberta like it should be.

In one of the annual reports of the Alberta Energy Company, or some of the returns we received, it's quite interesting that the average loan was in the vicinity of \$110,000.

MR. DOWLING: Alberta Opportunity Company.

DR. BUCK: Alberta Opportunity Company, I apologize.

Mr. Speaker, to my way of thinking that is not the purpose of the Alberta Opportunity Company. I would be much happier if the average loan were \$20,000, \$30,000, or \$40,000, because that's the range where we are really helping the small Alberta businessman. I realize we probably dropped another \$2 million of the taxpayers' money today. One of the companies we were discussing this afternoon indicates it's in dire financial straits. But we seem to favor companies where the cabinet can get together behind closed doors with its little group and decide we're going to lend somebody \$3.5 million. That seems to impress this government. It tends to be associated and to think with big companies, big government, and a big civil service.

Mr. Speaker, the last point I'd like to make . . . [interjections] I'm glad to see the hon. member is here.

Mr. Speaker, the 1976-77 estimates for the Alberta Opportunity Company were \$15 million, and the forecast is for \$6.6 million. So either the small businessman has given up trying to get funding from the Alberta Opportunity Company, or the government has run out of large people to lend money to. When I say the small businessman has become discouraged and has given up, I think this may be closer to the truth. The small businessman has lost confidence that this government is genuinely interested in helping him. I ask the hon. government members especially to support this resolution and give the small businessman in Alberta the kind of help he needs.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder have leave to revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you, and through you to the members, some 14 grade 6 students plus one preschooler from Athlone elementary school in my constituency. They're accompanied by a parent Mrs. Bedard and by their principal Mr. Clintberg. They're seated in the public gallery. I would like to ask them to stand and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. KIDD: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to correct an error. The name of the high school teacher from Cochrane is Paula Daves.

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

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to rise to correct a few things that have been said.

I'm delighted to have an opportunity to say a few words to the motion presented by the Member for Clover Bar. Before I begin, I'd like to say that I notice the trend toward smallness has extended right into the middle of his caucus. So maybe they haven't forgotten smallness at all over there.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to congratulate the then Provincial Treasurer for offering an imaginative position paper recognizing the opportunities that had slipped through Albertans' fingers all through the 1950s and '60s. As I read the important initiatives the Member for Clover Bar put forward today, I see that item (i) says, introduce legislation "designed to aid"; number (ii) says, introduce "legislation which would strengthen"; and number (iii) says, "establishing . . . procedures", which is all very useful but not too definitive. So I thought we'd begin by discussing what the problem really is.

As I understand the small business problem in Alberta, our position would be to assist and encourage small businesses and identify desirable locations and industries that might be their prime motion. The alternatives to do this, as I understand them, are several.

First of all, there are tax incentives. Mr. Speaker, presumably those would be corporate tax or personal tax. We would probably have to abandon the personal tax because of the huge bureaucratic cost and logistics involved in doing the collection. On the other hand, the corporate tax is a possibility. But in order to do that, individuals of high income would have to be incorporated. Some timing would be involved for putting staff and procedures in place. Then there would be the problem of identifying useful deductions.

The second vehicle this government might use is that it would be a catalyst for venture capital to be exposed to entrepreneurs. This might be done formally through the Treasury Branch or the Alberta Opportunity Company, or informally by sponsorship through the Department of Business Development and Tourism by gathering and disseminating data on possible investors and opportunities.

Thirdly, it might be done by a vehicle like the

investment incentive corporation discussed in the position paper. But that particular ICC presentation does have some difficulties. The trick here is essentially to get the investor attracted to the proposition and, at the same time, leave the innovator without encumbrances on his assets, perhaps, and with the ability to buy back a controlling interest at some later date. It is very difficult to be sure that people who are in fact in a position to incorporate don't become vultures and devour everything they invest in.

The [fourth] possibility for this government might very well be to continue the high profile we have for Alberta regarding no estate tax, the lowest income tax in the country, great life quality, advantages of stable source and price of fuel, labor quality, and the environment of Alberta altogether.

When this position paper was brought out, the initial urgency was further aggravated by a uniform Canadian tax system which didn't appear to make allowance for geographical or special provincial aspirations. In the last few years this has been eased somewhat by an apparent real initiative by Ottawa to dialogue with provincial tax officials in response to particular provincial priorities such as the royalty tax credit and the renter assistance credit.

After this position paper was made public, the industry at large responded with measured enthusiasm. The philosophy of assisting small business is of course very acceptable, but the implementation was variously received depending on the vested interest of the respondent. One responded by saying equity funds are of course more readily available in Ontario than in Alberta, therefore this would not move entrepreneurs or people with special skills westward. Another said large companies would be reluctant to get involved in investment incentives because of weighing tax advantage versus risk in ventures outside their normal sphere of operation. Another said the time required by specialists in large corporations to look outside their normal interests is expensive and time-consuming. Another said tax holidays for small companies should not begin until after first revenue. In other words the tax holiday shouldn't begin from the time the shovel goes in the ground. The hiatus in tax should continue until a specified time after the company has an ability to earn.

The question of what is a small business in terms of a \$500,000 pretax earning figure was found difficult by some of the respondents, in view of the fact that many companies are experiencing their most dynamic growth and their most rapid and high capital requirements in that earnings range.

Finally one mentioned that the gross tax incentive might better be directed to a strong basic industry in total, which in turn would cause healthy small business spinoffs. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the problem with tax incentives has been said to be that it only hurries the inevitable. In fact when a prospective manufacturer is looking for a place to locate, it's well down the line from source of labor, fuel, location, and other infrastructure. So it could very well be that these tax incentives simply hurry the day the inevitable would have happened in any event.

The problem of using a tax as an incentive brings up some interesting areas. Generally, tax is difficult to understand unless you have a tax specialist on your payroll, which many small companies can't afford the luxury of. Tax doesn't generally fine tune

readily to special circumstances. Finally, a given tax incentive total may lack leverage, particularly spread over a wide number of small businesses. In the opinion of many, Mr. Speaker, tax in a broad sense has more appeal when it is easily understood, consistent, and fair.

Mr. Speaker, Alberta continues to struggle with very high labor rates, perhaps among the highest in the world. Our distance from market and oppressive transportation costs are problems the solution of which would be a tremendous competitive incentive. Our high participation rate in employment and improved balance opportunities across the province have given us time to reflect on industry input and to respond properly to the January 29, 1975, position paper.

There is no evidence that equity capital is not abundant in Alberta, as evidenced by the total RRSP contributions in equities going outside Alberta. As I see it, Mr. Speaker, the trick is to put in place a well-considered vehicle to introduce the investor to the innovator, to preserve the innovator's long-term equity position, to have the ability to fine tune as required to suit provincial aspirations, and to offer a favorable return to the risk investor with a minimum of government involvement.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would have to reject the collective thoughts of this resolution until a well thought out and useful plan can be put into action.

MR. KIDD: Mr. Speaker, entering the debate and attempting to reply in a specific manner to some of the comments by the hon. Member for Clover Bar, it is very difficult to be specific with such a rambling resolution. So I thought I would just make comments on one aspect, number (2). It says:

introducing in the current session legislation which would strength the position of independent service station operators in dealing with the major oil companies.

By talking of independent service station operators in this context, I presume we are talking about dealers. Mr. Speaker, my comments will hopefully be very, very brief but much more pertinent than were those of the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Let me make it very clear that I join with those who are sympathetic to the hardships that may have been imposed on independent service station operators through changing market conditions. However, it is my personal view that any action taken through legislation to artificially interact with a market place can only be effective in the very, very short run. In the longer run the effect of the changing market — that is, the effect of changing public demand, and it is changing — will surely impose much greater economic pressures on independent service station operators than those that are effective now.

It is generally agreed, Mr. Speaker, that there is overcapacity in the retail end of petroleum marketing, that marketing services patterned around consumer needs will continue to be dynamic, and that consolidation will continue. Competition between majors is intensive. Let's not have any doubt about that. Any action to reduce the efficiency of the majors — that is, their ability to get products to the public at competitive prices through self-serves, et cetera — will certainly leave a gap. That gap will be filled by private branders, those now operating and those who will be

enticed into operating through seeing the opportunities. In fact we have in Alberta a very successful and aggressive private brander who is providing substantial competition to the majors and who would be very happy to take advantage of any lessening of competition from majors.

Mr. Speaker, I am apprehensive of any action to change the free operation of supply and demand, particularly where such action cannot be clearly demonstrated to be in the best interests of the public as a whole. We have a number of examples of attempts to control the market, such as that of the federal government with regard to agricultural products. Whenever so-called experts attempt to second-guess the complexities of demand and to forecast the overall reaction of the market place, it seems to me they are much more often wrong than right. When it comes to factors that affect the pocketbooks of individuals, I have great faith in the combined intelligence of individuals in accurately establishing real levels of demand.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that most if not all major oil companies are attempting to minimize the effect [on] their dealers during this period of change by implementing their new marketing programs on a planned basis and by endeavoring to place the dealer in another suitable location or by compensating him when another suitable location cannot be found.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, it is my belief that any legislative action we might take in response to this resolution would have the exact opposite effect than that intended. Therefore, while appreciating the sincerity of the motives of the mover, I cannot support the resolution.

Thank you.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, back in '71 I used to wonder if there wasn't someone in the former government competent to do a more able job than the minister of that day in the portfolio of Industry and Commerce. I thought for a time — in fact, I've continued under the illusion for quite a number of years — that maybe the hon. Member for Clover Bar would have been able to achieve that. The illusion has been completely driven away from me this afternoon.

DR. BUCK: I'm trying to help you.

MR. GHITTER: Alice in Wonderland.

MR. YOUNG: Well, hon. member, if your speech is widely promoted in the press of the province, you have helped me.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has introduced a resolution in three parts. His main objective, as declared to the House this afternoon, was to urge the government to increase support to small business. I find it regrettable that in only three ways was he able to develop ideas for doing that. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that by confining himself in this manner, he has restricted his remarks, and the House is restricted in its deliberations in many respects.

There are many ways in which this government has assisted small businesses in this province, and many ways that comments could have been made with potential suggestions in the honing of the assistance which has been provided. But this resolution, Mr.

Speaker, forces us to confine our views to three very narrow topics.

I am forced to the conclusion, therefore, that the hon. member was unable in his imagination and exploration of the subject, even with the extensive research assistance he obviously had, because I detected in the delivery of his speech a very halting manner at times, and difficulty with unfamiliar wording and sentences. Obviously . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: He's quite the schoolteacher.

MR. YOUNG: . . . not sentences he had written on his own.

Mr. Speaker, if we wish to consider small business in this province, we ought to start from square one and ask: what is necessary to get small businesses into operation and to foster their well-being? It seems to me the first thing we have to have is ideas and opportunities. You don't have opportunities unless you have a good economic situation. Now surely that's basic. And surely, when Alberta is booming in the way it has for the last six years, we have that basic fundamental requirement for both small and large business. The hon. member failed to mention this requirement, which I would consider elementary and which I think is here aplenty.

Certainly, in expressing that point of view, I would want to say that the opportunities I think exist — and the most promising opportunities — are those related to our dominant industries: agriculture and the petroleum industry.

Just on the matter of agriculture, I would like to remind the House of the tremendous initiatives taken in the last five years, which have very directly benefited small business. I ask the hon. members in the former government what they did by way of fostering the development of small local meat-packing plants, and giving them the opportunity to develop their products into markets on a major basis. Certainly it couldn't be done without inspection. And why didn't we have inspection? Because nobody thought of it until this government came into power. Now we have some healthy, viable meat-packing plants apart from the very large industry.

The second basic requirement to develop small business is a source of finance. Surely we have that with AOC and ADC. If the hon. members in the opposition keep hammering away at the occasional loss sustained in those operations — losses which must be expected, as they will surely admit, if the government is to foster the businesses and ideas which are not generally going to be financed by the traditional method of private finance. Surely we must expect some losses. But every time we have a loss, who do we hear crying? It's not the government members we hear crying about it, it's the hon. members in the opposition who are ready to say the taxpayers' money is going down the drain.

DR. BUCK: It is.

MR. YOUNG: Well you can't have it both ways, hon. Member for Clover Bar. The government has to take a chance and put its money where its mouth is in terms of supporting small business — and that's what we're doing — or we're going to have to retire into our shell. It seems to me the hon. member, in his

suggestions at times, would prefer to see us in a shell and doing nothing for small business.

The third necessary requirement to have a viable opportunity for small business is to have skilled trades. I invite the hon. member to take a look at the annual report of the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower. Surely that is a good illustration of the development of skilled tradesmen that has been encouraged and initiated by this government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in keeping with some of the approaches taken by other speakers this afternoon, I'd like to raise a question about the third item in this resolution. The item deals with the purchasing procedures which, in the words of the hon. member opposite:

. . . would ensure a predetermined level of participation by small business in supply to government.

I have great difficulty with this proposition. I have difficulty first, because the hon. member in introducing his motion failed to give us any concept — any indication — of what he considers a small business is. I don't know what a small business is, or where the transition is from a small business to a large business. Do we follow the federal tax program definitions, or what were you referring to, hon. member? Or had you thought that far?

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest that the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place might cease directing asides directly to the hon. Member for Clover Bar and address the Chair.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I will address my comments through the Chair to the hon. Member for Clover Bar. I do not consider that it was the Chair's dereliction that caused the difficulty in my speaking with effect to this proposition, but rather the dereliction of the hon. Member for Clover Bar in presenting the resolution this way.

Mr. Speaker, to go back to my problem. I do not know, and have no concept from the mover of the motion, what is contemplated as to definition of a small business. I do not know, and the question has not even been raised in the earlier discussion, whether the intent is to provide some kind of bidding advantage — for instance, that we accept a tender which is 5 per cent higher if it comes from a business with a gross volume of maybe \$500,000 or \$5 million. I'm at a loss. I just don't know and haven't had any guidance from the mover of the motion. Are we going to accept a tender 5 per cent higher if it's from a small business, assuming we can define it . . .

DR. BUCK: We did with AEC, \$5 million higher.

MR. YOUNG: . . . as opposed to a larger operation? Are we going to accept a tender from an Alberta small businessman if it's 5 per cent higher than a tender from a Saskatchewan small businessman? Mr. Speaker, that question has not been asked, should be asked, and should be answered by the hon. member.

The other question on which I would have wished to hear some debate is whether in fact we are providing any serious basis for growth for small businesses if we provide an artificial environment of this nature; that is, a purchasing advantage by the government of

Alberta. Of all the initiatives that could be taken, this kind of preferential treatment would be difficult to accomplish and would ensnare the government, and perhaps small businesses, in some misleading or difficult circumstances in making decisions. We would have to look behind each small business, to determine not only its volume or its profit but who the owners are, because it could perhaps be a spinoff of a larger business. So the topic deserves a considerable amount of debate and a good and thoughtful introduction, which I submit, Mr. Speaker, it did not get.

Before I close, I as a very small businessman would like to comment on two suggestions made by the hon. Member for Clover Bar. If I understood correctly, one of those suggestions was that we have special legislation and a special government department for small business. I have a lot against government departments — especially special government departments, which I think are dubious in the extreme. I wonder what could possibly be achieved by a department sponsoring legislation which would apply uniquely to small business. Would the small businessman have to be subject to the legislation originating from that department? Would the small businessman have to be subject to the legislation which applies to larger businesses? And what if they crossed the boundary between being a small business and a large business? How would they know what legislation they were under? The hon. member hasn't dealt with this issue, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is a very grave omission, an omission serious enough to make me consider the matter had not been considered very well at all.

One hon. member advanced the suggestion that one of the greatest helps to small business would be tax legislation which is fair and easily understood. I submit that that in fact would be a tremendous advantage, and that the proposition advanced by the hon. Member for Clover Bar — a special government department and special legislation — would go in the opposite direction. Mr. Speaker, for those reasons I would be unable to support most of the comments advanced by the hon. member.

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm always happy to hear ... Oh, he's going ... [Dr. Buck left the House]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time has expired for this order of business. I believe we're on private members' public bills.

MR. GHITTER: Then may I beg leave to adjourn debate, Mr. Speaker.

head: **PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS
OTHER THAN
GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Second Reading)**

**Bill 220
The Blind Persons' Guide Dogs Act**

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to speak to second reading of Bill No. 220, The Blind Persons' Guide Dogs Act.

The bill I am presenting will grant certain privileges to blind persons who are accompanied by guide dogs;

namely, the right to enter and use public facilities and services, and the right to accommodation when accompanied by a guide dog. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I'll read from the bill:

No person, directly or indirectly, alone or with another, by himself or by the interposition of another, shall

- (a) deny to any person the accommodation, services or facilities available in any place to which the public is customarily admitted, or
- (b) discriminate against any person with respect to the accommodation, services or facilities available in any place to which the public is customarily admitted, or the charges for the use thereof,

for the reason that he is a blind person accompanied by a guide dog.

Legislation similar to what has been presented here today has already been proposed or enacted in half the provinces of this country.

In 1974 the government of British Columbia was the first to pass legislation which guaranteed to blind persons accompanied by a guide dog the same rights and privileges with respect to accommodation and access to other public facilities as a sighted person. In 1975 Ontario enacted similar legislation, The Blind Persons' Rights Act. In 1976 Manitoba followed suit with an amendment to the province's White Cane Act. The New Brunswick government has proposed amendments to their Human Rights Act which would prevent discrimination against any blind person who relies on a guide dog. Just one month ago the government of Nova Scotia gave first reading to a blind persons' rights act. In addition to these five Canadian provinces, 40 of the 50 states of the United States of America have guide dog legislation in force.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before you today contains basically the same principles as the legislation currently in effect in other parts of Canada and the United States.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the experience of Ontario, which has had the legislation in force for approximately one year. There have been a good number of complaints concerning violations of the act. But in each case the Attorney General's Department has resolved these complaints without resort to prosecution. I think this is a highly desirable situation. In fact I think it would be much more desirable if we didn't need legislation of this type.

A little bit of humor, Mr. Speaker: the only two exceptions to the act the Ontario government found they had to make was in access to the metropolitan zoo in Toronto; in that case they provide an area to look after the dog and a human guide for the blind person; and of course in the hospitals they have exercised a similar ruling.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that legislation such as this is necessary, but I firmly believe it is. At present there are approximately 250 guide dogs in Canada. About 15 of them are in Alberta, at the last count six in Calgary, seven in Edmonton, and two about the province. However, this total figure represents a 33 per cent increase since 1975 in the number of these dogs in the province, and there is every reason to believe their numbers will continue to grow.

In many cases guide dogs are already freely admitted to public facilities. Our earliest example was that of Air Canada. In 1939, on one of their inaugural flights to Vancouver they were faced with the situation of a blind person with a guide dog seeking to take the flight. The president at that time set policy which has been adhered to ever since. In fact they give advantages to the blind person. They give him the front seat so there's lots of room for the dog. There is no extra charge made for the dog. Most of the American airlines give similar privileges. Some of them require the dog to be muzzled, but this doesn't interfere in any way with the dog's task. In fact an executive of one of the oil exploration companies in the city of Calgary, a blind man, has literally toured the world with his guide dog. This clearly indicates the great importance of a blind person being able to resume normal employment with the assistance of the guide dog.

There have been random acts of discrimination both in this and other provinces which have prompted the passage of legislation to ensure the rights of the blind. Two recent incidents in Alberta have persuaded me that the need for such legislation is indeed urgent.

Not too long ago a young blind girl in Calgary going out on her first trip was denied entry to a restaurant because she had the dog with her. There are certain regulations under The Health Act that provide for the dog to gain entry, but this was such a traumatic experience, the girl suffered so much humiliation and embarrassment that she was not inclined to leave the house with the dog for a good many weeks.

The second situation, the one which actually prompted me to bring forward this legislation, concerns a man living in a multiple housing development in the city of Calgary. He is threatened with eviction should he acquire a guide dog. I attempted to negotiate with the management on his behalf but they absolutely refuse to back away from their rule which says, no pets. You will find it most interesting, Mr. Speaker, that the other residents of this multiple housing unit took up a petition in which they stated they didn't consider the guide dog a pet under the regulations of the housing unit and were quite prepared to have this man bring the dog in. But, as I say, the management are not prepared to back away from their rules and regulations.

While legislation which would guarantee to a blind person with a guide dog the right to accommodation in any self-contained dwelling unit might appear to discriminate against landlords, I'm sure any reasonable person would recognize that the guide dog is not a pet, not an animal in the true sense of the word, and is just as necessary to that blind person as a wheelchair or other equipment is to a paraplegic. I feel quite sure the landlord would be very reluctant to turn down a paraplegic in a wheelchair for reasons such as this.

Concerns have been expressed about the conduct and actions of the dogs in public. These seeing-eye dogs receive special training to enable them to carry out their duties for the blind. At a school in San Rafael, California the guide dogs are given a six-months course of instruction before they are individually selected to serve a blind person. Then the blind person and the dog are given an additional month of training together to prepare themselves to

meet their tasks in the outside world.

One question that has been thrown at me a number of times during recent weeks when I've discussed this bill is the toilet manners of the dogs, in that the city of Calgary has a by-law that exercises some pretty severe penalties for the dog not exercising proper manners. I can assure all of the members and Mr. Speaker that these dogs are toilet trained and there have been no problems whatsoever in this area.

After their training, these guide dogs are entrusted with the task of serving as a blind person's eye. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is much more than a pet or an animal, in the true definition. Thus, through the services of a guide dog a blind person becomes less dependent on other people around him. With his dog he can lead an active, happy, normal life. Surely the service of these dogs should be applauded and not limited.

The particular case I spoke of in which this man is threatened with eviction should he get this dog is a situation where once he gets it he will be able to resume total employment. So it's rather a severe penalty the landlord is inflicting.

Mr. Speaker, the effect of this bill would be . . . in the situations I have outlined a blind person at present has no legal recourse. It is the intention of this bill to provide such recourse and also a sense of security to the blind person which he does not feel at the present time. It is also hoped that this act will promote greater public awareness of guide dogs use and of the blind, and that incidents which might result in charges being laid will be resolved in other than court procedures, as has been the experience in the province of Ontario.

The final section that I would like to read from the act, Mr. Speaker, has to do with accommodation. Section 2, subsection (2):

No person, directly or indirectly, alone or with another, by himself or by the interposition of another, shall

(a) deny to any person occupancy of a self-contained dwelling unit, or

(b) discriminate against any person with respect to any term or condition of occupancy of any self-contained . . . unit,

for the [sole] reason that he is a blind person keeping or customarily accompanied by a guide dog.

I believe the purposes of the bill have been clearly outlined, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope the members would give it their support.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, rising to support the hon. Member for Calgary McCall in his bill this afternoon, since the hon. member has fairly exhaustively covered the purpose of the bill and the bill itself, I would like to express my support, and the reasons for it, in terms of what I take to be a necessity to awaken the public in general to attitudes it has developed or currently has toward persons not able, as most of us are, to make their way readily in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I think the problem in this instance is one of acquainting the public with the challenges blind people face. If the public in general were aware of the function of guide dogs, of the training of guide dogs, and of the way guide dogs conduct themselves when they are controlled, as they must always be when they are helping a blind person, I can't believe

the incidents of misunderstanding — I'd like to think of them as incidents of misunderstanding — found in media reports would occur. Generally speaking I do not believe our society would be so negative — that it would have acted that way in the instances which are reported — if it fully comprehended the seriousness to blind persons, the training that guide dogs have, and the function they perform.

Mr. Speaker, I see the problem that faces blind people as a problem of public attitude, not unlike the challenge this Legislature considered some six years ago when we dealt with human rights legislation and The Human Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure we best advance the cause of blind people at this time with legislation that forces a severe penalty. I am convinced that before we exercise the penalty provisions, every effort should be made to acquaint offending individuals with the role of guide dogs and with the fact they are performing discrimination of a very negative nature. In that sense, the Alberta Human Rights Commission could have a role in removing some of the misunderstandings.

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall has indicated one instance where he endeavored unsuccessfully to play a Human Rights Commission role, as I would envisage it. I think that's highly regrettable. It's not something the persons involved, who acted negatively in this instance, can be very proud of. But I don't think failure in one instance should lead us to enact strong legislation which would apply a penalty at the first sign of discrimination. Rather I think we should administer this legislation in such a way that the attempt would be to change attitude. If that fails, then let's apply the offence provisions.

Clearly this legislation isn't going to affect or benefit many people. But it helps a small group of people toward an objective I believe we all uphold; that is, making people as self-sufficient, as self-supporting, and as independent as we possibly can. It has been the attitude of this government — and I think I can fairly speak of the opposition too — that in every instance where we can, we should enable people to remove themselves from institutional care, to put them on their own two feet as it were. This measure would help a small group in that respect. On those grounds I think it's worthy of support.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying again that my interpretation of some of the negative actions by individuals which have been reported is that they didn't understand guide dogs, and maybe didn't realize the people were blind until they had committed an act and then didn't know how to back out and correct their position gracefully. In other words, they acted out of a sense of misunderstanding and haste.

Some people may have reacted because they felt insecure on seeing a blind person with a guide dog. They didn't know what to expect. Fair enough. Those people need to be helped. That is why, if this bill goes through, I would like to see every effort made to reconcile and explain, to change their attitudes. I don't think we should apply penalties unless absolutely necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill with the proviso that every effort be made in the implementation of the legislation to conduct an educational function by some agency.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add my words to those of the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place. I feel the bill, as written, would make a very good addition to the bills that have been legislated by this Assembly. I say that because, while I appreciate it affects only a very few people, it's a very significant help to them. As we know, many provinces in Canada have adopted similar legislation and seem to be administering it with a minimum of trouble.

As the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place said, this government and the preceding government have always tried to consider minorities, particularly those in really stressful situations, such as blind people.

Last week I had the opportunity to represent the government at the annual dinner of the Alberta district of the Canadian National Institute for the Blind. I had the opportunity to meet a person who was there with a seeing-eye dog. This gentleman is a familiar sight to those of us from Calgary. He's a practising professional engineer employed by a well-servicing company in the city of Calgary. Last week he was telling us he was conducting classes for engineers on the conversion of their company to the metric system. His dog goes with him everywhere and is a great addition to helping him operate as a normal human being.

One of the things he did say was that while some people may feel using a dog is a frustration, they would become more complete people if they felt the community was behind them in the ability to own a dog and take it wherever they could. One of the difficulties he has run into is being allowed into some restaurants, which I find rather strange. I appreciate that restaurant owners are not supposed to discriminate against them, but this does happen. The important thing he mentioned, though, was his great ability to travel on airplanes. Throughout the world he said he had received tremendous treatment with his dog.

Speaking on behalf of people who own property, I realize that having dogs — pets, as a lot of people have claimed they are; and I appreciate they are not — on property is a great problem. But I think most tenants are reasonable people. If they knew that a tenant in the building had a seeing-eye dog, I'm sure they wouldn't try to use this as a precedent that they too should have a dog.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, to support this act would be a very positive step for this government to take. I believe the education process suggested by the Member for Edmonton Jasper Place is not really that critical, because I think most Albertans are law-abiding citizens. When they know what the law is, they don't really have to be conditioned into obeying.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I would be very surprised if any hon. member of the House opposed Bill 220. In my view it's a very excellent bill. I'd like to commend the hon. Member for Calgary McCall for bringing it in, for the great amount of research he did, and for the excellent presentation he made. I want to join the two members who have already spoken in supporting the bill and give some reasons I think the bill should become law in the province.

About 1970 or '71, I was in a Vancouver restaurant that is no longer in existence when a man came in with a seeing-eye dog. To most people it was

apparent he was blind. But one of the head waiters went over and said, you can't bring that dog in here. Take it out. The man's face reddened. He was taken aback. He said, but sir, I'm blind. He said, I don't care if you're blind or not, no blankety-blank dog is going to come into this restaurant, this is a first-class restaurant. I think everyone felt the way I did, completely humiliated, when that man turned without saying another word and the dog led him out the door. I hadn't given my order, but I immediately got up and walked out too. I noticed seven or eight people at the counter — some in the middle of their meals — got up and said to the man who had ordered the blind man out, that's the last time you'll ever see us in this restaurant. Many times I wondered what that did to that man. He wasn't a young man. As a matter of fact, he was quite elderly. But he was certainly taken aback and humiliated.

I remember seeing a seeing-eye dog when I was in Boston about 1972. I'm always fascinated when I see these dogs. They seem to be most intelligent and almost like human beings. As a matter of fact, many times they're more alert than we human beings. I followed this man for several blocks because I was so fascinated with the dog. I saw him take the man to a very busy intersection, stop, wait for the light to turn green, then even look in both directions before he would tug on the rein and take the man across the street. I saw him going through a park. I think they call it the Kennedy Park. It's after some president anyway. It's in the heart of Boston. In that park are a number of monuments, a number of water places, and a great number of pigeons. The seeing-eye dog would almost humanly take that man around so he wouldn't disturb the pigeons, away from the water. He took him right to a bench — there was a band playing in the park — and I think he had one of the best seats on the bench. Then the dog sat up and seemed to enjoy the music with everybody else.

Sometimes we may say this legislation is not effective, but I think it is. Maybe this would have happened anyway, but in 1974 I was in a restaurant in Vancouver — not the same one, it's no longer there — again at the counter. I saw this man come in with a harness around his dog. The dog led him to one corner of the counter. The man apparently had been there before. He took his coat off and hung it up. He said something to the dog — I didn't catch what he said — and the dog lay down behind him. He got up to the counter and the waitress took his order. I thought that was a pretty wonderful thing. As a matter of fact, almost a breath of enjoyment came over you when you saw the way they treated that man. I don't think anyone in that restaurant would have complained if that man had been given first place ahead of everybody. He got good service. When he was finished, he just reached around and touched the dog on the head, and the dog stood up. He took his coat, and they led him to the cash register where he paid his bill and then went out.

That was after the legislation was passed in British Columbia making this legal. Maybe that would have happened, and should have happened, whether there was legislation or not. But I'm inclined to think the legislation had something to do with it.

In passing this type of legislation, it would be my hope that it would be effective through not being used. I think the very fact it's there would make it — I

would hope at least — never to be used by anybody against the blind. I don't think we can do too much for the blind. While the blind themselves are in many cases completely independent and don't want sympathy, they do need help. A seeing-eye dog gives them eyes.

It appears to me that to keep a blind person out of an apartment, hotel, or eating place because he has a dog with him is almost inhuman. Because that man has eyes, but they're in the head of the dog. They are his eyes, and I think they should be considered like that.

I detest seeing cats running around a restaurant counter. I don't like cats anyway, but I like them even less when they're chasing around on top of a counter where I'm going to eat. I've never seen dogs on the counter. Dogs never bother me in a restaurant if they're staying on the floor where they should be.

But I don't think that is comparable at all when we're talking about a seeing-eye dog. As the hon. Member for Calgary McCall said, they're exceptionally well trained. They're like human beings. Their intelligence is remarkable and fascinating. In my view, putting this legislation on the books might be the means of never having a case happening again like that recounted by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall. I think the very fact that it's on the books is something we could be very proud of in this province.

I would like to see the government either adopt this and make it a government-sponsored bill after it gets through second reading — as they did with one other bill — or take it all the way, which might be impossible because of the length of time when it drops to the bottom and so on. But I hope the government might bring in the bill at the fall session or even before, and put it on the statutes of Alberta. I think this would be a real tribute to the humanity we expect from the government of Alberta.

I am very happy to support the second reading of Bill 220.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks in support of the principle of this bill and perhaps to underline some of the areas where problems may arise. I think the hon. Member for Calgary McCall has done an excellent job of research and of informing the members of this Legislature on the legislation brought forward in other parts of this country and in our neighbor country.

It's perhaps unfortunate that we must legislate human compassion and consideration under difficult circumstances. However, I suppose to some degree the nature of humanity is individual preference and selfishness. It appears the only way to resolve the problem is by legislation. I'm not sure that at this point I would say [whether] the route to take is separate legislation or considering other mechanisms. As far as the principle of the bill is concerned, however, there's no doubt in my mind and I'm sure in the minds of the majority, if not all, the members of this Legislature that the principle is sound and supported.

I know availability of access has been denied to blind people who wish to have the assistance of a guide dog. That is unfortunate, because certainly the majority of individuals are healthy in all other respects and able to maintain themselves without turning to public support for financial assistance. I

think it's unfortunate if they're denied assistance such as a dog that would enable them to function independently, to maintain themselves. I've had communications from one or two citizens in my constituency who have had to face this very problem, where accommodation near their place of employment was being denied. Accommodation was available to the individual, but not insofar as their having a guide dog was concerned.

If we look at the many kinds of facilities — some have already been mentioned — to which blind people accompanied by their guide dogs are denied access . . . Restaurants have been used here, and living accommodations. But I think it's much wider than that. If we look at requirements in concert halls, facilities for sports activities, general shopping centres, food merchandising outlets — a very good example is bakeries, where I think it is attempted to maintain a very high standard.

However, I'm not sure we will resolve all these problems by one piece of legislation, because where an individual does not wish to have human compassion or make their facility available they will look toward legislation currently in place that allows this kind of discrimination either by direct clauses or the fact that the legislation under which they may operate or have their facility existent is silent.

I think it would be worth while to consider that the various clauses of this particular bill be implemented in every piece of legislation now in existence that is either silent with respect to these points or is in fact directive and results in discriminatory actions being allowed.

Communicating to every business or individual who owns a facility where they offer a certain service required by the blind individual might be more easily achieved if amendments are brought to every piece of legislation requiring it.

I would like to suggest both to the hon. member who introduced the bill and to the minister — perhaps in the greatest majority, the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, but to all other departments responsible for legislation or under whose jurisdiction legislation is existent as well — that these issues would be relevant too. I would like to say that we should have an examination of what is attempted under this bill, that the other legislation be sought out and brought forward, and that amendments be put forward.

Because we are dealing with the principle of the bill, I would suggest at this time that members of this House support the hon. Member for Calgary McCall, support this legislation on principle, and that these other areas be examined prior to the final passing of legislation and then perhaps be brought forward. It may not achieve the quickness in action we may desire. But I think the fact that the principle is being discussed here and that this legislation has been introduced — if there is an indication that this government would move in the direction of making such amendments to all other legislation, we would go a long way in achieving the kind of acceptance, consideration, and human compassion on the part of the public in allowing any blind person who may now have, is contemplating having, or may in the future find need for, a guide dog to assist him to manage in an independent manner.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on The Blind Persons' Guide Dogs Act, submitted by the Member for Calgary McCall. I think it's a compassionate kind of presentation that is certainly worthy of the consideration of all members of the Legislature. Though it deals with a very small number of people, it is nonetheless an extremely important consideration. Within my own family — not immediate family — are two young girls, one born partially blind and the other born totally blind. I attempted for a short period of time to put myself in their position. I think I still have the bruises from it. But it did prove to me the kind of handicap under which a blind person labors. That doesn't mean to say they aren't able in many ways to develop all their other faculties to an extreme degree.

In respect to these two particular young people I might add at this time they were both able to acquire high school education. I think both have university training, one toward a second degree. Both have become professional people to varying degrees, and have been able to fit themselves excellently into our society.

In considering the bill, while we still have to be compassionate, we don't have to forget that even with those kinds of limitations people are able to survive in our society and become very important parts of the human race.

I thought I would look at The Individual's Rights Protection Act which this government passed in 1972, to see if there was some section that might give this kind of provision for a handicapped person. If you bear with me I would like to read parts of Section 4 for the benefit of *Hansard* to again clarify with the people of Alberta what is in this particular section. It says:

No person, directly or indirectly, alone or with another, [or] by himself or by the interposition of another, shall

(a) deny to any person or class of persons the right to occupy as tenant, any commercial unit or self-contained dwelling unit that is advertised or otherwise in any way represented as being available for occupancy by a tenant, or

(b) discriminate against any person or class of persons with respect to any term or condition of the tenancy of any commercial unit or self-contained dwelling units,

because of the race, religious beliefs, colour, sex, ancestry or place of origin of that person or class of persons or of any other person or class of persons.

When we remove all the legal gobbledygook, it says we cannot discriminate in commercial and other dwellings, and it names those specific areas. But, Mr. Speaker, it does not say anything about handicapped persons. I think there was discussion with the handicapped some time ago to see if some provision could possibly be incorporated into The Individual's Rights Protection Act to give them the protection they may need.

It might be well worth looking at this particular section or other related sections, to see if an amendment might be applied in this particular case. This act of course deals with persons. It doesn't deal with other than persons, although I would say in this particular case the two are closely related, in that we are

saying a seeing-eye dog replaces the sight of a person who is blind.

I think the Member for Edmonton Jasper Place touched on something when he said it is rather unfortunate we have to write this sort of thing into legislation. It would really be nice if we could incorporate the kind of concepts we are talking about here without having to write them into legislation. Legislation is pretty definitive. It doesn't give any flexibility except probably to end up in a lot of legal arguments as to whether a person is totally blind, therefore entitled to a seeing-eye dog and to the provisions or access to a dwelling, or whether the person is partially blind or perhaps becoming blind — all these other ramifications come up when you get involved with legal issues.

It would be nice, Mr. Speaker, if we had some body that one could refer these kind of problems to, that could assert a subtle — if you want to use the term — weight that would encourage someone to reconsider who for example was opposed to accommodating a dog within their rental accommodation. That's the sort of thing we do in a lot of cases: government packs a pretty hard wallop and they can do it, without necessarily writing legislation. I worry sometimes about the volume of legislation that occurs and the confusion that can result from it.

In any kind of an act, if we go this route, I would like to see some provision to protect the other side of the story. One might not agree with me that some people are really allergic to animals of any type, but unless you are, you probably don't experience the kind of physical effect of animals.

I am simply saying we should consider both aspects in any kind of legislation and make provision for flexibility. Because there could possibly be intolerable situations where a landlord could say, there's no way, it's impossible. That employer should then have some kind of an access, perhaps some appeal procedure, whereby he could place his case. Because we should all have rights, in this case both in terms of the person who isn't able to see and of the person required to provide this facility. The fine suggested in the possible legislation is pretty severe for the landlord who is not able to cope with that kind of situation. I think we had better also have a look from the landlord's point of view, before we totally accept the provision.

I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, whether the Member for Calgary McCall outlined the number of cases here in Alberta. It is a very small number, 15 or so. I'm not sure in my own mind if the provision of legislation would escalate the use of seeing-eye dogs. I somehow think it wouldn't, but that's purely speculative. I say that because there are many other problems with handling seeing-eye dogs than there are with the ability to go down the street with a white cane. I see quite a number of blind persons on the street and they seem to be able to handle themselves very well.

What I'm saying is that in the event a seeing-eye dog is used, you're faced with the cost, requirements of food, medical attention, eventual replacement, and it's very questionable whether many of these people have the finances to cope with this thing.

So if we come in with this legislation, I don't think we need to expect it's going to be a great movement to acquire seeing-eye dogs, rather than the present means used.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it abundantly clear that to me it's a tremendously compassionate kind of bill that we should really consider very seriously in the Legislature.

[Motion carried; Bill 220 read a second time]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 5:30 in order that we can begin with the next bill next week. This evening we'll be in Committee of Supply in the Department of Labour, and I'll move that in a moment.

I will move, as well, that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until the Committee of Supply rises to report.

[The House recessed at 5:15 p.m.]

[The House met at 8 p.m.]

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

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will come to order. We will discuss the estimates of the Department of Labour. With the committee's consent, could we revert to introduction of visitors?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the House agreeing so that I may introduce 12 very fine young Albertans, members of the No. 355 cadet ambulance division of St. John Ambulance Brigade. They are accompanied tonight by their divisional nurse Miss Judy Lambert, Cadet Officer Wayne Hunter, and another individual about whom I'll hold hon. members in some suspense.

MR. NOTLEY: Jack Horner?

MR. CRAWFORD: These young folks are fully trained first aiders who volunteer their time to the public for first aid attendance at various functions. Their superintendent is with them, a young man well known to members of the Assembly, Mr. Steve Stevenson. I'd like to ask them to rise and receive the acknowledgment of the House.

Department of Labour

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you turn to page 227 of your

Estimates. Mr. Minister, do you have any opening remarks?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to direct a few remarks by way of an overview of some of the more important factors in connection with what is, compared with the recent estimates and the recent year of activity of the Department of Labour, assured of being another interesting, active, and productive year on behalf of the department. In saying that, I want to draw immediate attention to the government's priority for two years now. We're in the second year of a program developing the occupational health and safety services of the Department of Labour. This still continues to receive a great deal of attention and effort from people in the department and, of course, many other Albertans who are interested.

Mr. Chairman, I want to mention first the other Albertans who share with me and the people in the Department of Labour that important consultative role that guides government in things that are so important in the programming of a department throughout the year. Hon. members will note that over the past number of months I was able to announce the appointment of the advisory council in regard to occupational health and safety. I'm very proud and very pleased with the way that body got under way and is advising the department and me in regard to occupational health and safety matters. Hon. members may remember that Dr. Cochrane, the President of the University of Calgary, agreed to be the chairman of that body. It numbers 12 in all, including representatives from labor and management, and from the Legislature in the form — if I can put it that way — of the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood.

That's not the only part of the consultation process. We have continuing, as in past years, the close liaison in occupational health and safety matters with the Alberta Federation of Labour. Not long ago the federation conducted its annual workshop in regard to occupational health and safety. The Department of Labour was closely involved in that. When one considers that in a case like joint worksite committees, which are much discussed, we have the advantage of being able to make proposals to the workshops of the Federation of Labour and get their feedback, and in the same context get the feedback and advice of the advisory council of which I've just spoken, then one can see that the consultative mechanism and the involvement of the people of this province in this type of program development is a very real thing indeed.

I think the workshop held last month in Edmonton by the Alberta Federation of Labour, and attended by a number of senior representatives of the Department of Labour, came to some conclusions in regard to joint worksite committees that were so topical that tonight I wanted to mention a bit of that relatively new information to hon. members.

In doing so I should underline that the only part of the estimates of this department that is substantially increased, percentage-wise and dollar-wise, over previous years is in connection with the development of the occupational health and safety programs. The workshops conducted by the Federation of Labour were sure that flexibility in the number of members and the possibility of subcommittees and joint worksite committees were two of the items to be assured,

and that labor should have at least 50 per cent representation on joint committees. They point out that management members on the committees should have sufficient authority to make decisions for action on behalf of management while the committee is actually serving. I underline that, Mr. Chairman, as an indication to hon. members how much attention, sincere thought, and input is being given in these workshops to this type of approach. It seemed to me that one other idea in regard to alternate chairing of the committee meetings is: to assure the effective working of the committees either the chairman from management or the chairman from labor should be able to call a meeting at any time.

The workshop also dealt with the question of frequency of meetings and underlined again the consideration that there should be no question of a worker representative on the joint committee accompanying an officer of the Department of Labour during an inspection of a worksite. I feel that's very important. I certainly have no difficulty according with that view and am prepared to predict that that would be one of the things I would hope the regulations in their final form would assure.

The sort of thing that those not involved directly on a continuing basis might overlook was not overlooked by the workshop. The workshop pointed out that near-miss accidents are one of the most fruitful sources of inquiry in regard to worksite safety, and suggests they be treated in a manner similar to an accident. Surely it makes a great deal of sense to include that in the scope of authority joint worksite committees will have.

That is far from an exhaustive or complete look at the question and the work being done in both the Federation of Labour workshops and the advisory committee under the act. But I thought that sort of touching upon it would be of interest to members this evening.

The percentage increase in occupational health and safety disclosed in the estimates — 44 per cent — and the increase in manpower of 20 brings me to the recollection that last November I was able to inform hon. members in the House of certain initiatives being taken in regard to recruitment of staff. Great care was being taken recruiting highly qualified individuals into the service of the Department of Labour as a result of the estimates approved by this House on previous occasions and the significant growth in the occupational health and safety capability of the Department of Labour that was provided by those previous decisions. The essence of this year's work is that that is to continue. The estimates indicate increases in both manpower and dollars for that purpose.

I referred to the statement I made in November. At that time I was able to forecast a bit in connection with some of the research projects the department was going to become most interested in. I particularly want to refer to that tonight too, Mr. Chairman, in that when we speak of occupational health and safety the temptation in the minds of many — although not in the minds of those who are consistently working in the field — is to think of the industrial or worksite accident as being the prime concern. It's true that there's no greater concern. But one should never lose sight of the fact that a worker is just as dead as a result of a disease that overtakes him after 10, 15, or

20 years of working in a particular job without any immediate cause of injury. He may have not only complete disability to continue his work, but of course industrial illnesses like say, lung cancer or other industry-related ailments can cause the worker just as great a problem as if he had an accident and was suddenly hurt.

I mentioned we had research that was being conducted through the Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board, and referred to a project at the University of Alberta where development of, hopefully, a relatively simple and inexpensive predictive type of test to detect carcinogenic potential of industrial chemicals had been undertaken. The expenditure of funds last year began some work on that, and I hope to see more of that particular project.

This year we are looking to a specific grant to begin the important work of basic practical research in the area of lung disease. So I thought hon. members would be interested in knowing that although the department has worked in the area of an asbestos program for some time, and has done its best to produce a useful and contemporary type of program for continued monitoring of cases in the Alberta work force, we are proposing that a special project be undertaken. As a beginning, it was approved in last year's budget under the care of Dr. Kaegi of Calgary. That work will be specially directed toward the incidence of asbestos-related problems in the work force. It's interesting to note that probably 95 per cent of the asbestos used in industry in Canada, known as white asbestos, gives rise to most lung ailments, of which there are many. According to some estimates, perhaps 3,200 products have asbestos involved in their manufacture or use in one way or another. Asbestos itself is dangerous not only in the formative process of manufacture, but continues its dangerous potential right through to the period when asbestos products may be junked or destroyed. People involved in that type of work may also find there are problems related to the inhalation of these fibres.

The proposal in respect to the research project, as I mentioned, is specifically given against a background of the work done so far. For example, for some time it has been the practice in the province of Alberta, based on regulations, that workers in the field — and there are some 26 separate fields referred to by the regulations — are provided with a chest X ray every two years. Regulation requires that a 14 by 17 chest X ray and a pulmonary function test be taken.

The group two occupations — asbestos processors, auto body workers, construction workers, demolition workers, and insulation workers — are considered the ones that as far as industry is concerned are primarily at risk. The procedure which has been in place since 1972 calls for a review of the examination of each person involved in the testing program, and a report back to that individual so he may consult his physician in regard to any difficulties uncovered by that type of examination. For example, in the period from April '76 to March 31, '77, 2,571 workers were investigated under this program; 524 of them were involved in insulation or other potential asbestos-associated industries. Of those 524, it was found that 21 per cent had abnormalities and were referred to their physicians.

Just to give a little more information to show how the testing program works, of the abnormal group —

being 21 per cent of the 524 — some 13 per cent had abnormalities suspected of being fibrosis of the lungs. This is commonly referred to as asbestosis; the cause in these cases presumably being occupational dust or asbestos exposure. This is an interesting feature too: the remaining 87 per cent of the abnormal group with lung difficulties had a variety of non-occupationally related problems. So although it does show up as a special concern from an occupational point of view, it was also found that chronic bronchitis, emphysema, heart disease, previous tuberculosis or pneumonia, and even a broken collarbone in one instance, were given as reasons for the test having shown the workers in those particular cases having lung abnormalities.

The examinations are usually performed in hospitals. The employer pays for the test and is required to give the worker time off during working hours for it.

I just want to add one more thing in regard to that program prior to making more specific reference in respect to the new research I am mentioning to hon. members tonight. That is that although the program was started in 1972, only in the last couple of years has the senior administration of the department been satisfied with the method of review. The program was a little slow getting started. We identified that as a problem. As soon as it was discovered this was happening, corrective action was taken. The program in the past two years has been in very good form as far as medical surveillance of the people tested is concerned. Like many new programs, it had that feature to it. We are sure it can be improved, but we believe it's an effective and very useful program at the present time.

The difficulty with lung-related illnesses is that they may relate to previous occupations. They may relate to occupations that have taken place in other jurisdictions. They may go for 10 or 15 years without any apparent evidence. Because most of the active work done on the subject has been in the last five years or so, there are of course people in the work force who have a significantly predating condition which may cause a disability in connection with lung disease. Those may be discovered only after a number of years have gone by.

The initial phases of the study by Dr. Kaegi that I mentioned — the agreement in regard to that research was undertaken last month — will be to review the nature and the degree of the health hazards associated with asbestos, and the degree to which asbestos does represent a problem to Alberta workers. Dr. Kaegi is to suggest to the department alternative ways of structuring the program. This obviously will involve an appraisal of the present program, following which perhaps some changes, if useful or required, could or should be made.

During this month the Alberta Lung Association was asked to suggest a specialist in pulmonary medicine to be a resource person for this study. Dr. Grant Buckle of Calgary agreed to do that work, and of course will be working in this area in the assessment and evaluation of what is done.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to offer that kind of detail in regard to this important new thrust, because I think it is typical of the type of silent killer that lurks in the work force. I began by saying that very often we can identify a broken leg, a vehicle accident, a falling piece of machinery, an unsafe guardrail and all these

things that relate to accidents, for example. The silent killer, the one which is inhaled, has perhaps not received the same attention over the years. I wanted to make it clear to hon. members that for some time it has played an important part in the work being done in Alberta, that our appraisal of it is on a very current basis, and that ways have been found, and can still better be found, to avert injury and death from this type of occupational situation.

I think it's fair to add that both employer and employee groups in Alberta have worked closely with the department in what has been done in regard to lung-related illnesses.

Just in closing, hon. members would want to have the picture — and I want to give the picture — as to what you do when you find out about the type of material and the type of process causing this difficulty. Some of the options you have are to encourage industry to find substitute materials for ones which include asbestos. To some extent that's been possible. There's been some success in that regard. The possibility of handling mechanically as opposed to other ways, segregation of handling from other types of work, the enclosure of the process involving the use of asbestos — and the method of ventilation of course would be an obvious and familiar way to deal with the problem. Generally speaking better personal protection, improved operator training, and the consistent reappraisal and examination that I mentioned are so much an important part of the ongoing process.

Mr. Chairman, there are many other areas. I expect questions and will be pleased to respond to them.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'll start with the minister. If you have your pencil handy, Mr. Minister, perhaps you could make a note of about six areas, respond, and we could go from there. I'm sure other members will have questions too.

I'll start by asking the minister to give us an assessment of the general bargaining situation across the province this year. Several times it was indicated that a number of major contracts are up for negotiation this year. I think it's always helpful during the estimates if the minister gives us some sort of outlook. I'm not expecting the minister to tell us how many days are going to be lost strikewise across the province, but rather to give us a general overview of the situation as we move into 1977.

Secondly, Mr. Minister, my research indicates no order in council was passed in January of this year with regard to a large number of trades and businesses which were to come under The Workers' Compensation Act. I'd be interested in a comment in that regard. We may well get into more detail later on. I would find it very helpful to get some indication of the minister's intentions in that area this year, notwithstanding the fact that a motion is on the Order Paper where there's already been some discussion.

Thirdly, I'd be very interested in some comments from the minister with regard to the transfer of the accident prevention people to the Department of Labour. How was that worked out? What does the minister really see in that particular area in the coming year? I appreciated the comments the minister made in the area of occupational health and safety.

Fourthly, Mr. Minister, I recall in the estimates last

year the minister indicated the government would be taking some initiative in the area of co-determination this year. I believe there was some reference to the possibility of the department, with organized labor and the business community, co-sponsoring a fairly detailed look at the concept of co-determination and some possible benefits to our Alberta situation. I have had the chance to discuss this with some people from the Alberta Federation of Labour and the management sector, and would like to know, Mr. Minister: where is the government's thinking in this area now? Members will recall the trip that a number of cabinet ministers and people from Alberta took to Europe. One of the rather glowing reports that flowed back from that junket was some aspects of the co-determination labor approach used in Germany, I believe. I'd be very interested in the minister's comments there.

Mr. Minister, perhaps the most important piece of legislation before your department this year will be the labor act. Can you give us some sort of game plan or outline as to when we might expect presentation to the Assembly of the amendments to The Alberta Labour Act? Hopefully it would be this fall. I'd be very interested in responses from the minister on two or three areas in The Alberta Labour Act where representation was made to the government.

The first would be with regard to arbitration. From the reading I've done in the area, it seems there was considerable enthusiasm not long ago for the idea of a one-man arbitration approach. My assessment of the situation now is that there's a great deal less enthusiasm for this kind of approach — at least based on some things that have taken place in Ontario. Certainly that was one of the recommendations made to the minister.

Secondly, Mr. Minister, with regard to right-to-work legislation in the province. I am sure all members have received the benefit of representation made by a variety of groups in the business sector who, I think, are looking around for alternatives to some of the management/labor problems they see now or down the road. I'd like to get an assessment from the minister. As I understand it, earlier the government did have a serious look at the idea of right-to-work legislation. It is also my understanding, from comments made by the minister outside the House, that the government has decided to drop the idea. I think it would be fair to say that the minister is less than enthusiastic about the idea of right-to-work legislation at this time. I think it would be helpful for the members of the Assembly to get some indication of the government's feelings in this particular area.

One other area, as far as The Alberta Labour Act is concerned, is the side effects from the pipeline question that's been before the House on many occasions. Mr. Minister, I'd be very interested in hearing your assessment of the Department of Labour being involved, as it was, in holding the contract in escrow; any comments you'd care to make on how successful the legislation passed in 1974 in this Assembly has been, when the comment was made that we basically had labor peace as far as the Syncrude project was concerned, and implications that would have as far as The Alberta Labour Act which is before the minister right now is concerned.

Perhaps I might leave it at those four or five areas, Mr. Chairman, and ask the minister to respond.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you wish to answer now? Or would you like all the questions, and answer fully at completion?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, it's perhaps six of one and half a dozen of the other. I will always remain seated if I apprehend that another hon. member has risen. Since I didn't apprehend that, maybe I can now answer some of the matters raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, in the hope that that could answer other questions that might have been asked.

I think the hon. leader has done me the service of outlining enough new material to enable me to give a second speech, just by taking notes on the questions.

MR. CLARK: Not intentionally.

MR. CRAWFORD: I'll try not to overdo it.

The assessment of the general situation in collective bargaining in Alberta this year is, of course, closely related to the fact that this is the year in which the construction contracts open again. Last year there was virtually no bargaining in the construction area. That isn't to say there aren't a number of other very important contracts involving many thousands of workers, because those are also coming up. I don't think I would have to point out to the hon. members that various areas of the public service are also bargaining at the present time.

Maybe I could reflect briefly on the medium-term history of bargaining in the province and note that in 1975 we had what was generally accorded to be a difficult year in construction; perhaps not a terribly difficult year in a number of other respects. In 1976 we had a relatively trouble-free year, whatever the reasons, acknowledging the anti-inflation program was in force at the time and the fact that construction contracts had been signed for two years. I think the prognosis this year is that of course it can't fail to have an effect that the anti-inflation program of the federal government remains in effect. When that first came to pass concerns were expressed right off the bat about what that would do to the *bona fides* of collective bargaining. I think it was and is a concern in that respect. But I don't believe the parties can bargain without reference to the guidelines.

For better or for worse, in some cases the existence of the guidelines will cause contracts to be signed that might not otherwise be signed. That appears to have been the effect in the past year, when [the guidelines] were also in effect. I don't know whether or not it will generate more appeals to the Anti-Inflation Board, because under their original regulations they had a provision that if the cost of living surpassed the guideline amount at the time that particular guideline was in effect — because of course the guideline was designed to change over a period of time — the parties could take into account the change in the cost of living. It seems to me we're pretty well at that point in much of Canada and in Alberta right now, where the cost of living is certainly pushing up against the amount allowable under the guidelines.

I think as far as the responsibilities of the Department of Labour are concerned — if I can take off my prophesying hat for a moment and remark on the ability of the Department of Labour to assist in these circumstances — we do have the capacity, and it is

much used, to work with the parties from early stages of the dispute. On the whole, whatever the ultimate results and occasional breakdowns may be, the presence of really very, very competent people in the conciliation and labor relations areas of the Department of Labour distinctly has a good effect. It seems to me this is part and parcel of the role of government. Our function is not so much to interfere with what the parties would otherwise do, as to be there as that other way each might turn to at the right moment if the views of a third party can help.

So I would think every year is different. This year will be affected by the existence of the guidelines. There will be spirited bargaining and some difficulty in the sense of work interruptions. We will play our part and do our best to assist the parties to their solutions when that happens, and as importantly, prior to that happening — because that's an important role for the department too.

I can deal fairly quickly with the question of The Workers' Compensation Act. I believe I'm right in saying the order in council passed in 1974 had in it the date "up to January 1, 1978" and no further order in council is necessary for this year. I believe that's the case in the ones declared under the 1974 order, which with one exception did come into effect on January 1. The exception was teachers in private schools. They made a case that if we were deferring the school boards from that type of arrangement, it would make sense to defer private schools on the basis of the "who's the second-class citizen and who isn't" argument. So an order in council passed at the time was in fact a relatively short amendment to the one in 1974.

On the third point, I think the transfer of the accident prevention branch was attended by some early difficulty. There were the sorts of problems you would expect. The Workers' Compensation Board had a slightly different classification structure. They had a slightly different compensation structure. We were doing our best to rationalize that, at the same time not being unfair to people already in the department and doing similar work. As a result of a number of discussions and hard work and good efforts by the officials involved on both sides, I think the difficulties one would expect to be there at the time of changing over from one employer to another — in fact these things were there but were worked out.

We were anxious that the people who came from the Workers' Compensation Board be happy in their work. We didn't want it to happen that inspectors — who have important work to do on behalf of the government — would be less effective because of strains within the actual employment picture in their own cases. Everything done was directed at trying to resolve those difficulties, such as they were. I believe that's all pretty well behind us now. I hope it is. I think it has been for some months, as a matter of fact.

The other thing which I think is close to the heart of the transfer was that we wanted to broaden the base of skills of the inspectors. This was and is a policy: that inspectors would become more rounded individuals who would not only look for accident situations but could be pulled in to all the functions of the inspector and also be more alert to potential occupational health hazards as well as accident hazards. Of course, that part of the ongoing upgrading of the abili-

ties of those individuals is being carried out.

The hon. leader also asked me about co-determination. When he was talking about it, I almost resolved to begin my answer by reading from a copy of a letter written jointly to the Prime Minister by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and the Canadian Labour Congress. Then I thought that over and considered it was so blunt in its language in opposition to the idea of work councils and the like that maybe it would be an embarrassment in the light of any previous enthusiasm I may have expressed for it. But to be fair, this is an extremely interesting document. I believe it was quite widely distributed. It's dated January 1977. In part the letter, which is signed by Joe Morris as president of the Canadian Labour Congress and R. J. Bilodeau, president of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, said this:

At no time have organized labour and management been more interested in or willing to explore in an open and honest fashion the possible benefit to be gained from a thorough examination of new institutional relationships between government, labour and management. This implies a wide range of possibilities but does not include the concept of "works councils" imposed either at a federal or provincial level.

Through our counterpart organizations in the Federal Republic of Germany, and by other means, we have been examining the West German model for some years and are convinced that the statutory imposition of works councils would result in more problems being generated than resolved.

I think the letter then asked the Prime Minister in effect to ask Mr. Munro to stop talking about it so enthusiastically, and went on to other matters.

I think it's fair to say though that once we're on this subject, people should understand what is meant when one speaks about works councils. I believe I have never advocated, in fact have avoided, the idea that the appointment of workers on either a "just a few for the show of it" type of appointment or a full 50-50, which I think is the latest amendment in Sweden, is almost irrelevant to a North American discussion. I've suggested that if there's relevance to what is co-determination, it probably belongs on the plant floor as opposed to the board room. And most of the suggestions I've received that seem to be of value are ones that suggest ways in which the day-to-day operations can be humanized. The day-to-day operations can be made more the subject of consultation and cross reference. For example, some companies succeed in operating without foremen by working with teams. I think it's a terrific concept and should be done much more than it is. I sometimes wonder why people are slow to change to something like that when it is a more humanistic approach and can certainly be shown to be at least as productive as the alternatives if not more so. But things change slowly; people's minds get on other matters and they fail, I think, to consider some things which are really worth while.

So I want my response to the hon. leader to be that I think the subject is still there for discussion. I think we have to know what is meant when we use the words, and examples are perhaps better than some title or catchword in the course of such a discussion.

In the last year we did not actually sponsor a

workshop on the subject. We have worked very closely with both labor and management in one or two other areas. When I originally spoke of it, I think we said we were looking for ways in which three-party consultation could be had and that we would respond to cases when they came up. We used arbitration and occupational health and safety as examples. It's quite likely that I referred to the other area too. I suppose I would have to say that my feeling about how important that is has declined somewhat in the past year. However, we're still ready and willing to talk to people about it.

Another feature I think important that has been injected into this situation is that we chose early 1977 as the time to review The Alberta Labour Act. We asked people for input on that very subject, among others. In fact if I'm not mistaken that was in the list of six points we sent to some 100 organizations to help them direct their briefs in certain directions. On the whole the briefs expressed the same sort of caution, fairly widespread in both labor and management, that hon. members have heard me reiterate. As to the timetable for changes in The Alberta Labour Act, we're still interested in acting in the fall of this year if we can possibly pull it all together. I suppose I wouldn't have to say to any hon. member present that sometimes one's hopes in these regards are not fulfilled for various reasons. So it's a hope rather than a commitment. But at this stage of the year I think it's still a reasonable and realistic goal, and I would hope to have matters to put before the House in the fall.

The work done on arbitration has actually been fairly extensive. We've canvassed views widely in Alberta and studied other systems in connection with arbitration. I haven't had the impression that the one-man tribunal idea has declined in popularity. It has a place and many Albertans are interested in seeing the parties use it more. I think they would welcome leadership from the government in a policy way, structuring our arbitration services and the guidelines under which arbitrators as a whole act. They would be quite happy if that was facilitated.

In leaving that point, I suppose one of the real advantages in a single arbitrator is that you only have a single arbitrator if that's what you want. You can always go to the three-man board anyway. So it seems to me that it's not a dangerous type of thing to promote.

I think I said very, very little publicly on the right-to-work legislation issue. What I did say was that in the context of what is normally meant by that, the government had no intention of going in that direction. I usually tried to ascertain if the person talking to me, sometimes a reporter and sometimes someone else, was really talking about the question of closed shop, union shop, and that issue. I pointed out that under The Alberta Labour Act one may have a closed shop, but if one does it's not because the government said you have to have it or can't have it, but because the parties agreed to it. To me that's been the essence of the involvement of the union shop and the closed shop in Alberta.

It may be that there is a better answer, but I haven't been able to say to anyone with any feeling of sureness that my hopes were very high for a situation any better than allowing the parties to resolve it at the bargaining table. By the nature of any agreement

in which there is a union shop or a closed shop, it's obvious that at some point the union gave up something to get it. There's no way that that arrives in the agreement without it having been negotiated. Therefore that was in lieu of something clearly much better; not a bad position in which to have left the parties.

Now I probably should put on record that as a government — and this is based purely on the hon. member's quite proper question on the point — we did not treat it in the sense that we looked at it and then dropped it. As a government we did not address the issue from a point of view of considering this type of legislation or attempting to find some form in which right-to-work legislation might be enacted here. We have distinctly stood on the ground that I described just a moment ago: that the parties have negotiated closed shop arrangements in some cases. Presumably they live with them thereafter, whatever advantages or disadvantages there are. I do not think there is a matter there for legislation on that issue.

I think the hon. leader raised two other items. I suppose that first I should deal with how I feel about holding the Operating Engineers contract in trust. I should also say to the hon. leader that as one who in private life was a solicitor, I found nothing strange or unusual about somebody coming to me and saying, will you be a third party? If not adversaries — which I think they don't want to be — at least at the moment obviously in one way or another their interests were not the same. In those circumstances, coming to a third party is a perfectly natural thing to do. I suppose if I thought about it, I would have been pleased that they [thought] the government was so impartial and trustworthy that they chose us instead of somebody else. I didn't read the agreement when it was brought to me. I was told that this was an agreement the parties wanted me to hold, and both parties came to my office at the same time. I asked my officials to do that, and that was that.

Now a reference to Bill 52 of 1974 — I think that has worked out pretty well. The complaints made on behalf of the construction industry generally, those who were not involved in a primary way at Mildred Lake, were made before the bill was passed and have been made since. We have said that we recognize the unique nature of it and the validity of the arguments made against what is often called a carve-out type of agreement. But on balance we thought it could be justified, so we acted in that way. The history of it after that . . . Remember that the legislation didn't require anyone to enter into any agreement. All it did was say that if the parties negotiated an agreement, they could agree to a no-strike, no-lockout clause and would pick up their compensation package from settlements in the balance of the province.

The concern of the construction industry of course was that strikers would work at Mildred Lake, where there was lots of work to be done, and therefore wouldn't be hurt by any strike by contractors in the south. The view was that it would lengthen the strikes in the south. Whether or not it happened just that way in the summer of 1975 is debatable. In fairness, I suppose some of that did have an effect. But to say it had an effect is not the same as saying it was the cause of the lengthy disruption in the summer of 1975, because I don't believe it was. I

don't think the involvement of southern Alberta workers on a no-strike site at Mildred Lake was that significant. If we collectively thought it was worth while, we could probably find out from Canadian Bechtel Limited a number of figures and so on that would establish that. I, at least, haven't done that. But I've talked to them about it, and my impression is that the effect was minimal.

It's part of the overall picture of what happened in recent months that the parties, the 16 or 17 trades, started signing two years ago. First half a dozen signed and, after that, 10 or 11 and so on. For example, caterers signed quite late. They didn't sign until well into the late part of 1976, and I think there was one other trade besides the Operating Engineers.

Ultimately only one trade was outstanding, and that was the Operating Engineers. What they indicated to the people they had to deal with at the time — after all, Operating Engineers were working at the Mildred Lake site and their principal contractor, as established with certain rights under our act of 1974, was Canadian Bechtel Limited — was that they weren't going to sign and the agreement would run out. That gave everyone involved cause to become very reflective and thoughtful for a while, and certain other well-known events transpired. But I think it should always be clear in everyone's mind that the Operating Engineers would have been in a legal strike position, not an illegal strike position. If one wants to criticize what happened, one should do it with that knowledge in mind.

Basically, I think those are the points the hon. leader asked me to cover. He asked me if I thought there were other side effects from the pipeline dispute. I don't know. I don't have a feel for that. I suppose any time anything of consequence happens, other things can result from that. I don't believe that much of what happened was related to the labor relations area. It was, admittedly, a mix of situation and circumstance. Much of what occurred was a matter of business practices of the companies involved. On that basis I think the hon. member would accept my answer as being one that in the long run will probably bear itself out in truth when I say, "I don't know."

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'll resist the temptation to go back [to] the pipeline question, at least for a few minutes. But I would like to ask the minister, and I neglected to do this when I started: Mr. Minister, in the course of discussions we've had with both business people and people in the labor movement, it's been drawn to our attention that in a number of the agreements signed during the course of the anti-inflation program there are clauses for renegotiation after the AIB program is finished. Now I recognize that's a matter of management and labor working out that agreement. Fair ball. I'm not laying the responsibility on the desk of the Minister of Labour at all.

But, Mr. Minister, does your department have any feel for how often this kind of thing happens? If it is happening a great deal, it [will have] fairly major effects after AIB — October, or whenever it might be. I guess the question to the minister is: has his department done some sort of an assessment in that area, not an official assessment that I'd ask him to table in the House, but some sort of feel for it? It was drawn to our attention in the course of discussions

when some folks from the Alberta Federation of Labour were meeting with MLAs on both sides of the House with regard to how we might vote on the continuation of the anti-inflation program; then from talking to some people in the construction field, where they frankly admitted, yes, they had entered into an agreement in some cases where there would be some reconsideration after anti-inflation comes off.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, perhaps at this point I will go the other direction and wait for a few other members to add to it before coming back to that single point.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, first I'd like to make a few comments on several issues. Then I have three or four specific questions I'd like to put to the minister.

First of all, Mr. Minister, turning to this question of right-to-work legislation, I was pleased with your answer tonight, particularly in light of the rather unfortunate resolution passed by a gathering not too long ago — I gather somewhat over the frustration and objections of the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands. I guess he will learn how to manage things from the Chair as the years go by. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could deal with the issue itself, because I think it is very important.

I think when many people hear the term "right-to-work" — it's a very misleading term in a sense because it implies the right to a job — they think, gee, that sounds like a great idea. In actual fact, as you pointed out, it is really a question of whether two sides, management and labor, negotiate a set of circumstances and negotiate a union shop. I think it is important we remember that this is not imposed on anybody. It is as a result of negotiation and of a certification vote. Just as members who are pro-union may well find that they lose the vote and are deprived of a union, on the other hand if the vote is accepted in the shop, certification occurs. But it is not something which is imposed on anybody by the government; it is really a voluntary agreement, if you like, between the two major parties in any industrial enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, when one looks at some of the statistics about so-called right-to-work laws south of the border — I've done a little investigation — and compares the 19 states with right-to-work legislation with the states that don't have right-to-work legislation, that have accepted the concept of an agreement between two major parties, you find some very interesting information. The so-called right-to-work states have a substantially lower average hourly wage than the union-shop states: \$4.99 an hour, almost \$5.00 an hour, compared to \$4.27 an hour — a difference of approximately 20 per cent between the right-to-work states and the union-shop states. Mr. Chairman, I might point out this is information compiled by the department of labor in the United States. It's dated May 1976, the most recent information I've seen, so it's not quite a year old — 11 months old. The differences are really quite striking as you look over the states. It doesn't make any difference whether it's the deep southern states or whether it's the right-to-work states in the northern part of the U.S., the difference holds true and uniform.

Mr. Chairman, I feel it would be a very serious mistake at this point for the government to even consider moving in the area of right-to-work legislation, at least as it is defined by the supporters of right-to-work legislation who are all in favor of full employment, which is a different thing. The basic proposition now set out in The Labour Act, and I think well-accepted by both management and labor, should be carried on, in my judgment.

I know there are always people who say: isn't it possible to find a better approach; can't we find that magical solution to avoid strikes? Perhaps it might be tripartite-ism; perhaps it might be some form of compulsory arbitration; labor courts, as they have in Australia. The fact of the matter is that when one carefully evaluates the alternatives, one really has to come back to the proposition that free collective bargaining, with all its failures, still offers the best and most stable environment for handling the obvious interests of both management and labor, as well as the disputes which are going to arise in the course of any contract. Efforts, however well meaning, to short-cut free collective bargaining are not backed up by any real evidence, at least to date, that it will do anything other than make matters worse. As I mentioned before, I think it would be a mistake, in an attempt to change things, to fail to recognize the very important progress made; and while free collective bargaining has its shortcomings, it has worked relatively well.

In going over the Gale report I saw some very interesting statistics that I thought made the point for free collective bargaining better than any trade union leader or, for that matter, any politician. In 1972, according to the Gale report, 26,126 man-days in the province of Alberta were lost through work stoppages or strikes. But in the same year, 789,000 man-days were lost as a result of temporary injuries. In other words, 25 to 30 times as much time was lost due to injury on the job as the total time lost through strikes.

When a strike occurs the public is incensed, and inconvenienced. Sometimes unjustified strikes have occurred. No one is going to argue that every strike has been justified. Nor would anyone argue that every lockout has been justified. But when one asks what alternatives there are, again I come back to the answer that free collective bargaining is the only workable alternative, as I see it anyway, in the North American system.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move from there to four specific questions. First of all, I'd like to ask the hon. minister if he would comment on the concerns of Mr. Bailey, the former director of inspection, who left the department and in the process made a number of assertions about the government's move in the area of occupational health and safety. Let me preface that by saying I was very impressed with the minister's introductory remarks on occupational health and safety. But when you have a situation such as Mr. Bailey leaving the department and in the process making a number of what seemed to me rather serious assertions, I would ask the minister to take the opportunity in estimates to review those concerns. I have them here, but the minister is well aware of them. Rather than my summarizing them so I can read them out to the minister, perhaps the minister would take the time to deal with that question.

The second question, Mr. Minister, is really a

follow-up to one the Leader of the Opposition put. That is the question of Alberta's participation in the anti-inflation program. I raised this during the debate on the resolution whether Alberta should continue in the AIB program for the duration of the year. I suggest the concern your department is going to have to face is a very practical one. We have extended Alberta's participation from now until the end of the year, unless the federal government chooses to opt out of it. Subsequent statements by Mr. Macdonald would seem to indicate the program will be with us for at least the remaining months of this calendar year. As a result of the resolution passed by the Legislature, Alberta's participation will continue until the end of the calendar year. The problem I put to you, Mr. Minister, is that after October 14 we get into year three of the program where the basic protection feature, the basic beginning yardstick, is not 6 per cent but 4 per cent.

Now it seems to me the problem is that any contract which comes open on October 15, and we're in the wage and price control program, who is going to settle for 4 per cent? That's the basic protection factor. That's going to have a rather significant relevance as it relates to the public sector in Alberta, it would seem to me. I'm wondering to what extent that was taken into the considerations of the government when we went into the wage and price control program. I suspect — I hope not, Mr. Minister — that between October 14, 1977 and December 31, 1977 your department will be busier than usual. It might be worth while to make sure that people with conciliation expertise are well rested, because they will need the best diplomatic skills to do the job under those circumstances.

The third point I would put to the minister — I should have mentioned this under occupational health and safety; I'm sorry — deals with how many worksites have been designated so far.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister two additional points. What changes does he see in human rights legislation? It's my understanding the minister has already indicated it's under review. To what extent does the government see substantially extending the protection of the present bill of rights in additional areas?

The final point is more comment than anything else. The Leader of the Opposition raises the question of co-determination. We've had the debate at the national level over tripartite-ism. Frankly it's my assessment of the situation that the trade union movement is backing away from support of tripartite-ism. Certainly in the province of Ontario the major issue at the Ontario Federation of Labour convention was tripartite-ism. That particular section of the labor movement made it clear they weren't very enthused with the proposition.

MR. KING: You must earnestly hope so.

MR. NOTLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would not be heartbroken — let me put it that way — nor, I suspect, would Joe Clark.

MR. CLARK: There are other ways to break his heart.

MR. NOTLEY: Yes, there probably are other ways to break Mr. Clark's heart, that is break it even more

than it has been broken in the last few hours.

But I think the question of tripartite-ism is less relevant today than it was a year ago. I do agree with the minister, when he made an important point on the question of co-determination, that the value of that sort of working together in the plant environment is extremely significant — a point, it seems to me, that all sides of the House would support. Quite frankly, that's one of the reasons I think the legislation should be changed to set up mandatory on-site health and safety committees. That's one of the ways, Mr. Minister, of creating the kind of close co-operation on the plant floor, which seems to me to be pretty important.

DR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, my remarks and questions are on a very different aspect of the minister's portfolio. They are related to Vote 4, occupational health and safety. I would again like to draw the minister's attention to a double standard of X-ray technology and interpretation that exists in the province. As suggested in my submission a year ago, chiropractic X rays — especially spinograms, mammograms, and fluoroscopy — are used almost routinely and with increasing frequency by chiropractors in this province. As by the very nature of their beliefs, most disease processes emanate from the manipulation of the spine, we cannot see how these X rays can be of any value at all.

I would like to quote from a letter from the Hon. Marc Lalonde, dated March 30, 1976:

I am advised by my officials that total-body X rays are not useful for the diagnosis of conditions which are treatable by manipulation therapy.

Further there is no scientific or medical justification for the use of chiropractic total-body X rays of children and women.

Now because of the lack of training or examination by any academically recognized body in the province, or in this country for that matter, has the minister considered any provincial legislation or a qualifying examination which would limit the use of X rays by chiropractors for diagnostic purposes, and thus reduce the hazard to citizens of this province?

Radiology is one branch of medicine where chiropractors are not limited. I have been advised by the Canadian Association of Radiologists that they are opposed to chiropractic X rays, not in order to preserve their own position but because they feel the unscientific basis upon which chiropractic is founded makes chiropractors unfit to use ionizing radiation for the good of the population. Following investigation . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Would the hon. member please get to the point as far as the Department of Labour is concerned.

DR. WALKER: This is very much to the point, Mr. Chairman, in that X-ray control is under the minister's office and protection of people from unnecessary X rays should be controlled by the minister.

I will finish then. Does the minister not feel that some restrictions should be placed on chiropractors, as they are now placed on medical practitioners, because the majority of X rays and X-ray interpretation in the medical profession today is done by spe-

cialist radiologists? I feel this should be applied to chiropractors as well.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be wrong not to acknowledge that whatever else the hon. Member for Macleod does, he raises our interest in this subject on whatever occasion presents itself. I certainly want to congratulate him for his persistence. I think part of the background here, if I may be so bold as to say it, is something of a dispute between two professional bodies, which won't actually remain nameless. It reminds me a little of the possibility of this happening in other areas, and the story about the lawyer who was cross-examining a doctor on the witness stand. Once again the professional rivalries flared. Of course, he wanted to show the incompetence of the doctor and said, isn't it true, doctor, that when you make a mistake, you bury him in the ground? The doctor said, yes that's true, you bottle-nosed old reprobate, and yours swing in the air! So I think when we get to flinging down the gauntlet from profession to profession, there is always more than one side.

In fairness to my good friend and distinguished member of the medical profession, the Member for Macleod, I do want to say that The Radiation Protection Act is, of course, the responsibility of the Department of Labour, but inspection responsibilities are basically for inspection of the site where the equipment is located. As far as I know, since assuming this portfolio as distinct from the last one I had the honor to hold, I've successfully avoided getting into the balance of the debate. I don't think tonight is an occasion when I'd want to break that rule.

Going back to the question of the Leader of the Opposition before dealing with the other points raised: in regard to clauses in contracts which provide for renegotiation after the guidelines are off, I'd honestly have to say I don't really have a feel for that. Collective agreements as such are provided to the department. It may be that some surveillance of that has been done, because surveillance is done on an analysis basis of typical terms in the collective agreements. For what it's worth, my impression is that this has not been a large factor. Now if that's mistaken, I would want to say that to the hon. member on a subsequent occasion. If the information is available and my impression is wrong, I'd be glad to remark on it further.

There's the other side to it: nothing stops the federal government from declaring that any such arrangement is contrary to the regulations anyway and that those clauses are of no effect. Only at the point where we know exactly how they dismantle the late stages of their program will we know how they deal with that issue.

Going on from there, and staying with the Anti-Inflation Board for just a moment — because the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview also raised it — given what limited flexibility there is in the federal regulations, I don't think anyone imagines that a 4 per cent contract will be easily negotiated in the third year of the anti-inflation program if the cost of living remains in the area it has. The increase in recent years has certainly been beyond that. In fact indications are that it's beyond the 6 per cent by a couple of points.

Of course the other side to this is that those

contracts, are on a first-in, first-out/last-in, last-out basis. Therefore whether the example of one who commences again on exactly October 15 represents very much is another matter. That would mean that the person was also into a contract on October 15, 1975, and probably had the benefits at that point of the negotiations which took place prior to the guidelines being announced. The review of the contracts will show that many, many contracts at that stage were in fact approved for higher amounts than the guidelines provided for in the first year. There was just a very, very large number quite a bit above that, and the reasons in each case were given, rightly or wrongly.

So that's another matter to speculate on. I don't think we can really say what the effect will be.

I don't know if we'll ever have a return to the period when contract negotiations were done on a more individualized basis. My memory is that until we were hit a few years ago with rampant inflation, although relationships were looked at, basically it wasn't considered almost the duty of a negotiator to get a figure that related somehow to somebody else's increase. Unfortunately for bargaining as a whole, I think that sort of thing has crept into the psychology of collective bargaining. It seems to be there at the present time. Whether that type of stratification in thinking survives the end of the controls is another matter, but it does seem to have some effect now.

As for Mr. Bailey, I'll frankly tell the hon. member that I didn't bring his report in with me and have not recently reviewed it. Therefore I have difficulty responding to his specific points from memory.

However, I think some of the circumstances are important. Mr. Bailey was recruited to come to Alberta in a competition in which he was successful. On several occasions the position he was to take was referred to as a director of the program, which was not the case and wasn't the case at any time. He was a prospect for future promotion to head the inspection service, but not to head the overall program or indeed, for the brief time he was here, to head that division.

So he was here a matter of a few weeks and left, obviously disappointed with the circumstances he had agreed to come to here. Perhaps — and I'm only speculating — there may have been some misunderstanding on his part as to what he would be given to do. We have leadership in the division in which I have had confidence from the very beginning. To put it bluntly, we did not need or want Mr. Bailey to perform that function, to lead the section or anything connected with that. And my view that we didn't need him for that purpose certainly hasn't changed.

The officials, whom I found to be very fair, acknowledged to me at the time that some of the points he made were perfectly valid and that we should review them. We've done that, and I only regret that I'm not able to package it and say from memory to the hon. member tonight that this point was made by Mr. Bailey and our response to it was such and so. I'm not in a position to do that. But I did want to say that I think the difficulties were as much a matter of not fitting in with the system we had in place as anything else.

I've always suggested, always known — the saying is that there's more than one way to skin a cat — that there's more than one way to run any operation. It

would be remarkable if there was only one way to run any important function of government or any other large body. Frankly there was a difference of opinion, a parting of the ways, and some angry words. In the memory of anyone here that wasn't the first time that happened.

I don't have any follow-up to what I now consider a relatively remote incident, other than the fact that we had the benefit of the report and agreed to look on it as impartially as possible. At that point there was no way the differences were going to be resolved, so it became a matter only of the value of the report left behind.

The hon. member asked about designated worksites. The regulations allow worksites to be designated for joint worksite health and safety committees and allow sites or industries to be designated in regard to particular substances.

I believe in both cases the situation is the same. Draft regulations and codes of practice are being worked on. I made some reference to how the joint worksite one was being developed. But none has been designated so far. My earlier statement on this — I hope I allowed the government enough time in that respect — was that it would be the summer of 1977 before a designation was made. I feel that the time is being well spent, that the consultation I described earlier is extremely valuable, that we will do a good job in the joint worksite committees when they're in place, and that they will provide a very, very valuable contribution to worksite safety in the province.

As far as changes to human rights legislation are concerned, I think it best if I indicate what the procedure was. The Human Rights Commission, which has a high degree of independence, is probably the best provincially supported commission in the country in the sense of the backing it gets financially and from the point of view of its field of action given by legislation. It's probably the best set and best-supported commission in Canada. I think they don't doubt that. I think they feel they've been given important work to do and they're doing their very, very best with it. [They] said to us on a number of occasions that what was really being sought in changes in the legislation was to make good legislation better and not to repair any defects that were unique in any way. It was just that they had worked very hard, and having come to certain conclusions from their experience, thought improvements could be made.

At the same time they took the understandable step of asking the Institute of Law Research and Reform to join them in an examination of the legislation. That is always useful, and I think it was in this case. As a result they took some time in producing a very, very considerable format of proposed changes, incorporating both the several years of experience of the commission and the work of the Institute of Law Research and Reform.

I've had their proposals in hand for some time. They've certainly been fully reviewed by me in the meantime, and our review of them as a government is continuing. That being the case, I've indicated that if proposed changes in legislation are made, the earliest would be this fall. The commission is aware of that. They like the idea. I understand and certainly appreciate that if we're going to make changes, they'd like them made soon rather than late, because

they believe in the recommendations they've made. We don't disagree with the importance, of course, but have indicated that in the normal course of events the issues are large enough that some time should be taken to give them full consideration and be sure we've not overlooked any of the nuances of what's involved.

So that's the situation at the present time, similar in this sense to the timing for the labor act — looking at the fall of this year. I admitted that if we got bumped off the labor act for various reasons such as happened, that that could delay it. That's more true in the human rights case, I think. We're still aiming for 1977, but it would really be difficult to give them or the House a commitment that we will achieve that.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think those are the answers to the questions. I hope I haven't missed any of the points that were raised.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, there are two additional questions. I do have a summary of Mr. Bailey's points. It's not my intention to get into an argument with the minister over Mr. Bailey — that's your department. But to the extent that the report was made and certain of the recommendations are now under consideration by the department, I think that is relevant public information and I'll just summarize those in a moment.

The first question, just so I don't forget it, Mr. Minister, is: at what point are you and your department being involved in the whole area of the post-control mechanism? Mr. Macdonald has indicated that the federal government is looking at possible routes for decontrol. I would assume that as far as Alberta is concerned your department would be closely involved in this question of how in heaven's name we get out of the control program and on what basis, because there's going to have to be a mechanism. I think Mr. Macdonald was quoted at one time as saying that there should perhaps be some kind of review agency that wouldn't have the powers of the AIB but where every contract would have to be at least referred to the review agency. To what extent has the Department of Labour looked at that?

Briefly, the points Mr. Bailey made dealt first of all with the workers and worksites: "accepted, but as an option ...". Well we know that; it's not as a requirement. Education, he says:

ambivalent position. No move for general improvements, or educational funding. New branch has other functions, and does not have exclusive educational responsibility within the new division.

Occupational health services "appear to be promoted out of proportion to other facets, but lack objective or functional integration". Research and development "have been substantially downgraded in importance, are not centralized, and will not have the resources to pursue their goals". The inspectorate — I gather Mr. Bailey had sought the role of director of the inspection division — is split. I gather the general safety services are left in the department but, for example, the miners inspection remains with the ERCB. And the role of management and unions has not been satisfactorily addressed, according to Mr. Bailey.

He then goes on to deal with some of the questions related to the act. Essentially summarized, they are:

the definitions are not precise enough; an inspector can only inspect where work is being performed as opposed to inspecting idle equipment that might be dangerous or potentially dangerous; and subjugation of legislative intent to regulatory definition. Generally, Mr. Minister, those are the points I've been able to glean from the summary of Mr. Bailey's concerns.

The two questions then are: (a) what mechanism are we looking at in the decontrol period, and (b) those specific points he has made.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, by and large I would say the role of the Department of Labour is that of a resource agency, along with the other government departments involved. The work is co-ordinated by my colleague the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs in regard to government policy on decontrol and all of the arrangements with the federal government. I am certainly aware of the suggestions that both the federal Minister of Finance and Mr. Pepin of the Anti-Inflation Board have made in regard to subsequent review and monitoring agencies. I have attended meetings where those issues have been discussed with the federal people. My impression is that they were really trying on ideas as they went through that and didn't have a firm series of proposals to make.

That is really what is involved when I say that I don't think we would agree to a postcontrol mechanism that was unnecessary or conceived for some other related purpose, or that in our view, in the interest of the economy and work force of Alberta, just shouldn't be there. The fact that the federal government proposed it wouldn't make us agree to become part of it. But we haven't reached that stage with them in the type of idea trying-on they've been doing. So we haven't necessarily had that much to say no to either. It's still being worked on. As I say, we are one of the agencies involved in the work that's being co-ordinated through Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

I want to thank the hon. member for referring to some of the issues in the report Mr. Bailey provided that I didn't have with me this evening. I must say the one I did remember — and I knew it wasn't enough to start on — was the one on joint worksite committees. I felt then and now, and I know I've expressed the views here before, that our approach to it is very practical and credible. I know it's not the approach some others would use, but we believe in it. Maybe this is overstating it, but we really expect that the approach of gradualism as opposed to the overall stereotype approach has every bit as much chance of functioning very, very well as any other.

I think the criticisms made in regard to lack of co-ordination and funding in certain areas are just matters of judgment. We had the benefit of the Gale commission report. We are able to show, in large measure, that that report has been adopted. On a number of occasions I remarked here that we didn't go for the idea, for example, of the separate department, and a few things like that. But we went for the idea of the one-window approach. I think it is a matter where the people who are locally involved are probably better equipped than any outsider to begin the setting of priorities, for example, in fields of research development and education.

Surely a knowledge of the general fabric of Alberta

industry, and the fact that the people who have been working here for a number of years have the expertise associated with that, would enable them to make judgments which have at least an equal chance of being the right judgments in regard to how much of your financial or manpower resource to put in a particular basket.

So in something like that I think it would be extraordinary if I, as the minister, set about in the circumstances that existed when Mr. Bailey was here to change those judgments and to substitute the ones of the person who spent only a few weeks with us. It was on that basis that I felt it necessary, regrettable as it may seem after so many months have passed, to refer to the fact that there were clearly differences there, and what we saw was the upshot of them.

I think I've already covered in part this evening the question of the policy decision to merge the inspectorate. Based on the one-window approach we just can't doubt this was the thing to do. Whatever the good points were in regard to *esprit de corps* and so on of the separate unit as it was, that would correct itself. The *esprit de corps* might lag, but it's capable of transfer to a new body, particularly if that new body is given more and exciting work to do and the work is a challenge to those people interested in it who are there to perform it.

The only other point is positive I think. The hon. member quoted a portion of the report that said that under our legislation — I'm not sure whether that applies to the ability the Lieutenant Governor in Council has to fill a lot of areas by regulation — inspectors could only inspect while work was being performed and not where idle equipment might be discovered to be potentially dangerous. If that is the case, I think that's a very, very good point and the sort of thing we would give him full marks for, and say: that shouldn't be that way; the inspectors should have the authority, and we would intend to provide it.

Agreed to:

Ref. No. 1.0.1	\$105,786
Ref. No. 1.0.2	\$735,116
Vote 1 Total Program	\$840,902
Vote 2 Total Program	\$2,595,057
Vote 3 Total Program	\$7,253,218

Vote 4

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. Going from estimate to estimate on Vote 4, if we look at the manpower costs and the salaries and services, we see almost a 48 per cent increase in manpower costs and about the same kind of increase for supplies and services. I fully recognize that this year the department is giving priority in this area. What kind of situation are we looking at, Mr. Minister? In one or two more years do you see the department being able to look at the usual kind of increases? I want to make very clear that by asking these questions, I'm not being critical of the increase in this area this year. But I do think it's a reasonable question to ask: how long do we expect those kinds of increases? Is it for another one, two, or three years? Then to couple that with the supposed regulations coming out this summer: where does the minister see this area going?

MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, that's a very important question, Mr. Chairman. The informal plan, the plan the department and I have had, has been for a three-year program. I call it informal, because it's only formal when the House makes it so. This is the second year of that three-year program. I think the logical progression is fairly apparent. I fully recall the criticism, was justified at the time I thought, that we weren't moving up our manpower from the original 24 who came from the Department of Health and Social Development. These jumps go very quickly this year and last year. That's the reason for it. We expect after one more year to have achieved the manpower requirements.

Agreed to:

Vote 4 Total Program	\$4,002,433
Vote 5 Total Program	\$642,042
Vote 6 Total Program	\$7,346,500
Vote 7 Total Program	\$452,277
Department Total	\$23,132,429
Capital Estimates	
Ref. No. 1.0	\$4,800
Ref. No. 2.0	\$12,600
Ref. No. 3.0	\$175,915
Ref. No. 4.0	\$76,441
Ref. No. 5.0	\$2,400
Ref. No. 6.0	—
Ref. No. 7.0	\$1,400
Department Total	\$273,556

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move the resolution be reported.

[Motion carried]

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolution, reports the same, and requests leave to sit again:

Resolved that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1978, amounts not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the Department of Labour: \$840,902 for departmental support services, \$2,595,057 for labour relations, \$7,253,218 for general safety services, \$4,002,433 for occupational health and safety, \$642,042 for individual's rights protection, \$7,346,500 for workers' compensation, \$452,277 for industrial relations adjudication and regulation.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the intended government business for tomorrow morning in Committee of Supply would be the Department of Culture and, if there is time, beginning on Legislation which I understand will be handled by the Members Services Committee.

I move that the Assembly do now adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

[The House adjourned at 9:57 p.m.]