

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**Title: **Monday, May 9, 1977 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 218****An Act to Repeal****The Health Insurance Premiums Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 218, An Act to Repeal The Health Insurance Premiums Act. The purpose of this act would be to set up the provision for the elimination of health care insurance premiums.

[Leave granted; Bill 218 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file copies of a number of reports and communiques resulting from the successful western premiers' conference in Brandon, Manitoba, last Thursday and Friday; first, a communique relating to the Report of the Western Premiers' Task Force on Constitutional Trends, to which is attached a full copy of the report. Further communiques are on: the State of Confederation, Western Co-operation in Agricultural Research, Drought, the Competition Act, Western Economic Co-operation — Trade and Tariffs, and a communication relating to a number of significant transportation issues; lastly, two copies of the four western provinces' brief on The Industrial Sector in the Multilateral Trade Negotiations, to which is attached a copy of a letter of April 7, 1977, from the Premier to the Prime Minister.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to introduce a group of young men and women from Austin O'Brien High School. There are approximately 140, which is probably a record for one attendance. They are seated in both galleries, attended by their teachers Mr. Porochiwnyk and Mr. Acheson.

I ask them to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****PWA — Acquisition Discussions**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first

question to the Premier and ask if he or any member of the Alberta delegation discussed with Premier Schreyer of Manitoba the possible takeover of Transair by PWA.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the matter was raised in the context of discussions regarding the federal Aeronautics Act. The position we took, which I think has been expressed in the House by the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, is that the government has not yet received a recommendation or a proposal from the board of directors of Pacific Western Airlines, although we're well aware that Transair has entered into discussions with Pacific Western Airlines and that a directors' meeting on the subject is being undertaken in Calgary at this time. The matter was raised through a press conference, at the conclusion of the meeting, when we were asked about it. Of course, we repeated the position that has been repeated in this House.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. In the course of those discussions and in the course of the press conference, was the question of retention of maintenance facilities in Manitoba discussed between the Alberta delegation and representatives of the government of Manitoba? I raise that in light of the comments emanating from Manitoba that one of the conditions for Transair being acquired by PWA would be that the maintenance facilities remain in Manitoba.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think the most appropriate way to respond to that question is the recognition that, if a proposal goes from Pacific Western Airlines to the Canadian Transport Commission, the province of Manitoba will no doubt be interested in the terms and nature of that proposal relative to employment and other factors within the province. I think it would be inappropriate for me to attempt to present to this Legislature the way the government of Manitoba feels about the matter. I think they will have an adequate opportunity, should Pacific Western Airlines continue with the proposed merger, to express their point of view. Rather than my trying to interpret the views they have, I think it would probably be in order to let them express them in whatever appropriate forum should ensue.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, let me rephrase the question to the Premier. Has PWA or the Alberta government given a commitment to Manitoba that the maintenance facilities would remain in Manitoba?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, there is no way the Alberta government would give such a commitment or undertaking. The only discussions that occurred were on a very hypothetical basis with the government of Manitoba, should Pacific Western Airlines agree to proceed with the proposed merger, in which case we presume that officers of Pacific Western Airlines, as they customarily would in this situation, would approach the Manitoba government to give them a general outline of the thoughts that Pacific Western Airlines might have in the event they entered into a merger agreement with Transair.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the Premier. From a policy standpoint, what is the position of the government of Alberta concerning the proposed takeover, having regard for the eastward expansion that would be involved with Transair and in light of the reasoning given by the Alberta government of opening up the north as one of the basic criteria for initially acquiring PWA.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that's difficult for me to respond to today because I'm still in the situation of dealing with a hypothetical position. We haven't received a proposal from Pacific Western Airlines — although we may have it by tomorrow, in which case I would perhaps be in a better position to respond to the hon. Leader's question. However, going to the nature of the matter and reviewing the statements we made with regard to Pacific Western Airlines — and again I don't want to prejudge the management decision of Pacific Western Airlines — I'm sure we're all aware that Transair is involved on a route basis between Edmonton and Whitehorse in the Yukon Territory and that we have always been of the view that Alberta is the gateway province to the north, [which] involves not just the Northwest Territories but also the Yukon.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Will the final decision be made by the cabinet, by the board of directors of PWA, or will a recommendation come to this Assembly? How does the government plan to handle a recommendation from the board of management of PWA with regard to takeover?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think we've made our position clear on a number of occasions with regard to Pacific Western Airlines' operations, that is that we have a very effective board of directors. They are managing and operating the company, and doing an effective job. The decision with regard to a proposed merger would certainly be a decision they would make. The only position they would take with the Alberta government as owner is whether or not we had any objection to it. I would presume that they would make the decision. We would either concur or object. If we concurred in it they would then proceed. The ultimate decision in this case probably would be made by the Canadian Transport Commission.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Premier. In light of the meeting taking place today, is the Premier able to advise the Assembly when the cabinet will be in a position to examine the recommendation of PWA, and when in fact the time will arise when a green light or not will be [given] by the government of Alberta with respect to this proposed merger?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I am advised it probably would be tomorrow, in the sense they are meeting today and we will get a recommendation and either concur or reject it. I just want to underline again — and I realize the hon. member has some difficulty in these situations — that we really leave the management of these matters to the board of directors and operating management of Pacific Western Airlines. Frankly we look on the question of the merger with

Transair, if it should come about, as a management decision.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. Premier. Has the federal Minister of Transport advised the Alberta government that he would favor the amalgamation?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I suppose the federal hon. Minister of Transport is in roughly the position I am. Again we are pursuing questioning here that deals with exploratory discussions on what might not come to pass. I am given to understand by the Minister of Transportation in the Alberta government that the implication has been that the federal Minister of Transport sees the matter somewhat differently than he has in the past and would not have any significant objections to it. But I suppose I should let him speak for himself as well.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Recognizing that the board of directors will be making the proposal, were there at the premiers' conference any discussions of routes, the maintenance facilities in Winnipeg, and the staffing of Transair?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I'll have to check the record for *Hansard*. I thought I had the exact question and gave the answer.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask one further supplementary question of the Premier. Have the government determined if it's their intention to bring a recommendation to the Legislative Assembly? I recognize this is somewhat hypothetical, but really the whole area is. I really ask the government if the Premier would be in a position to indicate to the Assembly this afternoon: is it the government's intention to bring the matter to the Legislative Assembly for discussion or ratification, should PWA make a positive recommendation to the government?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, as we've said in the past, I think the answer to that question is clearly no. We consider it the appropriate role of government in our investment position with regard to Pacific Western Airlines to make those decisions, and we will make them. Certainly we would anticipate responding in all normal and customary ways to any documentation that may be required to be placed before the House. We would do that and would anticipate, as we have in the past, having a good and lively debate on the subject.

#### Health Care Equipment

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. In view of the fact that current health care regulations provide coverage for health services but not health supplies and equipment — and for such individuals as ostomy victims, these supplies are essential for maintaining life and can cost up to \$2,400 a year — is the hon. Minister of Health and Medical Care currently revising regulations to extend health coverage to include essential life-supporting supplies?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, that's a matter I'm aware of, but [it] is one my colleague the Minister of Social Services and Community Health and her officials have been working on. It will be discussed in joint planning between Social Services and Community Health, and Hospitals and Medical Care. Perhaps my colleague the Minister of Social Services and Community Health would like to add to my comments.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't have too much to add to that. It is a matter that has been brought to my attention on several occasions. I've asked my department to look not only at that but other areas of medical supplies that are not available to those under age 65. That's currently under review.

#### **Grain Marketing**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister indicate whether the government has made representation to the federal government with regard to the establishment of a new international wheat-marketing arrangement?

MR. MOORE: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not made any direct representations to the minister responsible for the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board. However, matters of that nature were discussed with the chief commissioner and other commissioners of the Canadian Wheat Board.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Has the government held any discussions with Unifarm, the Wheat Pool, or the National Farmers Union, leading up to the government's position in the area of international marketing?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I've had informal discussions with members of the Unifarm organization regarding the proposed international grains agreement; not with the other groups the hon. member referred to.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One final supplementary question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Will the Premier be making representation with regard to the establishment of a grain cartel at the GATT meetings?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, no, I wouldn't envision that situation involving the GATT negotiations, in the sense that those negotiations are limited and restricted in their orbit to a general agreement on trade and tariffs — trade barriers, tariff barriers. I would not think the question of arrangements or understanding between wheat and grain exporting nations properly fits within the scope of the GATT negotiations. But in further discussions we may be having with the federal government — as the Minister of Agriculture has been referring to — and possibly with other governments, it may come up.

#### **Western Premiers' Meeting**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier and ask whether it is the intention of the western premiers to meet again to

follow up the discussion of the last several days before a meeting of all 10 provincial premiers takes place.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview could specify if he was raising any particular subject, or whether it was a general inquiry.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it was a general inquiry, and I wanted to move from the general to a specific subject. Perhaps I could put the question in terms of a general question first, and then I'd like to follow up with a very specific question.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, in these matters it's somewhat difficult to respond, in the sense that some of the discussions the four western premiers have obviously have to remain privileged. There was some tentative discussion of a meeting with regard to the recommendations of the Hall commission that we would have perhaps before the annual premiers' conference scheduled for New Brunswick in mid-August. There was the possibility that we would also meet again, or correspond again, with regard to agenda items. I really don't think I'm in a position to go beyond that, except to say that from Alberta's point of view the conference in Brandon was very successful in every respect.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. With respect to the reports emanating from the conference, making it clear that the west saw no particular advantage in a customs union with an independent Quebec — a position I share — is it the intention of the four western premiers to discuss this particular reaction — which I guess would be a better way of putting it than "position" — with the government of Quebec, or to seek out the Prime Minister of Canada to discuss this with him?

MR. LOUGHEED: No, Mr. Speaker, there would be no intention specifically to bring up the matter of independence followed by economic association, which has been rejected by the western premiers. But in the communique under agenda item 2, the western premiers stated:

... there are a number of important policies requiring major accommodations and revisions. To this end, the Western Premiers express their commitment of working towards solutions and changes. This approach is consistent with the need for strong provincial governments and a commitment to the recognition of regional needs as opposed to over-centralization of power in Ottawa.

So I think the best way to respond to the hon. member's question is to say: not anticipated to have any further discussions with regard to the rejection by the western premiers — which, by the way, is shared by Ontario — that Quebec could present to its citizens a view that there could be independence followed by an economic association; but certainly considerable scope for a reassessment of the arrangements in our federal state as between provincial governments and the federal government. It's with that view in mind that what's been referred to as the

"intrusions" report, which the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs tabled today, will be sent to all provincial premiers. It may well and probably will form an item of discussion at the annual meeting of premiers in New Brunswick in August.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the Premier. In light of the discussions that took place and the views expressed by all four western premiers, was any consideration given, particularly with respect to the Prime Minister's so-called "Winnipeg speech", that the time might be propitious to hold another western economic conference with the federal government? I know I posed that question before, but that was [before] this conference, and I wonder if there was any specific consideration of such a move.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that matter was not specifically discussed. What was considered was that we had presented a very effective report showing the high degree of intrusion by the federal government in provincial governments. By the way, it affected not just western governments but all 10 provincial governments. The chairman of the conference, the Premier of Manitoba, was requested to pass on that document to the Prime Minister.

At least at this stage, we felt that that was an appropriate response to the Prime Minister's April 18 speech in Winnipeg, the date of which I have impressed in my memory. The intention will be to see the nature of that response. Then the matter raised by the hon. member is certainly one of the future options open to us.

#### **Anti-inflation Program**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs with regard to the AIB and decontrol. I wonder if the minister could indicate what agreements were made or what discussions occurred with regard to that topic at the conference.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, as with all meetings of this kind, all parties agreed that it's not appropriate to release information concerning the positions of the other parties. However, Alberta did make the submission again that we felt it was past the time when a definitive statement as to the start of the beginning of the end of the program should be made. We feel that the uncertainty has increasingly caused and will cause problems among labor, business, and governments as to their future planning. We indicated that as far as this province is concerned, we would certainly tend toward October 14, 1977, as an appropriate date for beginning decontrol. We indicated that in our view a phasing out would probably be the most equitable and fair approach.

As regards the monitoring mechanism which has been suggested, we felt that would probably be satisfactory, provided such a mechanism was not permanent — that it did not become a permanent fixture of the Canadian economy, that it had a short and definite lifespan — and, secondly, provided there were no powers with respect to any monitoring agency which would be mandatory or which would in any

way, directly or indirectly, work against the jurisdiction of the provinces.

#### **Tendering Practices**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. Could the minister indicate if it is usual government practice to give to contracted architectural firms pre-tendering specification controls for government projects, on items such as furniture? I raise the question in light of the matter, raised earlier in the House, at Northern Alberta Institute of Technology — the new section there.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, the volume of work by the Alberta Housing Corporation has increased very substantially in the last couple of years. The budgetary increase has been almost astounding, and the number of personnel within the Alberta Housing Corporation has basically been maintained at very much the same level it had been prior to the tremendous expansion in the amount of work involved. This has resulted in more and more work having to be tendered out to consultants. So it is not against the policy — I should put it that way — of the Alberta Housing Corporation to include furniture in the tendering process with respect to some of the construction projects handled by the Alberta Housing Corporation.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then a supplementary question to the minister. What steps has the minister's department taken so that design specification fees will not be passed along to firms whose products are specified? What regulations does the minister's department have to prevent design specification fees being used?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the nature of that question has in it detail to the extent that I would have to take the question under advisement and respond accordingly at a later time.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might rephrase the question to the minister and simply ask: is the minister aware of any policy in the department that would prevent the practice of divine . . . of design specification fees developing here in Alberta? That's "design" specification fees.

MR. FOSTER: There's lots of divinity here.

MR. YURKO: Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the question under advisement, because I'm not sure whether the Leader of the Opposition is referring to projects by the Alberta Housing Corporation or indeed by the Department of Housing and Public Works. I would like to take the question under advisement and respond accordingly.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might just pose one further question to the minister. Is the minister aware of any regulations or any policy in place in either the Alberta Housing Corporation or in Public Works that would prevent the use of design specification fees in either agency?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, my answer is still as it was to the two previous questions.

#### Rent Control

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Prior to rent control, a percentage of landlords endeavored to be very fair and kept their rents at a very reasonable rate. When rent control came in, they found themselves under the regulations and facing increased utility costs, et cetera. Is there an avenue of redress for landlords who did try to be fair before rent control?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to that question could very well come out in the debate because I think the answer can be found in the legislation itself, which has now been introduced.

#### Agricultural Policy

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. It also pertains to the conference of western premiers. In light of concern expressed by the Saskatchewan Minister of Agriculture pertaining to the beginning development, if you like, of a national food policy, and in particular to the paper called DM-10, was there any discussion of this particular paper and of the response of the west to a national food policy at the western economic conference?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, there was a discussion related to what's known as the DM-10 report, in that it is my understanding that the recent Competition Act, Bill C-42, flowed from the particular report the hon. member is referring to. As a result, some discussions were held with respect to the aspects of the proposed federal competition legislation that pertained to agricultural marketing boards. A communique, a copy of which was tabled earlier today by the hon. Government House Leader, was drafted with respect to the positions of the four western provinces on that particular bill.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Have any discussions been held between the government of Alberta and the federal government pertaining to the developing national food policy, and in particular to the DM-10 report? What is the position of the government of Alberta itself pertaining to this report?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't say any discussions have been held directly with respect to the so-called DM report. However, a great number of discussions have been held between our government and the federal government with respect to agriculture and food policy. All the problems associated with the beef cattle industry, the dairy industry, and so on, are related to the development of any national food or agriculture policy.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it's my view that countries such as ours should have a national food and agriculture policy. There are certainly a number of areas in which the existing policy, if there is one in Ottawa, could be improved upon to meet the desires

and needs of Alberta's farmers, and consumers as well.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. In view of the general opposition — I guess would be the best way of putting it — to supply management inherent in the DM-10 report, what is the government of Alberta with respect to the import of the DM-10 report?

MR. MOORE: I'm not sure I totally understand the question, Mr. Speaker, but if the question is: what is the position of the Alberta government with respect to marketing boards and agriculture, both nationally and provincially . . . Is that the question?

I'd pretty well have to begin commodity by commodity, Mr. Speaker, and say initially that with respect to the production of dairy products, poultry — both eggs and broilers — [and] some other commodities which farmers have the ability to produce very quickly and for which we have a limited market in Alberta — basically only the population of this province, which is equal to about 7 to 8 per cent of the national population — we are in fact supportive of the marketing structures that have been developed and generally supportive of the manner in which prices and quotas are established.

That's not to say, Mr. Speaker, that there isn't room for improvement from time to time with respect to the allocation of quotas. Certainly in the egg and broiler business, it's my concern that the quotas may in fact go to people who are already in the business and expand their operations, rather than bringing in new farmers. I've had a number of discussions with the boards of directors of the egg producers marketing board and the broiler marketing board in that regard.

However, to go on to a number of other commodities for which this province produces far in excess of its ability to consume, you have quite a different matter. It's been our experience over many years, before this government came into office, that our production capabilities were curtailed very seriously by way of going into provincial or national marketing boards where they sliced up the pie and Alberta only got a percentage equal to its population. That, Mr. Speaker, is the reason for the express concern we've had with respect to beef marketing in Canada.

We don't believe, quite frankly, that our farmers would appreciate if we got into the situation of a nationally-controlled beef marketing board headquartered in Ottawa where we're being told that Alberta could no longer produce 36 or 37 per cent of Canada's beef, but only 8 or 9 per cent. With the influx of beef from Australia and New Zealand over the last two or three years, one could understand quite readily the kind of pressure our producers could be under if in fact we were to agree to control being taken out of their hands, out of this province, and into eastern Canada.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, about the various representations made with respect to the formation of national marketing boards, most recently with respect to broiler chickens, and suggest again that the reason we did not agree that would be in the best interest of our farmers — because the control purportedly would have been taken completely out of Alberta, away from the producers, out of government's hands in this province. Surely the direction of agriculture in Alber-

ta and Canada is not one of centralizing control in Ottawa.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. In light of comments attributed to the Saskatchewan minister expressing concern that the DM-10 report is, in essence, a cheap food policy for Canada at the expense of western farmers, is it the intention of the government of Alberta to clearly state its opposition to that part of the DM-10 report? Moreover, Mr. Speaker, is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly where things now stand in terms of federal plans to develop a national food policy?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the first question, if the opportunity arises for the member to review the joint communique issued from the western premiers' conference on Thursday evening last he will see that in fact through that process some pretty strong recommendations have been made with respect to the proposals contained in Bill C-42, which is really the first step in a major change with respect to food policy that would have some effect perhaps on the ability of producers to maintain a solid income and therefore a solid production base that in the long run cannot but be beneficial for consumers.

Insofar as where national food policy items stand on the agenda in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, I'm not at all sure. I'm aware that there appears to be a strong difference of opinion between various members of the federal cabinet. Quite frankly I think it's good that the discussion is being held, because really in terms of western Canada we could not but benefit over the longer term from a rational food and agriculture policy that would do two things: provide for some continuing reasonable incomes for farmers in Alberta and other parts of Canada, while at the same time ensuring that the consumers of Canada will continue to have what I think is the cheapest food in all the world, in terms of the percentage of their average wage. That can continue if we can get some recognition — something we haven't had during the course of the influx of off-shore beef and the kinds of things that have happened in the last couple of years — that it's important for farmers to have a stable income if consumers are going to have a reasonable supply of reasonably-priced foods for years to come.

#### **Mental Health Community Resources**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. It flows from the annual report tabled in the Assembly last week. Has the province-wide inventory of community resources in the mental health field conducted by the regional mental health advisory councils been finished?

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, that's an ongoing project as part of our review of services.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. What form will the inventory take when it has been completed, and is it the government's intention to make the inventory available to interested organizations?

MISS HUNLEY: Of course our usual policy is to publish widely as much as possible. I'd like to take it under notice and inquire as to the actual appearance of the inventory and the progress we've made to date, then advise the House further.

#### **Hearing Aid Services**

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps while I'm on my feet I could reply to a question from the hon. Member for Little Bow. I would apologize, because apparently I overlooked a reply I had prepared some weeks ago when I was asked about a meeting with groups regarding the quality of service offered by the hearing aid audiologists. I did meet with the Senior Citizens Advisory Council, but it was a general meeting. It was not to discuss the qualifications or standards of hearing aid audiologists. However, it was a most useful meeting.

I was subsequently asked if I had responded to correspondence regarding the life-line project of the Alberta Hearing Aid Audiologist Association. The answer to that is yes. I would also advise the hon. member that my department has asked the Council on Aging if they will monitor the hearing aid help line and give us the benefit of their experience and advice. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that to date they're enthusiastic about that as being a helping service to people, offered outside government financing by the way. The Council on Aging is highly enthusiastic about it at the present time. But it's fairly new. They were going to give us a report in six months.

#### **Psychiatric Facilities**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister, also flowing from the annual report. Since the interim eight-bed remand centre of the Calgary General Hospital received a grant from the minister's department last year, will the new forensic unit continue to receive financial assistance from the minister's department? I'm thinking of the forensic unit in the new addition that hopefully is going to be opened before too long in the Calgary General Hospital.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, our intention is that when that unit is open the balance of the funds available within our department — and that would be pro rata — would be conveyed to that. But we would not continue funding part of a hospital unit.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister for clarification. Once the funding for this year has been finalized, then the hospital should look to the Hospital Services Commission [for] funding? Is that the position?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, that's right, Mr. Speaker. Whatever unexpended portion of funds is within my department would certainly be appropriated for that purpose, for which it was intended, though.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask a further supplementary question of the minister. Is the minister in a position today to indicate who was responsible for making the decision that the regional mental health advisory councils would not be privy to

the Dr. Hellon report with regard to the winding-down of the Alberta Hospital, Ponoka, and would not be able to look at the report and then advise the minister with regard to their recommendations?

MISS HUNLEY: I haven't had the opportunity; I was going to check my correspondence. But I have to advise the Leader of the Opposition that I have not yet done that, although Dr. Hellon advised and reminded me that he believed Dr. Blair and I discussed it, and decided that because the report was in its formative and very rough stages it would be appropriate for Dr. Hellon to seek advice from the Provincial Mental Health Advisory Council — but for the present time it didn't need any further distribution.

MR. CLARK: Then a supplementary question to the minister. So the report of Dr. Hellon would not have found its way to the regional mental health advisory councils across the province?

MISS HUNLEY: No, it was not our intention to distribute that report widely because it was in such preliminary stages of development.

#### **Crop Insurance**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister indicate whether the Alberta Hail and Crop Insurance Corporation has given consideration to offering drought insurance for hay and pasture as the Ontario Crop Insurance Commission is doing at the present time?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the number of crops which are insured by the Alberta Hail and Crop Insurance board are the subject of pretty extensive negotiations each year. Those negotiations are generally carried on shortly after the end of the season, in other words in November, December, January. I believe the agreement with respect to the crops which are insured by Alberta and Canada this year under the Alberta Hail and Crop Insurance Corporation was finalized in February. We have made a number of extensive changes over the course of the last four or five years which resulted in the number of premium holders going from just under 10,000 to nearly 19,000 last year.

In addition to covering all areas of the province, this year we moved to insuring forage production which is grown under contract. That's mainly to assist [with] some protection to individuals involved in contract production, to alfalfa plants and so on.

As hon. members know, insuring forage is a much more difficult area in terms of determining and calculating loss than cereal crops. That is one of the reasons there has been some reluctance on behalf of both the Alberta Hail and Crop Insurance board and the government of Canada in going into a complete insurance program for forage. It's certainly something that can be taken into consideration in future years. But at least for this year it's not possible, within the time frame remaining, to give any consideration to additional coverage of forage lands.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are any statistics kept by the department

which would record long-term forage growth in the province — any statistics on the number of acres in forage? I'm speaking of long-term forage acreages.

MR. MOORE: Most certainly, Mr. Speaker. We have statistics relating to the number of acres of tame forage grown each year; also of course natural forage that occurs where the land has not been improved. I don't have them off the top of my head, but I do know there are in excess of 20 million acres in Alberta, including Crown grazing lands, that should be growing forage each year; and certainly in the area of five to six million acres of tame forage is produced in Alberta in an average year. If hon. members want, I would be pleased to get some estimate of what has occurred over the last few years.

#### **Hospital Services Commission**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care relative to the discussions we had on estimates a few days ago. The minister indicated there that he is going to relocate the Health Care Commission and the hospital care commission. I wonder if the minister could indicate what schedule he has in mind for relocating these offices, and in what location they will be relocated.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. Member for Little Bow misunderstood what I was saying. In the context of the expansion of another department, the Hospital Services Commission has been advised that we must relocate.

I have had preliminary discussions with the Minister of Housing and Public Works, and we may be able to delay that for a couple or three months. But basically, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Department of Energy and Natural Resources needs the space the Hospital Services Commission is now in. That is the reason we have to relocate the Hospital Services Commission. I do not believe I said the Health Care Commission, because they are well housed in the building they presently have. It should be unnecessary for the Health Care Insurance Commission to be relocated.

#### **Consultant's Services**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary with regard to our discussion. The minister didn't reply to another question I had with regard to outside contracts or other inside contracts with regard to Mr. Willis. Could the minister indicate whether Mr. Willis will have any other contracts, outside the present one he has with the minister?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, the contract at the current time requires full time, and Mr. Willis is not performing any other contracts.

#### **Trade Negotiations**

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Premier. I'd like to ask if his submission to the Canadian delegation to GATT, in Geneva in June, will be an Alberta submission or a western Canada submission.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the original intention was that it would be an Alberta submission in Geneva in June — and I haven't had a chance to discuss this fully with my colleague the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs as yet — but what we really received in Brandon was a suggestion by the other three western premiers that we consider reviewing with the Canadian delegation in GATT the briefs that have been submitted — both the agriculture brief which was tabled in the House some time ago, and the industrial brief which was tabled by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs today — so our submissions would be primarily Alberta, although it would have the input of the whole western region.

So I think the best way to answer the hon. member's question is that our submissions in Geneva will, in essence, be two parts: an Alberta submission with regard to the total position of GATT in the Canadian delegation's strategy; secondly a western one — and there may be further input from the other western provinces before we go.

MR. CHAMBERS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do the western premiers share Alberta's view on the merits of bilateral discussion with the United States as well as GATT?

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes. That's a very important point, Mr. Speaker. I was not sure, prior to going to Brandon, of the view of the other western premiers with regard to bilateral negotiations on trade and tariff matters, which has been a subject of debate in this House, and their merit in this year that's so important relative to GATT. But the communique on trade and tariffs does refer to that. The western premiers have joined really, in our view in Alberta, to suggest the western provinces also have much to gain by bilateral negotiations with the United States.

I really think, Mr. Speaker, that it very much strengthens our position on this matter by having the whole western region agree that it's a twofold approach, both in terms of GATT and bilaterally with the United States.

#### **Gasoline Retailing**

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview asked me several questions regarding gasoline marketing and dealer severance. I indicated at that time I felt that all the companies now had a severance plan. I now have indication from the companies that there is in fact a severance plan in place by all companies, save one. On May 3 we received a communication from that company indicating that they expected, within 60 days, to have a severance plan in effect.

The second part of the question was: what was the 2 cents per gallon increase in gasoline in Calgary divided into? What form did it take? It was passed on at the retail level because of a reduction in subsidy paid by the oil companies. As you know, the oil companies have been paying a subsidy to maintain the margin of the retail operator at a particular level so he could survive in the operation. They are now attempting to reduce that subsidy, and because of that reduction in subsidy the price has to be passed

on to the consumer. So the 2-cent increase, in fact, all goes to the retailer.

#### **Alberta Hospital Procedures Review**

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I answer an additional question asked of me on May 5? It was relating to Dr. Earp's progress, and the review of the forensic procedures at Alberta Hospital, Edmonton. I've been advised that his report is proceeding satisfactorily. He's devoting full time and anticipates meeting the deadline, which is the end of June.

#### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, and to the other members of this Assembly, a group of students from Grassland school in the Athabasca constituency. Grassland school is one of the smaller schools in this constituency and is the most remote from the capital. This is the second class that has visited us this year. With them this afternoon is their teacher Mr. John Roberts and their bus driver Mr. Casey Ritsen. They're 16 in number, seated in the members gallery. I'd ask them to stand and be recognized by the House.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to ask unanimous leave of the Assembly to move adjournment of the House for about an hour for the purpose of having a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meeting.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Assembly do now adjourn until 4:25 or until business of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is concluded, whichever is sooner.

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 accordingly.

[The House recessed at 3:37 p.m.]

[The House met at 4:28 p.m.]



head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**  
(Second Reading)

**Bill 36**  
**The Highway Traffic**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. FLUKER: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 36, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1977. Mr. Speaker, Bill 36 is the companion bill of The Motor Vehicle Administration Amendment Act, 1977, regarding mopeds and the use of flashing lights on safety vehicles as set by regulation. It's also the inclusion of Bill 209, as introduced by the hon. Member for Drumheller in the last session.

[Motion carried; Bill 36 read a second time]

**Bill 45**  
**The Universities**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 45, The Universities Amendment Act, 1977. The major principal involved is the provision of a statutory base for the Athabasca University, increased public participation on university boards of governors as well as those of colleges, and increased public participation on university senates.

[Motion carried; Bill 45 read a second time]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain bills on the Order Paper.

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**  
(Committee of the Whole)

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

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

**Bill 12**  
**The Colleges Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, question, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. When we did second reading, I indicated the reaction we'd received from not only the Alberta Association of College Faculties but also from students in the colleges who indicated they hadn't been that pleased with the basic changes made with regard to the make-up of the faculty council. If my memory is accurate, I think I used a comparison of a high school group, perhaps a division within a high school staff, the faculty council of a university, and where we really see the college faculties going.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps we might start the discussion with the minister there, and then proceed.

DR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, responding to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. When he says that general academic council is halfway between . . . what did he say? A university faculty is somewhere between a school council and general faculties council of a university. Yes, I agree, it is somewhere between the two areas. I think this is probably where it belongs. I see no reason it should go anywhere else.

He asked questions in his statements the other day concerning his disappointment and people's disappointment at a meeting he was at in Grande Prairie, and asked us at that time to advise who had asked for these changes. Three colleges asked for changes in the faculty association: Grant MacEwan College, Lethbridge Community College, and Mount Royal College.

Each of these has a faculty member on the board representing the academic council. All have discussed the question of the authority of the academic council — whether they should be specified in legislation or referred to the council by the board. The submission from Mount Royal College requested that the council receive these specific powers. Grande Prairie Regional College staff expressed the same concern.

But I believe that an academic council is very much in the same position as a medical staff organization in the hospital administration system; that is, it is an advisory body with advisory powers only, which a board would have to think about very seriously before it would disregard. And it would do so at its own peril. When we look at this, we of course find that the legislation set up for the hospital system was done before 1971, by the Social Credit government.

I think the very fact we are extending the academic council in such a way is a step forward. We also have to look at Section 35 of this act, which shows that the board is the ultimate decision-making body for colleges. We feel this should continue. We feel that the present amendments give a fair bit of flexibility in terms of numbers on the academic council.

The second point in his statements on May 4 was where we see academic council going. I think we still see them as purely advisory bodies. We compared The Colleges Act with The Universities Act dealing with general faculties council. I'd like to point out that general faculties council is a very, very large group in the university system which is broken into numerous faculty councils for each school. A college academic council is a very much smaller group and acts for no specific school within the college. Whilst in these amendments there are no specific rules and regulations as laid down in The Universities Act, the academic council will be a very powerful advisory body to the board. There are very many ways of setting up an academic council. As the hon. leader says, you have the university faculty over here and the college faculty council fits somewhere in the middle.

The third part of the hon. leader's presentation on May 4 stated: "I had a chance to meet with a number of people in Grande Prairie during the first part of this week." I have here the report of that meeting, which is interesting. It's very interesting to see what odd bedfellows our MLAs can have when they get into politics. We had the leader of the Social Credit Party, the leader of the NDP, and the leader of the Liberal Party, all together in Grande Prairie. They met there

to castigate the government and the minister for not having a representative there to join with them and make it into more than just a three-ring circus, which I gather it was.

It also states in this clipping that:

Mr. Clark said the Premier is using predictions that oil and natural gas supplies would run out within 10 years as the basis for his push for rapid industrial development. The Premier is using this as a basis for pushing increased manpower and vocational training as well and colleges must be safeguarded from becoming glorified apprenticeship programs . . . .

Mr. Chairman, I am the product of a glorified apprenticeship program. So is the Minister of Education, and our friends from everywhere else — law, medicine, you mention it. And long may we continue having glorified apprenticeship programs in both our colleges and universities, because I think they are worthy of support by the government and by every member in this House. I would like to see them stay as glorified apprenticeship programs.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I assume that we can take the comments made by the Member for Macleod, who is shepherding the bill through the House, as likely the attitude of the minister with regard to colleges as glorified apprenticeship training institutions and so on.

For the benefit of the Member for Macleod, I should say that perhaps his understanding of the college system would have been somewhat broadened had he had the opportunity to attend the function in Grande Prairie. I should say to the honorable sponsor of the bill that he would have been the logical person to be there, because the government was asked, as were the other political parties in Alberta, to have representation at this event. Had he been there, perhaps he could have explained the role that he, the minister, or the government sees for the college system in the province.

I simply raise that to point out to the hon. member that all four political parties were asked. The absence of one party was noted and regretted, perhaps because the people there felt the party that wasn't there likely had the greatest impact on the college system of the province at this time. I think it was a rather earnest effort on behalf of some of the faculty people to get a variety of points of view with regard to where we see the college system going in this province. I'd like to think the system is on a plateau now and needs to move perhaps one step further.

My question to the sponsor of the bill would be: coming through very clear in this legislation is the proposition that the government sees the boards of the colleges being the decision-making mechanism. I'd be interested in either the hon. member or the minister responding to that particular question. I think the bill and the legislation before us clearly sets out the government's view that the board would be the ultimate decision-making group and that faculty associations in colleges would rely to a very great degree on the good will of the board involved, which is a much more flexible situation than we have in the university community. Is that a rather accurate assessment of the direction in which things are moving?

DR. HOHOL: For the record it should be made clear, Mr. Chairman, that what is in the statute here in no way detracts from the existing situation in The Colleges Act, which is still the law of this province. What the amendment does is provide additional capacity for the academic council to recommend on its own initiative, and a recommendation from the faculty association requires a response from the board of governors; secondly, the board of governors may request from the academic or faculty council, by whatever name the academic people choose to call themselves, to in fact recommend to the board of governors. So nothing has been taken away, and something has been added.

What the hon. Leader of the Opposition is really asking is: why don't you go the whole distance; why don't you do it as it is in The Universities Act, in which all the duties of the faculty council are specified? The fact of the matter is that that isn't working so well in any case. It's not a model for any other institution except for universities. And I'm not so sure that universities — for example, the University of Alberta in Edmonton is looking at new ways of restructuring the general faculty council. So in saying that it's not a model for any other institution, I say it with no unkindness. I simply say that I think the larger universities in Canada are finding that the GFC approach is not working that well as the universities get larger.

Now I should point out too — and in no way to indicate to academic people what to do, because that's their business and they know how to do it — that in the process of recommendation there is a kind of give-and-take. The academic council could well bring the board to agree that certain items are negotiable or bargainable on a permanent basis on a schedule. There's nothing in the legislation that would preclude the academic council to sit before the board as a recommendation that certain items come before them annually or from time to time as the academic council may deem proper and necessary. On the other hand, the board may present to the council and ask it [for] its considered judgment and opinion.

But, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is literally correct that in affairs of policy in contrast to affairs which are academic, where the whole notion of autonomy is embedded in the classroom, in the research laboratory, in the library, in the clinic where the academic has his universe and his professorial say — in terms of policy, certainly the hon. Leader of the Opposition is accurate. The amendment clarifies a proposition which has been given for many years: that the board of governors is the decision-maker in the area of policy. But the academic people have a great deal of capacity to influence that by the very nature that they're there and have the right to have an association and to present themselves to the board.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could take just a few more moments on this question before proceeding. I thought the minister made a rather important comment when he indicated that in his view the concept implicit in the general faculties council at the university level was not working as well as it should. The minister cited size, but that was about the only reason I understood as to why in

his view it was not working as well as it should.

I wonder if we could take just a moment to pursue that. Because one of the important criticisms of this bill that we heard at Grande Prairie from the college faculty people was that in fact there was not sufficient authority designated to the faculty council. So if there is a moving away from the general faculties council and the authority that has generally been vested in the general faculties council at the university, I think perhaps we should just take a few minutes and have it more fully explained as to why the minister feels there are some problems there.

I recall several other points being raised at the meeting. The Member for Macleod indicated it was a three-ring circus. Mr. Member, I think the people there really wanted it to be a four-ring circus. They wanted a representative from the government, but for proper reasons. The provincial association was holding its annual meeting and, in my judgment, wanted to put the four political parties, including the government, on the spot: where do we stand on this particular bill, where do we stand in terms of the development of the college system? I think it was unfortunate that the Member for Macleod, the minister, or someone representing the government was not there, particularly in view of the statement by the minister this afternoon.

Just two other points, then I'll ask the minister if he would respond. The people at the meeting felt there was some ambiguity in the act with respect to the designation of the faculty association. We're not talking about the faculty council but the faculty association. They wondered why in fact we were setting out the terms for a students' councils, but made no provision for a faculty association.

The other thing I'd like to have the minister take some time and expand upon is the comment — and I assume it was not an offhand comment — of the Member for Macleod with respect to this phrase "glorified apprenticeship program". Surely, Mr. Minister, this is not the policy of the provincial government with respect to the future of the college system. If it is, I think we had better stop right here and take whatever time is necessary to debate it.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, the three points are so lightweight that, with respect to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I really don't know how to respond. My colleague who is sponsoring the bill used the term "glorified apprenticeship school" that was first used by the members of the opposition. Then he said, well, if that's how you view it — and he used it in positive terms — fine. He was simply saying our apprenticeship programs are the best in Canada. We need apprenticeships. What is the matter with an apprenticeship program? Since 1971, nothing has changed any college to make it less than it was before. All we've done is make it more. So how do you respond to a lightweight bit of nonsense like a college being a "glorified apprenticeship school"?

If an hon. member wants to use that kind of language and expect someone to treat it seriously, then be serious. Get up and state your case, and we'll debate the issues here in the Legislature where all parties are represented.

The association that met for its annual conference in Grande Prairie has access to me 24 hours a day,

seven days a week. We as public representatives have access to each other once a day, five days a week, four or more months a year. So I don't need any lectures from the two party leaders as to what I should do with my time at the date this group met at Grande Prairie. Again it's gratuitous nonsense. So debate if you want to, but at least make it heavyweight.

My comments with respect to the general faculties council at the universities have nothing to do with this bill. We're dealing with The Colleges Act, not The Universities Act. My point was simply illustrative; that today the University of Alberta is looking at the GFC. Why is it looking at it? Because it's unwieldy. It must have some problems, or they wouldn't be looking at alternatives. I say this with no criticism whatsoever of the University of Alberta; in fact, with commendation that they have the capacity to look at themselves and see if they can do better. It has nothing whatsoever to do with this legislation. All I said is, a college is a college. It's not a university. We're not going to pattern an academic association, a council, a student body on the model being used at the university; because the university is a very different creature. So it was purely a statement of fact that the university is looking at its general faculties council.

There may have been a third suggestion of a question. If there was I would ask the hon. member to repeat it, because I forget.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, at least we're getting into a lively debate. Fair ball.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that one of the major concerns expressed by the college faculty association at this meeting was the future role of the college system; whether the emphasis in the future would be toward technical training, apprenticeship programs, or in the direction of a liberal arts program. That was laid out in the material sent out, I assume, to all the people invited to participate. As I see it, Mr. Chairman, this is the sort of thing we should be discussing under Bill 12. Recognizing there is an importance for the training program, I would hate — and I made this point at the meeting — I would hate to see any shift in emphasis. I think we now have a balance. I would like to see that balance retained.

Now the specific questions related to a concern expressed to us about the designation of the faculty association and the increase in the size of the board. The proposal had been very clearly made that if the board was to be increased by two members, one additional member from the faculty association should be on board.

DR. HOHOL: With respect to the balance, Mr. Chairman, that's a proper question. If it was put before, I did not understand it that way. The hon. members who were there could have assisted the group. I met with them before, and they know the college system is very much balanced. It may shift from time to time, as it has in the past. But the technical trades are literally at NAIT and SAIT, at the technical institutes. That's where the majority and the predominant programs for apprenticeship, trade training, retraining, updating — that's where the programs are. You can get some of that at the colleges, but not very much. Most of it is in the arts, sciences, university transfer

courses, engineering, nursing, physical education, journalism, all kinds of programs and the arts and sciences generally. So yes, I would say the balance in the colleges is more in the area of the arts and sciences than the trades. That isn't going to change, except with emphasis from time to time.

I've had recommendations from the association with respect to the make-up of the board and of the association, and those have been considered. The results of our deliberations are in the amendments before us.

DR. BACKUS: Mr. Chairman, I wish to take exception to the heavy reference of the Leader of the Opposition about the absence of any member from government. As that is my constituency, it might have been interesting if I had been invited to it, which I wasn't, as a possible representative of government. Not having been invited, naturally I wasn't there. This isn't altogether surprising to me, because I happen to know who the president of the faculty association up there is. He has been making a lot of generalized statements, socialistic in outlook [interjections] and not generally accepted by the rest of the faculty. In fact I've had frequent calls from members of the faculty association wishing to dissociate themselves from some of the president's statements. So I just bring this in to balance the sort of very emphatic statements being made here today by other members.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I would just make one comment to the Member for Grande Prairie. I had the opportunity to visit with the president of the college and the chairman of the board. I would consider neither of them in the category you place the honorable . . .

MR. NOTLEY: He called it socialistic.

MR. CLARK: . . . president of the faculty association . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member address the Chair.

MR. CLARK: Yes. I wouldn't want to say the president of the college or the chairman of the board in Grande Prairie should be placed in the same category as the member placed the president of the faculty association in Grande Prairie. I can't vouch for or against the philosophical outlook of the chairman of the faculty association but I can say to the hon. member that it's my understanding the government was asked to have representation at the conference.

MR. NOTLEY: By the provincials.

MR. CLARK: By the provincial association.

DR. HOHOL: What's that got to do with the act?

MR. CLARK: The minister says, what's that got to do with the act. Mr. Minister, that's where we had a chance to discuss the act. I simply say to the minister: I'd be very interested in hearing some explanation from you, sir, why the Member for Grande Prairie, perhaps — if not yourself — wasn't given the opportunity to take part in the panel.

DR. HOHOL: Over in Grande Prairie?

MR. CLARK: Yes.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, I'm in no way accountable to the hon. Leader of the Opposition for what conferences I attend or don't attend. It's just an unusual sort of question. But since he asks it, I can answer.

MR. CLARK: Were you invited?

DR. HOHOL: Yes, I was invited. The association has met with me every time it has asked. It is open to meet with me on a day's notice, and has done so. Had they wished me, as their minister, to address the annual provincial conference and respond to questions thereafter, I would have done so. But to sit on a panel, to be in a set-up situation: who needs that kind of thing? As my honorable colleague from Grande Prairie said, it was a set-up. We've had enough of those.

The debates of all the parties are right here on the floor of the House. All of us are here. You can ask and answer any question you wish. Sure, I was asked. But I chose not to go, for my reasons. It's interesting that the member from the constituency wasn't asked to attend in his own home town.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With respect to Bill 12, there is an amendment. Are you all familiar with the amendment?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

DR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 12 be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

### Bill 13

#### The Forests Amendment Act, 1977

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I just have one question in connection with 47(8), in which:

No liability attaches to a person

(a) who sells a vehicle or property pursuant to subsection (5) . . .

and in the case of a sale that person passes good title thereof as against the former owner or anyone claiming through him.

I'm just wondering about the reasons for this clause. Could the hon. member enlighten me?

MR. APPLEBY: Do you want me to answer that by itself, Mr. Chairman? Is it 47(a) you were referring to? It refers to:

the vehicle or other property [that], in the opinion of a forest officer, interferes with the management or use of a forest recreation area . . .

I expect it could occur in several ways, Mr. Chairman. One could be if it was on a forest recreation trail, or somewhere in the forest recreation area where it was causing a blockage of the road or something like that,

so that it was causing an impediment for people trying to get by on a very narrow road. Or it could be abandoned and causing some sort of hazard on the road. In either case, it provides for taking care of such vehicles when they are becoming a nuisance to the public. I think that's the general idea.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a few brief remarks to make with regard to this bill and The Forests Act in general.

The provision for construction and maintenance of forest recreation trails is certainly an amendment I support. A group called the Great Divide Trail Association is promoting the completion of a trail along the Great Divide between Waterton Lakes National Park and Banff National Park. There is already a trail system within the national parks, and completion of the Banff-Waterton section would finish the Canadian section of an international Great Divide trail. Needless to say, this proposed trail will run through the Pincher Creek-Crowsnest constituency. I believe the amendment to the act to provide for trail construction and maintenance will assist in the completion of the Great Divide trail, an objective which has my complete support. I might mention that during the summer recess I hope to be able to hike sections of that proposed trail.

The Great Divide Trail Association is considering several alternative routes. They would prefer a route which crisscrosses the Alberta/B.C. border, which is the continental divide. I understand that this idea has not received the complete support of the British Columbia government. Thus the Great Divide Trail Association is considering an all-Alberta route for the Banff-Waterton section.

The forest recreation trails section in the bill will provide for assistance for trails of a local nature and interest, another area I certainly support. This idea is being promoted by the Crowsnest Pass Recreation and Trails Advisory Council.

With regard to forest management in general and increased recreational use of the eastern slopes, I should like to offer a few observations. A few years back, forest rangers were brought out of the various ranger stations and districts and centralized in regional offices. The stations were shut down. Since that time, the use of the reserves for both recreational and industrial purposes has increased dramatically. I believe that the removal of the rangers has led to a decline in the ability of the Alberta forest service to manage the forest reserve, particularly from the standpoint of public use. When forest rangers were stationed on the reserves, the public knew they were available for information and advice. I believe the public appreciated the service they received from the rangers in the field. If there was an emergency, one knew that a ranger was close at hand to give assistance.

With increased recreational pressure, I believe there is a need to move manpower back onto the reserves on a residence basis, to provide supervision and assistance to the public using the reserves. I believe the public would appreciate the presence of authority to handle difficult situations which arise in our forest recreation areas from abuses by thoughtless individuals. The function of forest management could still be carried out from district offices. But the need for supervision staff out on the reserves on a

residence basis should be reviewed.

One other area I should like to comment on is with regard to amalgamation of the Bow and Crowsnest forests, with centralized headquarters in Calgary. I recognize there may be some economic efficiencies to centralized headquarters, but there are a number of reasons the decision should be reviewed.

First, centralization removed a number of positions from the Crowsnest Pass, which was economically depressed at the time. The area could ill afford that loss. Secondly, I believe the management of the Crowsnest forest could be better effected by personnel on the ground, resident in the forest reserve they are managing, not in Calgary, removed from the day-to-day management problems. Thirdly, with increased recreational and industrial pressures, the need to decentralize the Bow/Crow forest will become more urgent. Fourthly, efficiencies of operation could be improved: rather than having a district regional provincial paper flow, a reversion to full forest status for the Crowsnest forest would eliminate one level and provide better service and communication to the public and industry.

Fifthly, there are different problems and conditions in different areas of the Bow/Crow forest. There are unique features of the Crowsnest forest, particularly the Porcupine Hills, which would receive better attention on a Crowsnest forest basis than on a Bow/Crow centralized orientation. From a forest management point of view, there are probably techniques different from other areas of the province which should be practised singularly in the Crowsnest forest. That's another reason we should be looking at reverting to a full Crowsnest forest status. Finally, the reconstitution of the Crowsnest forest as an entity on its own would reflect the government's policy of decentralization of government services.

With regard to the remarks brought up by the hon. Member for Drumheller, I should also like to add a word of caution. I think forest officers in the field must be judicious in their exercise of authority to impound vehicles being left unattended for 24 hours without permission. That's going to require some pretty cool and calm judgment by forest officers.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I support Bill No. 13.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest certainly brought forward some suggestions I would heartily subscribe to. I think the object of the amendments to the act — many of them are actually brought about by the fact that in respect to forest land uses at the present time we have had a great number of people travelling within the forested areas, and the situation now is one where there is very indiscriminate use of these for so-called recreation purposes, I expect, by off-highway vehicles. And just like many other things within the province, in campsites along the highways and other recreation areas, we have a great deal of vandalism, rowdiness, and this sort of thing. So one of the purposes of these amendments, especially under Part 3, is to bring about more control and more authority so this situation can be kept within the bounds of proper use in the forested areas.

With regard to the fact that the forest officers are centralized in certain locations and are not in the immediate field at the time, I'd like to point out that like many other departments, especially those dealing

with our renewable resources, we're still understaffed in that respect. But there are now more people on the fire towers than there used to be. Of course, these people have excellent communication with the central offices. The forest officers in the centralized locations can be dispersed into the needed areas much more quickly than was the case a few years ago when they didn't have the road facilities, the use of helicopters, and things like that. I think probably the protection aspect is better than it was when they were in the field as they were before.

With regard to management, the minister has assured me that they're going to be taking a close look at updating the management procedures in the forest management units. Because the quotas that were awarded in 1966 will be coming up for consideration for renewal at the end of the 20-year period in '86, and we have to get our new inventory completely in place before that date in order that the proper decisions can be made with regard to forest quotas and timber management at that time. So a lot of work will have to be done between now and the end of the first 20 forest management years which will be up in '86.

Speaking of the control of vehicles and the judicious decisions that will have to be made by the forest officers, I think this is a very valid point. Speaking with people in the department, I think they are well aware of the fact that they will have to be very careful as to how these clauses are put into effect, and realize that we have put this legislation before the Assembly and are making this considered judgment. But they will be interpreting this judgment and will have to do so in light of the fact that it is needed for the greatest good of the greatest number of people. The administrators, the assistant deputy minister, and the deputy minister have assured me that they will be keeping very close watch on the types of decisions made in this respect. I anticipate the amendments we are suggesting here in this Legislation will do much to assist in the proper, orderly development of the forest lands, particularly those that are going to be used for recreation purposes. It's essential that these changes be brought about before many of the natural aspects are destroyed by people who are uncontrolled at the present time.

I would hope that all hon. members will support these amendments.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 13 be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 14**  
**The Nursing Homes**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 14 be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 16**  
**The Extra-Provincial Enforcement**  
**of Custody Orders Act**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 16 be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 18**  
**The Social Development**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment to this bill. Are you all familiar with the amendment?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 18 as amended be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 19**  
**The Public Highways Development**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HANSEN: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 19 be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 20**  
**The Names of Homes**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 20, The Names of Homes Amendment Act, now be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 21**  
**The Public Health**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions,

or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

DR. BACKUS: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 21 be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 28**  
**The Alberta Uniform Building**  
**Standards Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. ZANDER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 28 be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 32**  
**The Municipal Government**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 32 be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 45**  
**The Universities**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

There is an amendment to this bill. Are you all familiar with it?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 45, The Universities Amendment Act, 1977, 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 the Whole Assembly has had under consideration bills 12, 18, and 45, and begs to report the same with some amendments.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration bills 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 21, 28, and 32, and begs to report the same.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, during government designated business tomorrow, for one hour in the afternoon, the Assembly will continue with second readings of the bills not dealt with today on the Order Paper on pages 1 and 2, among them nos. 43, 41, and 38. We will decide on the exact order tomorrow. That will continue during the session tomorrow evening.

At this time I would move that we call it 5:30 and the Assembly adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30.

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 afternoon and half past 2.

[The House adjourned at 5:23 p.m.]

