

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Monday, June 18, 1979 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. SPEAKER: I am pleased to draw to the attention of the Assembly the presence in the Speaker's gallery of the distinguished Ambassador of the Netherlands, Dr. Jalink, together with the Consul General of the Netherlands from Vancouver, and Mr. D'Arcy Duncan, Q.C., the Consul of the Netherlands at Edmonton. Would they please stand and accept the welcome of the Assembly.

**head: PRESENTING REPORTS BY
STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES**

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Standing Committee on Private Bills, I hereby report that Standing Order 77 concerning publication of notice of application in the *Alberta Gazette* and newspapers has been complied with in respect to the following petitions:

- (1) the petition of Newman Theological College for an amendment to An Act to Incorporate Newman Theological College;
- (2) the petition of Christian College Association (Alberta) for The Kings College Act;
- (3) the petition of the city of Edmonton for The Edmonton Convention Centre Authority Act;
- (4) the petition of Richard A.N. Bonneycastle, George MacKay, John M. Dodds, Donald C. Matthews, and James S. Palmer for The Stockgrowers' Insurance Company of Canada Ltd. Act;
- (5) the petition of The Merchants and Traders Assurance Company for The Merchants and Traders Assurance Company Amendment Act, 1979;
- (6) the petition of William I. Friedman, William Steinberg, Leo Charles Friedman, Felix Adolph Leew, and Otto Schenk for The Prairie Trust Corporation Act;
- (7) the petition of Robert G. Elliot, Gordon A. Reid, Lyle P. Edwards, Peter Morrey, and Ronald Graham for The Highfield Trust Company Act;
- (8) the petition of the governors of the University of Alberta for The University of Alberta and St. Stephens College Perpetuities Act;
- (9) the petition of Les Filles de la Sagesse for The Our Lady of The Rosary Hospital, Castor, Act;
- (10) the petition of Western Union Insurance Company for The Western Union Insurance Company Amendment Act, 1979.

Standing Order 77 has not been complied with with respect to the petition of Canadian Union College for The Canadian Union College Amendment Act, 1979. I

move that the said petition be referred to the Private Bills Committee for consideration pursuant to Standing Order 81(2).

[Motion carried]

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 29****The Social Development
Amendment Act, 1979**

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, The Social Development Amendment Act, 1979. This Bill will ensure that where the needs of a handicapped person are in excess of the amount prescribed in The Assured Income for the Severely Handicapped Act, they will continue to receive the handicap benefit and such other social assistance as they require to meet those needs.

[Leave granted; Bill 29 read a first time]

Bill Pr. 4**The Stockgrowers' Insurance
Company of Canada Ltd. Act**

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill Pr. 4, The Stockgrowers' Insurance Company of Canada Ltd. Act. This Bill will incorporate an insurance company specializing in livestock and public liability insurance.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 4 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to be able to table the annual report of the Alberta Human Rights Commission for the period April 1, 1977, to March 31, 1978, as required under Section 16(2) of The Individual's Rights Protection Act. That's in accord with the expectation I was pleased to provide on, I believe, Thursday last.

Mr. Speaker, if I may have the approval of the House, at this time I would like to introduce the members of the Alberta Human Rights Commission.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce first the chairman of the commission, Dr. Max Wyman, who on October 31 will have served five years as chairman with the commission, and has helped very greatly and lent his leadership at the time of the inception and the early stages of the life of the commission.

Perhaps the commissioners would rise as I turn to each one. Mrs. Jean Forest shares with Dr. Wyman the length of service and the tremendous dedication that has been shown to the commission.

Other members of the commission who have served for lesser terms are Mr. Robert Lundrigan, Evelyn Norberg, Mrs. Vina Christie, and a new member of the commission as of last week, Mr. Richard Hiatt.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to introduce at this

time the new director of the commission who commenced in mid-April 1979, Mr. Rulon Meldrum.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you and to members of the House some 40 young Albertans from the Evansview school in Evansburg, Alberta. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. David Allison. Mr. Allison has made a point of being to this Legislature once a year over seven or eight years. I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure for the first time since coming to the Legislature to introduce to the House Alberta students from the constituency of Calgary Fish Creek. Those guests, seated in the members gallery, are 27 grades 6, 7, 8, and 9 students from the William Roper Hull Home. They are accompanied by their instructor Mr. Spence. I would ask these fine Albertans to rise in the gallery and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, 69 students from St. Martha school in my constituency. They are accompanied by the vice-principal Walter Bialobzyski; teachers John Cleary, Ann Stokvis, and Darryl Russell; and parents and chaperones Betty Cook, Mary Soloski, and Olga Kushner. I might mention that Olga Kushner is the mother of the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View. They are seated in the public gallery, and at this time I would request that they stand and receive the usual reception from the members of this Assembly.

head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Culture

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to provide today additional information concerning the senior citizens' facility grant program. As members will recall, this program was noted in the Budget Address and follows up the commitment given by the Premier during the election campaign.

Basically, the new program will allow senior citizen organizations in Alberta to apply for direct financial assistance for capital expenditures to establish, renovate, or furnish cultural/recreational centres.

The program, Mr. Speaker, was initiated in response to the large number of letters, petitions, and briefs presented on cabinet tours from senior citizen groups.

Assistance is available to non-profit senior citizen organizations incorporated under the societies Acts of the Parliament of Canada or of the provincial Legislature. Community service organizations and municipal authorities will also be able to apply on behalf of senior citizen organizations, providing one of their objectives is the provision of social, cultural, and recreational services for senior citizens.

Financial assistance will be a basic non-matching grant of \$500, or the amount of the project if less than \$500. On projects that exceed \$500, a basic non-matching grant of \$500 will be available, plus an

additional amount on the balance on a matching basis up to \$3,000. Maximum provincial funding in any one year for this senior citizen grant program will be \$3,500.

Projects that can be funded include such capital expenditures as new construction, renovations, and upgrading and equipping of facilities.

Pamphlets on the program will be forwarded to all members of the Legislature, as well as to senior citizens' groups throughout the province.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

RCMP Manpower Shortage

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Solicitor General and ask if he has had the opportunity to indicate to the Assembly whether he will be able to table the letter he sent to his federal counterpart regarding the cutbacks in RCMP for Alberta.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to be sure that the federal Solicitor General had received the letter. From contact with his office this morning, I understand that he is not in Ottawa. Therefore I feel I should not table the letter in the House, at least until he has received it.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. With due respect to the postal service, I assume from the hon. minister's response that he will be in a position to table the letter in the Legislature as soon as he's assured the federal minister has received the representation. Is that an accurate assessment?

MR. HARLE: It would be my intention to do so, yes.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the minister. What contingency plans does the Solicitor General's Department have in place along with the RCMP, especially K Division, as a result of the shortfall in the number of RCMP officers being made available to Alberta this year?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, first of all I think I should indicate that in contacting the RCMP and K Division and Assistant Commissioner Wright in April, I was given some statistical information. I obtained that information from him again today. Apparently, taking statistics of Criminal Code offences reported in the first quarter of 1979 compared to the first quarter of 1978, there is virtually a zero per cent increase. Taking Criminal Code offences in the area of traffic, there's been a 31 per cent increase over 1978. Provincial traffic Act offences are up 24 per cent, and all other offences relating to provincial legislation — primarily in the area of liquor — are up 29 per cent.

I find it very difficult to conclude on that basis — because after all the Criminal Code, the provincial traffic Act offences, and other provincial offences are all basically, one could say, self-generated offences. In other words, they have in fact been laid by the RCMP. Now when you look at the clearance rates the RCMP have — and this is taken from Statistics Canada — their statistics in Alberta run . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I regret interrupting the hon. minister, but the question, as I recall it, related to the existence of contingency plans. It would appear that the hon. minister has initiated a debate as to whether or not contingency plans may be necessary.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, it's certainly helpful to provide the answer to the next question, which would obviously follow if I offered it ... [interjection]

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister going to answer the first question before I ask the second?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the background because I think it's important to the question. On the clearance rates, Alberta RCMP run at approximately 52 per cent in the ...

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the minister, we still do not appear to be dealing with contingency plans. I agree that the minister isn't obliged to deal with them if he doesn't wish to, but I think these other matters, although they may be related to the subject, are not related to the question.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the information I've just given, it hardly seems proper that there should be contingency plans.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the minister's recent comment that the government has no contingency plan, despite the fact that Alberta didn't get 200 RCMP personnel that it requested last year, Mr. Minister, has your department ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. R. CLARK: ... now decided that those 200 RCMP officers are not needed?

MR. HARLE: No, Mr. Speaker. I didn't say that. I said that because the clearance rates in the first three months of this year were running at 55 per cent ahead of the percentage over all of last year and the clearance rate across Canada is 46 per cent, I think the RCMP are doing an excellent job.

That does not mean that I'm not, at the same time, asking for the increase in the numbers of RCMP personnel in this province. When it comes to the statement made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition on Friday [Hansard Blues]:

... is the minister aware that K Division is now making decisions as to which cases they will follow up and which they won't, based on the severity of the crime, and that there are a number of cases the RCMP in Alberta are simply not able to follow up on because of their shortage in manpower?

I would like to know what those cases are. From the information I have, while it's certainly the case that the RCMP assess each case, investigations are continuing on each complaint until they can satisfactorily resolve it. I think it's unfair to make a blanket statement that their decisions are based on the seriousness of the crimes. So it comes back to the fact that I would like to know what cases are not being followed up.

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the hon. minister might ask his questions outside the question period.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, might I direct a supplementary question to the minister. Has the government given consideration to using the Alberta highway patrol — I'm not sure that's the official name, but it's the Alberta police force in blue — to augment the RCMP until such time as we're able to get the numbers that Albertans feel we need?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be unfair to put the traffic patrol people into the area of criminal law. These officers in provincial vehicles do not wear sidearms and in fact are discouraged from entering upon a criminal investigation. Of course they have dialogue with their counterparts in the RCMP, and if there is any incident which would seem to imply criminal activity they are urged to contact the local detachments.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one last question in this area to the minister. Is the government giving any consideration at this time to the establishment of a provincial police force in Alberta?

MR. HARLE: No, Mr. Speaker.

NAIT and SAIT Administration

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower and ask the status of the proposition put before the government on several occasions of the northern and southern Alberta institutes of technology being permitted to have a board of governors and follow the practice for colleges in the province.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, that matter will be reviewed by my department in the next few months. I've had some representations on that. A very mixed point of view is being expressed at this time, and I would like to assess that matter thoroughly before dealing with it, which I would hope to do within a reasonable period of time.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister outline to the Assembly the manner in which he is going to go about the review? I ask the question in light of the fact that a number of people, both staff and others, would like the opportunity to present both views to the minister before he makes a decision on the matter.

MR. HORSMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, whatever method is finally determined, I will certainly be pleased to make sure that all points of view are carefully heard and reviewed.

Metis Settlements

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health and ask if he can explain to the Assembly why officials of the Metis development branch this morning descended in a commando-style raid on six of the eight Metis settlements to seize documents and files.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member referring to the actions of an official body answerable to the minister?

MR. NOTLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm referring to the actions of the Metis development branch, not to police officers.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, without accepting any innuendo about commando-style, it is my understanding that officials from the department did visit the eight Metis settlements today to obtain access to our own files. The purpose is the preparation for the examination of discovery regarding the pending litigation between the Metis settlements and the province of Alberta regarding ownership of mineral rights. I also understand that the next step is under review by my chief deputy minister and the Deputy Attorney General.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to explain to the Assembly why officials of the branch did not formally consult the locally elected members of the settlements, and why entry to settlement offices was made without notification or warrant?

MR. BOGLE: As I've indicated, Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the information being obtained is government files.

I hope all members of the Assembly appreciate the concern my colleagues and I have to speed up the litigation so the matter of the ownership of minerals can be resolved at the earliest opportunity, the people in the Metis settlements can get on with their activities, and we in government can get on with ours. But this matter has been dragging for a considerable period. I've asked that the process be speeded, if you like. I did that in my previous capacity as Minister responsible for Native Affairs. I've had numerous discussions with the current acting president, Mr. Maurice L'Hirondelle, and it's our joint desire that this process be accelerated.

Legally, at the moment we're at the stage where we're ready to go to an examination for discovery. In order to fully document the government's point of view, we need access to our own files. That's what the entire process is about.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to explain to the Assembly why consultation did not take place with the various settlement associations before entry onto the sites of the files, which are the settlement offices?

MR. BOGLE: As long as there is no misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker. The information in settlement offices is the property of the people of Alberta, held in trust by this government. That is my understanding as to what was sought this morning.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. The question relates to the propriety of branch officials' going into the offices of the settlements without prior consultation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member is asking the selfsame question for the third time, and I would doubt whether it's part of the minister's duties to

exchange opinions with the hon. member concerning questions of propriety.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, the question really relates to whether the Department of Social Services and Community Health has any overall policy that entry will be made onto premises without first obtaining the consent of those whose premises they are.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is suggesting that we should in some way make advance preparations prior to obtaining information which is the property of the people of Alberta — and I'm now referring to files — I reject that. I'm waiting for more information from my chief deputy minister as to the circumstances, but it's my clear understanding at the moment that what was asked for was information from our own files — not someone else's files but our own.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Is it the position of the government of Alberta that there can be access to other people's property as long as there are government files in that property; without either prior consultation or obtaining a warrant?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the presumptions in the hon. member's questions are certainly with those of fact. I think the hon. minister said he will ascertain what the facts are.

MR. NOTLEY: A further supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Is the government prepared at this time to assure the settlements in the province whether there will be access to the files obtained, which include settlement material as well, by the settlements as they too prepare their legal case for the examination for discovery?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, if some of the material obtained is not the property of the government of Alberta, I'll certainly investigate to determine why that material has been obtained. But it is my understanding that the files in question are departmental files, and that's all that has been sought from the eight Metis settlements.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, if I may, to the hon. minister. What consideration has the government given to the Metis settlements' proposal for joint use of the documents in their office files, which the department has claimed are government files but the settlements claim are the settlements' files?

MR. SPEAKER: We appear now to be getting into details of the lawsuit. As to the production and possession of documents, I would question whether that should be dealt with any further in the question period. The matter is before the courts, and it may well be that the courts may decide who owns which documents and which documents should be produced and which need not be produced.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is not with respect to how the courts may decide the ownership of documents. My question to the minister is: what con-

sideration has the government given to a proposal by the settlements that there be joint access to the files?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any such proposal.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Could the minister indicate whether ministerial approval was given to officials to enter the offices today?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, obviously not. The preparation by legal officials, both within government and contracted, is ongoing. Surely the hon. member is not suggesting that a minister would be contacted over each and every step of that process.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Who authorized the actions today?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I assume that was a responsibility of either my chief deputy minister or his subordinates.

MR. R. SPEAKER: For clarification, Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate whether the legal committee, or the committee acting on his behalf, is responsible to him, for all its actions, including the actions which took place today?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, what committee is the hon. member referring to?

MR. R. SPEAKER: For clarification, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Are the department officials from the Metis settlements branch who today entered the premises of various Metis settlements not responsible to the minister? Does the minister accept all responsibility for their actions?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, this matter was brought to my attention today by my chief deputy minister. He gave me an explanation of what had happened, and I found that explanation satisfactory. He further suggested that the next step would depend upon our discussions with senior officials in the Attorney General's Department. I'm satisfied with that explanation.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, for clarification. The minister then accepts responsibility for the actions by his officials which occurred today?

MR. BOGLE: As I've said, Mr. Speaker, I accept the explanation given me by my chief deputy minister.

MR. R. CLARK: Who runs the department?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, as minister of that department, does he accept the responsibility or not?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, no question about the policy directions of the department. I accept the direction of our department from a policy point of view. Administrative matters are dealt with by officials in the department.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like again to put a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. It relates to what happened this morning where, without prior consultation, officials from a government branch walked into the offices of six of the eight settlements in this province. My question to the hon. Premier, with the members of the Human Rights Commission very appropriately sitting in the gallery, is whether this government tolerates that kind of action on the part of its officials.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I already answered precisely that question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. At an earlier date, did the minister or officials of his department make a formal or informal request to the Metis settlements for the records which they secured today by other means?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the question as to whether the request had been made earlier is one I can't answer; I'll take it under notice. I have indicated that my chief deputy minister gave me an explanation today of what happened and what the next course of action will be, and I'm satisfied with that.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question. The minister indicated he held discussions with the president of the Federation of Metis Settlements, Mr. L'Hirondelle. During those discussions, did the minister indicate that the government of Alberta, through the Metis development branch, would be seizing the records contained in branch offices?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the president of the Federation of Metis Settlements that if we continue to move at the snail's pace we're currently moving at, it may be 20 years before we have a settlement. That's something we, from a government point of view, and the Metis people find unacceptable. We have to find a way to speed up the process. [interjections]

MR. R. SPEAKER: In light of that answer, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister then prepared to go to any lengths necessary to reach some kind of settlement, even if those actions include breaking the law?

MR. SPEAKER: Unless he's using this topic as a means of debate, surely the hon. member isn't seriously asking the minister whether he's going to observe the law.

MR. R. CLARK: Well, he didn't this morning. Why should he this afternoon?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. leader has no right whatsoever to make that accusation in this Assembly, unless he wishes to make it in a proper way and not as an aside in the question period.

I regret my somewhat unusually frequent intervention in this line of questions, but we have to be extremely careful that we don't constitute the question period into some kind of informal and ill-conceived trial procedure whereby snap judgments can be made.

Loto Canada

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Culture. Has any representation been made by her office, or does the minister intend to make any representation, to the government of Canada with regard to the future of Loto Canada and the possibility of moneys from Loto Canada being turned over to the provinces for administration?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, this morning a letter was sent to the new federal minister in charge of lotteries, asking for a meeting when he next comes to Edmonton to visit his constituency.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Did the letter indicate whether the province would like to have more autonomy or control over Loto Canada funds?

MRS. LeMESSURIER: No, it did not, Mr. Speaker. It was an invitation for him to sit down and talk about the overall situation of lotteries.

Water Management — Bow River

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Environment. Could he indicate whether it's the intention of the government to go ahead with rehabilitation of the Bassano dam on the Bow River and, if so, when will it start?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I think I'd have to take that question as notice and review it.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the government going to do any feasibility studies on the Bow River? I'm thinking of the Eyremore dam that was discussed. Is there any possibility of putting in the new Eyremore dam instead of rehabilitating the Bassano dam?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd review that too.

Senior Citizens' Grants

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the hon. Minister responsible for Culture. In today's ministerial statement she stated that municipal authorities will be able to apply on behalf of senior citizen organizations. I wonder if the minister could advise whether municipal authorities will be able to make application on behalf of senior citizens in lodges which also require social, cultural, and recreational services.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, sometime during the afternoon a brochure will be distributed to all the members of the Legislature. All the details are in this brochure.

Foreign Ownership of Land

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to either the Minister of Agriculture or the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. It deals with the foreign land ownership regulations. Now that the regulations are in place, does the gov-

ernment have any immediate plans for changes in them?

MR. MILLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are giving consideration to changing some that are causing inconvenience to some people. But the general principle will remain the same, that we are going to control foreign ownership of agricultural lands. The changes will have to do with urban properties. Minor amendments will be dealt with.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is it the government's intention to include urban properties under the revised regulations?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, we do have a monitoring of urban properties, and that's the aspect where some changes will be made. For agricultural properties, the Act will remain as it is.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, will there be any adjustments in the regulations as to the numerical count of voting and non-voting shares which determines whether a company is deemed to be Canadian or non-Canadian?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, that will remain the same, where all shares are classified in regard to foreign ownership, rather than just the voting shares, as was in effect before.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister, so there's no misunderstanding. At this time, there's no intention by the government to change that portion of the regulations which counts non-voting shares, and on several occasions allows non-voting Canadian shares to be seen to dominate a company, even though in fact they don't?

MR. MILLER: This was one of the problems we ran into with the temporary regulations, where we had two classes of shares: voting shares and non-voting shares. In the permanent regulations we've adopted, all shares are counted.

MR. MUSGREAVE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister advise if those foreign owners who are single proprietorship or partnerships will also be monitored, or the regulations changed to affect this situation?

MR. MILLER: Would the hon. member please repeat the question? I missed the import of it.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister advise whether or not the regulations will be amended to reflect those situations where the ownership is in the form of a proprietorship or a partnership rather than a company?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I guess I'll have to take that as notice. I just can't get the import of the question, whether he's talking about a partnership where one member is a foreign owner and the other a Canadian, or what.

Water Management — Oldman River

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Environment is with regard to the Oldman River basin study. Could the minister indicate when that study will be finalized and ready for the minister's examination? Secondly, when will it be made public, hopefully?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, the Environment Council of Alberta is working on a report on the Oldman. We hope to receive it in the reasonably near future, and after that we'll table it just as quickly as we can.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate whether it would be finalized by the end of this month?

MR. COOKSON: I have some indication it could be completed by the end of the month.

Rural and Native Housing

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might respond to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition last week with regard to whether there were any unfinished studies. The answer is no. I've been assured by officials of the Housing Corporation and the department that no studies have been left unfinished or scrapped.

The department does two types of studies, Mr. Speaker. One is with regard to need. The department works with the local housing communities, gathers information, and comes up with an annual plan, if you like, of need. Once approved, the direction with regard to implementation goes to the Housing Corporation.

Secondly, as part of an ongoing assessment, programs are reviewed to determine if there are any unresolved problems or dissatisfaction that can be corrected. The recipients of homes, the housing committees, municipal councils, MLAs, and other groups are interviewed. In doing this type of study, the department normally uses summer students and/or contract help. For example, I think last year the department had two summer students and one contract graduate student doing interviews. This information is then passed on to the department. It's very useful, of course, in solving problems and planning future activity.

In summary; no studies have been unfinished or scrapped, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question in light of the minister's answer. Mr. Minister, are you in a position today to indicate to the Assembly whether a study was done by the department or the Housing Corporation or ... My information is that an outside individual was contracted to supervise the report or study, and then staff people in the corporation and the department did the work. Is the report an overall general report on the rural and native housing program?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I referred to two types of studies done internally. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition is referring to the second type I mentioned, where we employ summer students and a graduate — our contract help last year was a graduate student. They do these interviews, then put the material together

and send it to the department. The department people then put together the material they get and draw conclusions from it. If that's the information the hon. leader is referring to, yes, it's done on an ongoing basis. It was done last year, but it's finished. No such material has been scrapped.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. In light of the interest in the rural and native housing program, would the minister be prepared to take under consideration tabling in the Assembly the information the Housing Corporation received from the work done last summer?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, of course we like to make available as much information as possible. However, the particular surveys we've been discussing involve information with regard to individuals. In small communities it's possible to identify people involved in the statistical review, even on a collated basis. Therefore I don't think it would be fair or appropriate to make that information public.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, would the department and the minister be prepared to consider the idea of making available to the Assembly just the conclusions which came from that report?

MR. CHAMBERS: I could give the hon. leader one conclusion right now, Mr. Speaker. I don't like to use the word "report", because it's really a summation of interviews and collected material, a fairly significant amount. The happiness quotient, if you like, was very high. As I recall, some 82 per cent of the people were happy with the housing they received.

Again, it's a large amount of material, and if there's any specific information ... I think the hon. leader would appreciate the difficulty when we're talking about gathering information in which the client's group could be identified. I'm sure the hon. leader would agree with me that that information is not appropriate to be made public. But if there's any information of detail the hon. member would like to receive, I suggest it might be appropriate for the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker.

Drought Threat

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to supplement an answer to a question on Friday in regard to the moisture outlook throughout the province at this time, and to bring members up to date that the moisture conditions throughout the province are certainly below normal, with the exception of east-central and a portion around Slave Lake. The cumulative figures in regard to precipitation since May 1 also show below-normal rainfall, with those exceptions again of east-central and Slave Lake.

It's also interesting to note that to date temperatures throughout the province are certainly far below normal for this time, and indeed last week areas lying west of Highway 2 registered reasonably severe frost.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

11. Moved by Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved that

1. a select committee of this Assembly be established consisting of the following members: Hon. Bill W. Diachuk, Chairman; A. Little, I. Reid, M. Fyfe, S. Kushner, L. Fjordbotten, R. Cook, Robert C. Clark, and W. Grant Notley; with instructions
 - (a) to receive representations and recommendations as to the operations of The Workers' Compensation Act; and
 - (b) that the committee so appointed do meet for the purposes aforesaid at the call of the Chairman at such times and places as may from time to time be designated by him; and
 - (c) that the said committee do report to this Assembly at the next ensuing session of this Assembly the substance of the representations and recommendations made to the committee together with such recommendations relating to the administration of the said Act as to the said committee seems proper.
2. Members of the committee shall receive remuneration in accordance with Section 59(1) of The Legislative Assembly Act.
3. Reasonable disbursements by the committee, for clerical assistance, equipment and supplies, advertising, rent and other facilities required for the effective conduct of its responsibilities; shall be paid, subject to the approval of the Chairman.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a substitution of one of the names, with the unanimous leave of the Assembly. The hon. Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues have asked that the hon. member Dr. Buck's name appear in place of that of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Clark.

With that change and the agreement of hon. members, if I might have it, Mr. Speaker, I move Motion No. 11 to establish the select committee in regard to workers compensation.

MR. SPEAKER: On the request for unanimous leave to substitute the name of the hon. Member for Clover Bar, does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Motion as amended carried]

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

head: (Committee of Supply)

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will come to order.

Department of Advanced Education and Manpower

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make some introductory remarks of a brief nature, prior to consid-

eration of the four votes in the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, and to advise members of the Assembly and this committee of the various programs being undertaken by Advanced Education and Manpower as reflected in the funds requested to carry out those programs.

The provision of postsecondary education and training opportunities to adult Albertans able to benefit from such experiences is a major strategy used by government to achieve various social and economic goals held for Alberta and Albertans. Advanced Education and Manpower services prepare people to live happy, useful lives and assist individuals to contribute to and benefit from a productive provincial economy.

The translation of these goals and objectives into programs has resulted in the development of a comprehensive and diverse system of postsecondary education. The system has grown rapidly in recent years. More than 20 postsecondary institutions offer a wide range of academic, professional, technical, and vocational programs leading to degrees, diplomas, and certificates. Several thousand apprentices are trained annually. As I indicated on Friday in my participation in the budget debate, in the last year over 20,000 apprentices were served by the system — a very remarkable achievement on the part of that particular branch of the department and the various institutions involved with providing that training. As well, further education programming, career development, and employment development services are now in place to complement institutionally based programs.

In addition to its responsibility for advanced education and manpower development, the department has three other important policy area responsibilities: demography and immigration; to assist with the research and science policy which will be developed in the next period of time as a result of new initiatives on the part of the government; and, of course, co-ordination of the professions and occupations legislation in the province. We'll be hearing more about that during the latter part of these sittings and during the fall sittings. In all these areas we are in the process of reviewing policies, and development of new policies is under way.

Over the past five years a great deal of emphasis and planning has been devoted to manpower development for the resource industries. Technical and apprenticeship training capabilities have grown and are being decentralized throughout the province.

For budget purposes, the varied responsibilities of the department are outlined in the four votes set out. Vote 1, of course, is general support services provided to the department. Vote 2 will deal with program support and the operating and capital assistance to postsecondary institutions. With reference to the matter of capital assistance, members will be aware that I made a ministerial statement on Friday outlining the capital allocations to each of the institutions directly involved with the portfolio.

Vote 3 will deal with the matters of apprenticeship, employment development, career development, and special manpower programs. In addition, this vote includes provision for training assistance to students.

Vote 4 includes the financial aid provided to students through grants, loans, scholarships, and bursaries. I just might take a moment, Mr. Chairman, to indicate that the present estimates that deal with the proposals with regard to student finance are based upon the

existing policy and do not reflect any changes which may result — and I underline the words "may result" — from recommendations which have flowed from the report by the Grantham task force on the contribution by students to postsecondary education. On that subject, I will be reviewing very carefully in the immediate future recommendations which that committee made and the responses received by my office and the department by the end of May, which my predecessor originally indicated would be done. Over 20 recommendations have now been received and are presently being reviewed.

With regard to the student contribution, I think it's important to point out at this stage that students' fees will not be raised in the forthcoming school year, other than those raises already indicated by the various institutions in consultation with the department.

This budget request, prepared within the general framework, attempted to assess the role of the department in meeting the needs of individuals within the context of our present economic, demographic, and social environment. Alberta's economy is healthy and is forecast to continue to be strong into the mid-1980s. Due to our economic situation, pressure will continue to be placed on postsecondary education programs to meet the continuing high demand for skilled and highly qualified manpower, and to assist the unemployed, the underemployed, and the displaced worker in locating productive employment.

Increased rates of interprovincial immigration to Alberta have resulted in substantial population increases, particularly in our major urban centres. An increase in the demand for highly qualified individuals in social services fields is anticipated in response to the needs of a growing and aging Alberta population. In addition, some new Albertans require assistance in settling and in locating rewarding employment in Alberta. A growing labor force located throughout the province, having the time and need for part-time training and retraining, suggests a continued growth in the demand for services offered by this department.

Within the social context, many Albertans in certain areas of the province continue to have difficulty making ends meet; although at the other end of the scale, many groups and individuals continue to prosper. We are in the process of providing many new programs to assist the underprivileged, the handicapped, people really underemployed for their capabilities, youth, and other groups which have special needs for services.

This budget request took environmental conditions into consideration, within the context of an ongoing policy of fiscal restraint. An extensive internal review process was conducted over a period of months, and the request was designed to accommodate essential needs as perceived by the department. Knowing it would be impossible to respond fully to all needs, we wish to be able to provide a degree of flexibility. The budget request we are making of the Assembly is to provide some flexibility, to provide institutions with the capability to adjust to change, while maintaining at least the same level of service. There has been a conscious effort to live within the spirit of fiscal restraint, and we believe the requests we are placing before the Assembly are well considered and responsible.

With reference to manpower requested for the department. I would like to point out that there are 67 additional positions in the budget request. They have

been allocated as follows: firstly, 12 new positions in the manpower services division, reflected in Vote 3: nine conversions into permanent positions and three new positions basically related to the very rapid growth in the demand for apprenticeship training programs and services.

In addition, since the departmental total reflects employment of staff at the provincially administered southern and northern Alberta institutes of technology and the four vocational centres, 55 new positions are requested. While the allocation has not been absolutely finalized, it is proposed that these positions be made available: 30 at the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology, 20 at the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology, and five to the provincially administered vocational centres located at Grouard, Lac La Biche, Edmonton, and Calgary.

No growth is reflected in the departmental support staff. As I indicated, those requested by the department for consideration are largely associated with the very rapid growth experienced with regard to apprenticeship training programs in the manpower division and in the institutions which provide basic training in those particular programs. With regard to the apprenticeship program, members should be aware that approximately 50 per cent of the apprentices being trained in the department are located in and about the Edmonton area, just over one-third in and about the Calgary area, and the balance are circulated throughout the province in different areas.

Mr. Chairman, those are some preliminary remarks I wish to make, to add to those I made on Friday afternoon in the budget debate. Of course I expect I will receive some questions. If I may, I want to indicate that I have now visited 22 institutions in the portfolio. The most recent one was this morning at Lacombe, Canadian Union College, where I met with the administration, the faculty, and the students still on campus. I had a very good meeting indeed.

I wish to point out to members of the Assembly that with respect to private colleges, funds are made available on a per student basis and on an enrolment-driven formula, if you will. But as a matter of policy, no funds with respect to capital developments are made available to private institutions. Hopefully before the end of the month, given a couple more Monday mornings and maybe the odd Friday afternoon, I intend to conclude the visits to all these institutions that I had hoped to be able to make before the end of the session. Before the session started I had hoped to visit them all, but I wasn't able to do it.

Mr. Chairman, before I conclude my opening remarks, I want to say as well that I have appreciated the obvious attention and very real dedication paid to these institutions by the boards of governors and the voluntary groups, senates included, of interested and concerned Albertans who are serving these institutions by way of establishing policy for them within the overall framework of the department. I want to say that I very much respect the need for autonomy at institutional levels. It is very real and essential, so that we maintain institutions free from direct political involvement, or direction and control by government. I think that is one of the very real strengths of our institutions in this province, and in the term that I hold this office, I wish to do what I can to ensure that that continues.

Keeping that in mind, I very much support the move from an enrolment-driven formula which took place a

few years ago, to one which is based on a block funding basis — I think that's the proper term to use — whereby the institutions and colleges themselves make the allocations within their institutions to the programming they deem necessary and required.

At the same time, I think it's important for members of the Assembly to realize that it is important that there be a co-ordinating role by the department with respect to authorization of new program developments. Within each institution, despite the fact that there has been a stable or declining enrolment, there is still growth. The growth is reflected in the requests for new programs to serve the varied needs of the people of this province. I am hopeful that there will continue to be a spirit of co-operation, which I believe there is, between the institutions and the department with respect to those new program developments.

Mr. Chairman, as we progress through these estimates, I will be pleased to answer questions and to make notes of representations received by members of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Are there any questions or comments by members?

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, do we go through this vote by vote, or could we just comment in a general way?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will be going through each vote and sub-item. If you want to make any general comments, this is the time you may do it. Or you can do it on each vote. It doesn't matter.

MR. COOK: I'll wait.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have to attend another meeting in a few minutes, and I want to ask the minister just two questions.

First of all, on the issue of transferability he alluded to. I'm very pleased that the minister has taken note of representations on this very important issue from around the province. With the universities and colleges spread throughout the province, I think we have an advanced education system second to none in the country. I think it's a real shame, Mr. Minister, that these young people could start in a program in one part of the province and find a year or two later that they cannot transfer to another institution to take courses of their choice. I'm a strong champion of the autonomy and the authority granted under both The Universities Act and The Colleges Act that these institutions should have the say in running their own shows. But public funds are involved, and I think that area should be addressed, and I commend you for it.

The other point concerns unemployment insurance and perhaps your counterpart at the federal level. Increasingly, the number of citizens who make application for unemployment insurance benefits, for a variety of reasons, can't get those benefits. This happens in Lethbridge; I assume it's general around the province. As a result they end up with the regional offices applying for provincial assistance. I think that's wrong. I'd like to know what your plans are to meet with your federal counterpart to resolve that area of unemployment insurance benefits for Alberta citizens.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the hon. Member for Lethbridge West wishes to be elsewhere, I'd like to answer the points he has made.

With regard to the question of transferability, I find myself in a different position from a few years ago in this Assembly, when I was asking my predecessor what steps would be taken with regard to ensuring transferability. Mr. Chairman, I wish to assure the hon. member and other members of the Assembly that my interest in seeing transferability between institutions in Alberta has not diminished. But I do think it important to note that the council on admissions and transfers, which was established by my predecessor, is functioning, I believe, in a very useful and significant manner.

Since assuming the portfolio, I have met with the chairman of that council which, hon. members will appreciate, has no statutory mandate or authorization, but is rather a voluntary agreement by the institutions to participate in overcoming problems of transferability. That meeting was very useful. I have received the report of the council on admissions and transfers, and in a very few days I will be making copies of that available to each member of the Assembly. Of course there is no legal requirement to file it, but I do want members to be aware of the role played by the council and, furthermore, to read the information and see what work has been done in the past year.

I wish to encourage that council to continue its efforts, and furthermore to advise members of this committee that each time I met with a board or institution, I impressed upon them my desire to see a continuation of that spirit of co-operation, so that we will ensure that Albertans who attend institutions do not have any artificial barriers placed in the way of ensuring that their education proceeds smoothly.

With regard to the matter of unemployment insurance, it's only in a very limited way, I think, that my portfolio touches on that matter, through the manpower division. I have not yet availed myself of any opportunity to meet with my federal counterpart, the Hon. Ron Atkey, although I've had some communication from him.

It seems to me that in Alberta the problem is much less than elsewhere in Canada, in view of the fact that at the last reading, which was announced last week, Alberta's unemployment rate stood at 3.7 per cent, the lowest in Canada, reflecting the very healthy economy we enjoy in this province. Mr. Chairman, that doesn't mean to say that I underestimate the problem. At the same time, I do think we are fortunate that we don't have a bigger problem. I will do what I can in the next period of time to bring the concerns of the hon. member to the attention of the federal government, and also do what we can in our department to offer training and retraining opportunities so that in this buoyant economy people who want to work will be able to. And perhaps some who don't necessarily want to work as hard as other people would like them to work may be encouraged to do that.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the minister for having to slip out during the latter portion of his remarks.

Despite the fact that I don't think your department should be in existence and that I think there should be one department of education which should have the overall responsibility, Mr. Minister, I wish you good luck in your endeavor in the department. Recognizing

that this budget basically is not of your making, but of your predecessor's, I want simply to touch three points.

I'd like to know, Mr. Minister, the five-year projected operating costs for the \$100 million announcement you made last Friday and what projections we are looking at as far as student numbers.

Number two, Mr. Minister, I think you are at least the second, but could be the third, minister who has promised us the science policy. It's been in at least two, if not three, speeches from the throne. I hold you, Mr. Minister, at least from my position on this side of the House, to be responsible for the development of this science policy. I take it you've been so designated by the Premier. In light of your comments a few minutes ago, I take that implication from your opening remarks. If it isn't right, I'm sure you will straighten the record in your usual gentle way. But I think one of the serious shortfalls we've had, whether it's Advanced Education and Manpower or wherever the responsibility is, is the development of this much ballyhooed, if I might use the term, science policy that has been in at least two speeches from the Throne. I noticed it was absent this year and last year, but it was there the two years before. Now I don't know where the foul-up is, Mr. Minister, but I assume you'll be able to straighten that out.

Thirdly, Mr. Minister, if my recollection is accurate, some weeks ago you indicated that changes in the student finance structure as recommended by the Grantham commission would be undertaken this session. If that's accurate, I think it's fair to ask: what changes, and when will they be implemented?

The reason I think it's appropriate to ask those is that students are now looking at assistance for next September. I'm sure that in the month of September you'll be flooded with calls from MLAs, along with an awful lot of students, about where student assistance fits. Unless some decisions are made very quickly — if there are going to be changes — with all the genuineness I can muster, I urge you to make those changes now, not in August or September. Not only will the minister feel the swamping of that, but so will all Members of the Legislative Assembly. If changes are coming, Mr. Minister, I'd be very interested in knowing where they are.

Mr. Minister, the last point: I said in jest in my opening remarks, and the minister well knows, I don't believe the department should be in existence. One of the reasons I say that, Mr. Minister, is this question of some kind of co-ordination between a variety of departments. I use as an example, Mr. Minister, a proposed new program . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. Leader of the Opposition, but I would suggest that the same rules apply as in the Assembly. The dialogue would not be directly addressed to the minister but to the Chair, please.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I apologize for ignoring you. I shall endeavor not to do it again.

Through you to the minister, Mr. Chairman: a proposal was made to the department for a new program for training teachers of the hearing impaired, through the Department of Educational Psychology, University of Alberta. That proposition has been before the department for at least four years. When will a

decision on that proposition be made? If the decision is positive, when will the program be operational? Through the Chairman again, Mr. Minister: how much money is involved in this proposition?

It's my understanding that this proposal was put before the department four years ago; the university has been waiting for a decision from the department. It impinges on an area that I think all members of this House agree upon, the area of the handicapped. I believe the Year of the Child would be a very appropriate year for the department to move. Mr. Minister, all those things were said to you through the Chair.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to respond to the points raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

With respect to the matter of the announcement of capital projects last Friday, all of these projects have been reviewed carefully by the department with respect to the individual institution. Off the top of my head or from the material I have in this budget, I can't provide breakdowns on the operating costs of each institution. I think we can try to get that information and make it available to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Some of these new buildings will be to deal with programs already in existence, so new programming will not be involved in some of them. Therefore, the additional operating costs will be related to basic maintenance, additional staff, and so on. We'll try to get that information as best we can.

On the question of the science policy, I indicated that the department will be co-operating, as a result of the new thrust being made with regard to science. I'm not responsible. In his capacity as chairman of the Alberta Research Council, the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight will be designated as chairman of the committee dealing with development of the science and research policy. Because of its nature, the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower will be responsible for development of that policy in co-operation with other departments of government. Therefore I think that will be a very important new thrust and a new responsibility for the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight when he assumes it later this year.

With regard to the subject of student finances and the changes, I appreciate the caution of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and that's what I have tried to convey throughout my meetings with student groups and other interested organizations. My predecessor — and I concurred, of course — agreed we would receive representations on the recommendations of the Grantham report until the end of May. That being the case, those representations have just been received. In preparation for this session, I have not had an opportunity to review all of them in detail. The hon. leader will appreciate the fact that there are some very extensive recommendations on the recommendations. So I am doing my very best, Mr. Chairman, to bring all those together and see where there are areas of agreement, and then to try to achieve a measure of the cost implications. As I indicated in my opening remarks, whatever cost implications will flow from any student finance changes obviously are not reflected in the budget and would have to be obtained by way of special warrant if they go into effect for the fall term at the universities, colleges, and other institutions in the portfolio.

I have indicated to student organizations and to universities and colleges that that will be my number

one priority. I'm doing my best to get it sorted together, with a view to making a recommendation to the caucus committee on education and to the appropriate cabinet committee, hopefully to obtain some approval before mid-July. I recognize the fact — and the hon. Leader of the Opposition has been very clear in pointing it out — that unless the changes are in place by then, they are really not going to be of any use to students who are planning their year in the term starting September. So I want to assure the hon. leader and members of the Assembly that it's my number one priority in the department. I will do my very best either to have whatever changes in place, or to advise the students that we aren't able to do it. I think that's a fair and reasonable way to handle it. But I certainly want to make that effort. We're making the effort; I hope I can take all the necessary steps.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the final point raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, relating to the hearing impaired, I'm glad that matter was raised. It really falls into the whole question which has developed as a result of new thrusts announced by other departments with regard to the handicapped. In addition to the program mentioned by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, proposals from other institutions are now flowing into the department for program approval, which relate to the broad question of training teachers for the handicapped. All those proposals are presently being reviewed. The hon. leader will appreciate my concern that that is another priority area we must deal with if new programs are to be in place, so that in addition to the thrust being taken by Education, and Social Services and Community Health, properly trained and well-qualified teachers of the handicapped will be available to work in those programs. So in addition to the program already requested, and mentioned by the hon. leader, a number of others are presently being reviewed, and will be a very high priority for the next few weeks.

MR. R. CLARK: Through you, Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I'd like to make one comment and one further suggestion.

Mr. Minister, with regard to the comment on the last item raised here this afternoon, I think that to wait some four years is the most exasperating problem a university faculty or any group has, regardless of who the government may be. Better that the department and the minister's office establish the practice of saying no, rather than keeping a group like this on the line for some four years. I want to underline that particular point. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if it would be possible for you to look specifically at this particular program, and either in the House or outside advise my office as to the status of it.

The other question I'd like to raise is one the minister and I have disagreed upon on other occasions. That's the question of quotas at our universities, especially in the faculties of commerce or business administration — depending on which institution you're at — agriculture and forestry, and engineering.

Mr. Minister, during the weekend there was a group of chartered accountants meeting in one of the two major cities in the province, and once again they're lamenting the shortages. I noticed the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs perk up his ears when I talked about chartered accountants. I don't expect he'll be available for another three and a half

years.

But, Mr. Minister, I can't conceive of why we have quotas in the faculties of business, engineering, or agriculture. I know the argument can be made that it's the universities' fault, or it's the Legislature's fault that not enough money is appropriated. Wherever one wants to lay the blame, the fact is that a sizable number of young Albertans who have the academic qualifications aren't getting an opportunity in the faculties of engineering, agriculture, and business. Regardless of where one sits in this Assembly, I don't think many members can be very satisfied with that kind of situation.

I'm not particularly trying to make brownie points on it today, Mr. Minister, other than to say that surely by this fall we can be in a position, even if you've got to go for some special warrant arrangements, where we can take the quotas of those three faculties. When we talk about things we're trying to do economically in this province, we are just depriving a lot of young Albertans of opportunities in those areas.

Mr. Minister, one could extend the argument to some areas at NAIT and SAIT. Those institutions are often lost in the course of discussion in the Assembly, but they do a splendid job. It seems to me there are particular areas there where the manpower people in the minister's department should be able to indicate all sorts of opportunities. I have no qualms about seeing young Albertans get those opportunities first. As far as I'm concerned, that's the way it should be. But all of us should do what we can to get the wretched quotas out in at least those three faculties.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Leader of the Opposition for having urged me to have the courage to say no from time to time. Certainly there is a great deal of merit in that suggestion, because it appears to me that one of the worst things that can happen to any institution — and I've experienced this and heard this comment — is that uncertainty, not knowing whether or not their programming is going to go ahead, is in most cases a good deal worse than saying no.

Certainly, though, the field we are considering now, the training of teachers of the handicapped, is not one area where I anticipate that will be the answer. But the point is very well made that if an institution comes to the department with a proposal for a program, say, to train court reporters at Medicine Hat College when in fact the program that is in place at Red Deer College will more than fulfil the needs for the province for the foreseeable future, it is important to say no and deal with it on that basis. So I certainly appreciate that advice. I will take it to heart, and I hope that sometimes the hon. Leader of the Opposition will support me when I say no.

MR. R. CLARK: It'll be an unaccustomed position, but it is possible.

MR. HORSMAN: With regard to the question of quotas, of course the hon. leader appreciates that it is not the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower that sets the quotas at the institutions; it is the institutions themselves. They do so based on a number of criteria. Obviously the availability of jobs in the particular area is important. The availability of trained staff to teach is important. The real desire on the part

of students to undertake training in that particular area is very important as well, and must be tested.

With regard to how the department approaches this question, I think it's important that we recognize that the shift to block funding from an enrolment-driven formula is of great assistance to the institutions in planning their programming and in allocating the number of spaces available to students.

From my experience in my days at Medicine Hat College, Mr. Chairman, it was so difficult to plan effectively with an enrolment-driven formula. I certainly welcome the block funding principle we've now moved to, which I believe, and the department is convinced as well, is a much fairer, and better way of allocating funds to the institutions, so that they can do their own planning and develop the number of spaces they consider appropriate.

With regard to the specific faculties mentioned, I think it's fair to point out, with regard to the concern for commerce and business administration faculties, that that is a result of the diversification of our economy. We have to move to make available sufficient resources to allow institutions to plan in that area. It's interesting, however, that about four years ago at the University of Alberta the enrolment in the faculty of Business Administration and Commerce was in the neighborhood of 1,800 and, I believe, is now some 250 less than that. So it seems to me there is some room for growth there.

But I don't want to get into the position today in this Assembly, Mr. Chairman, of saying how many positions there should be. I think the universities have the obligation to shift within their offerings the funds necessary for development of growth areas, and if there are areas where there is lack of growth or in fact declining enrolments, to shift some of the allocation of funds in that particular manner. How they do it is up to them.

I want to say something with regard to NAIT and SAIT. I'm glad the hon. leader raised those two institutions, because they are indeed performing an excellent service for the people of this province. I visited both; and there, really, is a situation of dynamic growth not only in program offerings and developments, but indeed in student enrolment. That is not the case at the universities. While there is dynamic growth in program offerings, there has been a decline in student enrolment. That's one reason I'm sure the universities would indeed agree with me that they're mighty happy we've moved from an enrolment-driven formula for funding those institutions. I do feel it is important to underline the very important roles played by NAIT and SAIT, and also the vocational centres, which are providing a very real program of assistance and development, particularly for those who might be classed as underprivileged or underutilized Albertans.

MR. L. CLARK: I would like to make a quick comment. I have always been quite interested in the apprentice program. I've always thought a lot of children, who just simply refuse to go to school, or don't have any interest in the academic part that SAIT, NAIT, and the university put out, benefit a great deal by the apprentice program. I wonder if the minister has any idea of expanding this program with the co-operation of and in conjunction with industry, so it could be made into a real apprentice program.

Anybody who has ever been on a Hutterite colony

has seen what they can do with children who have grade 6 education, spend four or five years in apprenticeship in carpenter and machine shops, and come out skilled workmen second to none. I think we're missing a great deal when we don't have an apprentice program that actually works with industry in this province to train the people we need, and keep them off the street when they're at an age when they won't go to school.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. Member for Drumheller for those comments. I think it's important that all members of the Assembly be familiar with and try to understand what is happening in apprenticeship. An effort is being made under the new Manpower Development Act to provide a vehicle for training in the apprenticeship field. The department hopes it will receive the co-operation of industry in developing, trained apprentices and eventually, through the apprenticeship program, qualified tradesmen.

I must point out that I believe the policy of this government is to ensure that when a person has received, appropriate training and is qualified, he has a ticket recognized certainly throughout Alberta and hopefully Canada. I would like to resist any effort to train people so that, while they may be well qualified, they do not have that recognizable qualification. Therefore I hope industry will co-operate with the thrust of The Manpower Development Act to ensure that an individual who has training and qualifications is able to take those qualifications, and move about to new job opportunities within the province. Given that caveat, I certainly appreciate what the hon. member has said.

I would like to underline what has taken place in the past five years. The number of apprentices being trained at the various institutions in Alberta has more than doubled. I think it is important that all apprentices being trained on the job also have that opportunity to utilize the educational facilities available throughout the province. That is one reason I want to see an expansion of the apprenticeship program, so that courses are offered not just in Edmonton and Calgary but in smaller centres throughout Alberta.

I appreciate the comments, but I hope hon. members will recognize the very rapid growth that has taken place. Also, as I pointed out last Friday, I can't say enough about the department and the manpower division for the fact that growth has doubled in that area with a minimal increase in the number of staff in the department, rising from 145 five years ago to 171 people now dealing in this area. I think it's a remarkable achievement, and I want to applaud those hard-working members of the department for that extra effort they've had to put forward to achieve that result. I hope I've answered the hon. member's concern, and I appreciate him bringing that to my attention.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to cover several areas and raise a couple of questions. First of all, Mr. Minister, one of the department programs that I think has worked very well is the community vocational centres throughout northern Alberta. I don't know how many members of the Legislature have had an opportunity to sit in on some sessions in a community vocational centre, but I did shortly after Christmas. It was in the community of Peavine. One couldn't help

but be struck by the success of a program of academic upgrading which had, I suppose, about 40 people enrolled. The 40 people, Mr. Minister, ranged all the way from young women, perhaps 18 or 19, to people in their 70s who in this particular case were learning all the way from reading and writing to high school matriculation. It was a very impressive program indeed, and has involved a good deal of local input.

One of the points that needs to be made about the CVC program is that we have to have some form of follow-up in these areas from the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, or whatever — perhaps the Department of Economic Development has to work very closely with the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower. Because you can have life skills programs or academic upgrading, but if at the end of the training period we still have no jobs available, you have a group of extremely frustrated people.

Mr. Minister, that leaves me to ask you a question. I believe it was in 1974 the Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray, Dr. Bouvier, moved a resolution in the House. It was one of those rare cases where an opposition resolution was actually passed by the Assembly. The resolution suggested we look at the feasibility of airlifting men who could work on major construction projects in and out of the isolated communities. It was actually passed by this Assembly. It was suggested that it may not be possible to develop jobs in some of these places but if you can make it possible in a fairly reasonable way for these people to get transportation to a major job site, we should try to follow that through. I think that's important, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, especially if we proceed with the three major projects in the northern part of the province.

The second point I'd like to deal with is how the minister sees the present educational institutions in northern Alberta dividing up, if you like responsibility for the type of job skills that will be required should these major projects proceed. That raises the question of apprenticeship that the hon. Member for Drumheller spoke about a moment ago. I know there are agreements between institutions. For example, there is presently an agreement between Grande Prairie Regional College and Fairview College on the issue of who should provide what kind of service in the region. That makes a good deal of sense to me, because I can't think of anything more counterproductive than having colleges compete for the same type of program. The general agreement was that all the apprenticeship courses should be based in Fairview College, and if they're operated in conjunction with Procter & Gamble, Canfor or what have you, they would be supervised by Fairview College. On the other hand, Grande Prairie would be dealing with university transfer courses and that sort of thing.

Without getting into a debate over Grande Prairie versus the central Peace, we now find the chamber of commerce in Grande Prairie saying, but we would like to have apprenticeship courses; not apprenticeship courses, Mr. Minister, that are held in Grande Prairie under the supervision of the Fairview staff, but apprenticeship courses that would break the agreement between the two boards so that Grande Prairie would be getting into apprenticeship programs.

I raise this because I think it's very important that we have co-ordination. It may seem advantageous in the short run we have: a problem with enrolment in one educational institution so maybe we can beef that up a

bit by shifting in a few apprenticeship courses. But I wonder if that really is the efficient way to do it. It seems to me that a demarcation between the functions of colleges in the same region, so that we can have one that is clearly academically oriented and another that is trades oriented, provides the maximum opportunity to have people in the area obtain the skills that will be necessary for them to take advantage of the job opportunities, especially for some of these major projects where apprenticeship training will be so crucial in determining whether or not people get jobs.

I have a couple of other questions dealing with other items that relate to the universities, Mr. Minister. Since these points are all really related to northern institutions I would invite your comments.

MR HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, on behalf of the department, I would like to thank him for his compliments for the CVCs. As the department knows, I don't like acronyms too well, so I try to avoid using them. I've told various people throughout the province that I'll permit two acronyms to be used in the department, NAIT and SAIT, because those are really Alberta words today. That's as far as I'm prepared to go.

There are many of these vocational centres throughout northern Alberta. I would like to indicate two factors with respect to them. First of all there is a great deal of participation, by way of advice from local people, associated with the type of programming that should take place at those institutions. I really think that is where we should be looking first for direction. I believe that has been taking place and has been very effective.

With regard to the other aspect of the programming, programs may be taking shape in the province, such as the proposals at Cold Lake, Al sands, and so on, that local community groups will not necessarily have knowledge of, and the implications of what knowledge they have may not really be that seriously understood. I think we have to work in that area. We have to advise them and perhaps have a better line of communication than we now have, to let them know what is going to be taking place.

I regret to say I'm not familiar with the resolution, referred to by the hon. member, that took place before my arrival in this House. But I do know some experimentation has been taking place with respect to moving people from remote settlements and providing career counselling and job training. Housing and other information are provided to people. I'm not entirely certain about the success of that program, and I trust the hon. member will bear with me while I review it. I think there have been some successes but on the other hand I understand there have been some real concerns as well. In the next period of time, I will review with the department the resolution the hon. member referred to.

On the second question I think the responsibility for determining the acquisition of job skills and where the training is to take place are very important matters of concern. With respect to the specific item mentioned, I share the opinion of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that it would ill behoove this department or government to duplicate services particularly in an area which can be well served by one of the institutions. I'm aware of some of the representations with respect to apprenticeship training made by at least one chamber

of commerce in the Peace River country, and of an equally strong representation made by another chamber of commerce. But the chambers of commerce do not make the decisions with respect to program offerings; the boards of governors at the institutions make decisions and recommendations to government with regard to new program development. And it is the boards of governors I will be meeting with, talking to, and listening to in the next four years.

With respect to the composition of boards of governors, from my observation the people serving in those areas are doing an excellent job. I'm very pleased indeed that we've been able to attract people of the qualifications we have, to offer their services.

But there is another way, of course, to determine what an institution will offer by way of educational services. The department has asked each institution to submit a goal statement, so we know what the institution is planning to do and, working with them in consultation and co-operation with other boards, ensure there isn't duplication of services at considerable expense. Each institution has complied with that request. In addition, the program services division of the department, as well as the administration division, which has something to do with the money allocation, reviews these matters constantly.

By way of example as to what can be done with the manpower division and other departments of government, I refer to the Cold Lake workshop, which took place just a week ago last Saturday in Bonnyville. The hon. Member for Bonnyville attended, and a number of government departments were there to assess training requirements in that area, if the project at Cold Lake goes ahead, and furthermore to receive recommendations as to what institutions would best provide the type of training required. While it is a tentative step, I think we are co-operating very well with other departments such as Economic Development, to assess job opportunities, training needs, and life skills that will be necessary not only to meet the needs of individual Albertans as they seek job upgrading and training, but also to serve the needs of the industries; the construction and operating phases that will flow if those programs proceed. So I think the manpower division, working with other divisions of the department and other departments of government, is taking the right steps with regard to that preparation.

MR. NOTLEY: Following up, Mr. Chairman, there's just one brief comment I'd like to make. I don't want to leave any impression, Mr. Minister, that there's any ambiguity as far as the two boards are concerned, as I understand it. I think the position of the Grande Prairie board and the Fairview board is one of understanding and agreement between the two boards. To my knowledge, both institutions are living within the spirit of that agreement. I commend them for doing it, especially the Grande Prairie board, because they're under pressure from their local chamber of commerce to get into these fields which, quite frankly, wouldn't make a great deal of sense. As a matter of decision between the two boards, they said, you have this share of the pie and we'll have this share of the pie. It seems to me that's the only way you can run these institutions efficiently.

The other comment — and I apologize if I missed this; I was out for a few minutes when the minister made his introductory remarks, Mr. Chairman. I am

interested in the timetable for changes in students' assistance programs in the province.

MR. HORSMAN: I answered that in response to a question from the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman. If there are going to be changes — and we're in the process of working on that at the present time — I hope they would be announced no later than the middle of next month, otherwise their effectiveness would be sadly diminished for anyone planning to enter a university, college, or other institution in the fall session. So I've answered that in some more detail than that.

Before I sit down, I want to add that I hope I didn't leave the impression that there was any conflict between the boards of Fairview and Grande Prairie. As I understand it, there is, has been, and hopefully will continue to be a good spirit of co-operation between those two institutions in the Peace country.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might make some comments and [ask] some questions. I'm a recent graduate of a postsecondary institution, and I appreciate some of the problems and values of the institutions.

I'd like to zero in on the University of Alberta, if I might. That institution has some particular funding problems. The department's response with regard to quota faculties is: we're giving you block funding, and the university has to change its priorities in response to increasing or declining enrolments.

Mr. Chairman, the problem is that that policy doesn't necessarily recognize the tenure contracts at the university. As I understand it, fully 85 per cent of the university's budget goes to salaries, and it's more expensive for the institution to actually fire or dispose of personnel than to let them go by way of attrition. The reason is that there is a clause in the tenure contracts that has some penalties attached to termination. It's actually more expensive for the university to dismiss staff than to wait them out.

In part, this block funding arrangement meets the universities' desire for arm's length independence from government, but it doesn't recognize the particular problems of the institutions when they are trying to change their priorities. So I wonder if I could ask: is it the minister's intent to recognize this particular problem and increase the funding for quota faculties, in particular, Business Administration and Commerce, and Engineering? In Agriculture and Forestry, I recognize they're building a new building. But is it the intention of the department to assist the university in areas that are for the general welfare of the province, given engineering needs in the Alsands and Cold Lake plants, for example? In effect, we're turning jobs to non-Albertans. It is true that the Business Administration faculty has cut back 250 positions, with government approval, in an attempt to raise the standards of education in that faculty. That request was made by the professional associations, for example the chartered accountants institute, to increase standards. That was done with the full knowledge and support of government.

So if the government wants to increase the number of students and maintain the quality of programming, it has to recognize again that it's necessary to increase the amount of money for block funding requested by the university for that kind of support. Is it the government's intent?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might take a moment or two just to run through the method by which we fund. I'll use the University of Alberta as a specific example. In 1978-79, the base operating grant or block made available was just in excess of \$111 million. At the same time, the university had been carrying on a conditional program in mineral engineering, which had not received full, final approval. That type of programming normally takes a minimum of three years' operation before it is put in place.

In ascertaining the funds to be made available to the University of Alberta, the \$315,000 that had formerly been conditional for the mineral engineering program was added. That became the adjusted base grant, bringing the total to \$111,430,000. To that was added the overall increase on the block, which was 8 per cent. The figure of 8 per cent was arrived at by determining, as best could be done as the budgeting process took place, the effects of inflation, the cost of faculty salary increases, and so on. That 8 per cent added \$8.9 million, giving a regular operating grant of \$120,344,000.

In addition, two additional conditional grants have not yet been made part of the permanent operating grant: the extended practicum, almost \$1 million; and the Ukrainian institute, just under \$400,000. When added to the previous base plus increment, those conditional grants brought the total operating grants for the University of Alberta to \$121,676,000.

New programs will be added through approval on the conditional basis. While the formula is not perfect and results in some difficulties for me to understand when I see them strung out with X plus Y and all this stuff, I think it can be fairly said that in order to acquire program approval the universities must work through this system. However, within that 8 per cent I think a fair degree of flexibility is allowed to the universities and other institutions.

With regard to the particular program, I don't want to stand in this Assembly — and I don't think any of us really should be doing that, Mr. Chairman — and indicate what the universities' priorities should be. I think that would clearly be a violation of the autonomy of the institutions. Therefore I am very reluctant to have it appear — and if I did make it appear so, I want to correct that — that I believe the universities must change their priorities. I think that was the term used by the hon. member. I think they must make those decisions themselves. It's not at the direction of the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower and the government that it must do this or move in that direction. There has to be consultation, and I hope there will continue to be consultation.

We are of course always assessing what programming changes will be made and what extra funding may be required for those programming changes. It is quite true that the University of Alberta is making requests for changes with respect to funding levels, particularly with regard to Business Administration and Commerce. It is also quite true they have made requests for capital funding in that area. The department, through the budgeting process, has not seen fit at this stage to agree to those additional requests. Consultation will continue, and I look forward to that. But I'm not going to stand here today and say the program will be approved. A good deal more consultation will have to take place before that happens, if it ever does.

The hon. member touched on a very important question, the matter of staff tenure at universities and colleges. I must point out, so it's very clear, that the government, the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, does not grant tenure. That is a decision of the boards of governors in their negotiations with their faculty associations. As boards of governors, they of course must assume the responsibility for what develops as a result of those negotiations. I think it is most important to underline that fact for hon. members in this Assembly. That area is a subject of considerable debate. But I would suggest that the question of tenure is really not primarily a matter for debate in this Assembly, but rather at the level of boards of governors, unless someone would be so brave as to suggest we might legislate in that field. I would have to be dragged kicking and screaming into such legislation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very well. We'll proceed to Vote 1.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, if I could just ask a supplementary question on tenure and block funding. It's my impression — I'd appreciate the minister's response, and correct me if I'm wrong — that the department reviews the university's request for funding line by line and comes out with a sum total, the block fund, and that tenure is a contract between the university's board of governors and the professor. I don't think anyone here is suggesting that the university sign a contract or tear it up.

But that's part and parcel of the university's budget. It's impossible for the university to fire those people without facing some very severe financial costs. Implicit in that is a recognition by the government, by the department, that tenure of staff shapes the budget and sets the priorities. Unless the department wishes to step in and change those contracts — as you suggest you are unwilling to do, and I agree with you — in order to change the priorities for the institution and put more funding into a program desirable for the province, like business administration, commerce, and engineering ... It's too easy just to say, we give you a block of money, and you do with it as you please. Implicit in it is a recognition that there is a status quo and a problem there. You have to add money to the pot to get more programs in faculties that don't have funding.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I want to correct the impression — I don't know how the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry might have received it — that the department reviews institutional budgets line by line. They do not. What is done on a block funding base is that a decision is arrived at as to the additional amount that will be granted, in addition to adding previously conditional programs to the permanent base.

Where there is some degree of line by line — if I can use that term — discussion with institutions is in the development of new programming. For example, if the University of Alberta came forward and said to the department that they wished to have a program — let us use as an example mineral engineering, when it was made conditional — there would then be discussion as to the level of funding that would be required for the conditional portion of that program. Some representations have been made to me that there is too

much line by line examination at that stage. But that is generally where there are discussions as to whether that level of funding is really necessary to serve the number of pupils proposed to be served, et cetera. But once the conditional program moves into the block, there is no further line by line examination. If it were to take place, we would not be able to maintain the number of man-years available to the department. It just would not be done. In that respect there is no increase in man-years for general operation of the department. The increase does come in areas serving apprenticeship programs, as I indicated earlier. I want to correct that impression.

To deal with this question, Mr. Chairman, I believe we are operating in a proper, effective, fair, and reasonable manner to provide operating funds to institutions in this province. Granted, they may have to live with some problems, and they are living with them and coping with them very well. But as I indicated to the University of Alberta, when the total budget is in excess of \$130 million for one fiscal year and there is a difference in amounts of \$280,000, given the fact that most institutions normally have some operating surplus from previous years, and that while most institutions don't necessarily budget for a surplus, somehow they end up achieving it, I think the amount involved is not really sufficient to require special funding over the block amount already provided for in the budget for the current fiscal year.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, if I could just ask a final question. I'm puzzled. I'm curious. How would the department, if it recognized a need for additional accommodation for students in Business Administration and Commerce or Engineering, if that's a desirable end, approach the university and say: gentlemen, ladies, we'd like to assist you? We have to recognize that the tenure position of the university right now is such that it cannot simply change historians into commerce professors, or home economics professors into engineering professors. It's not practical or possible. Given that, and given the other factor, that I would think we would like to assist young Albertans in getting desirable jobs that are available to them but are now being turned over to Ontarians and other people from outside the province, how do we approach the problem and assist the university in fulfilling its mandate?

MR. HORSMAN: I've tried to answer basically as to the method of new programming developments that take place. It has to be done in consultation with the program services and administrative services divisions in terms of being able to make moneys available, if in fact it appears that there is that need.

If there were not sufficient funds in the overall budget and in the new program development budget, of course the next step would be to go to the cabinet for a special warrant and ask for that additional funding. That route would be followed in the event that a case can be made for additional funding. Whether or not that will happen is hypothetical and conjectural at the moment.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Chairman, at the moment I'd like to move from the topic we've just been discussing and refer to the area of immigration. I wonder if perhaps the hon. minister might give us a bit of

information with respect to the negotiations that had gone on in the past between the provincial and federal governments in the area of immigration, the kind of manpower needs that are being perhaps encouraged to immigrate to this country and into the province, where there is in fact availability of employment on a significantly long term. How are the quotas — perhaps "quota" isn't the term to be used — but how are immigrants allocated into the various areas of the country? Does the province have to undertake a certain percentage of those coming to the country? Where the immigration factor does not include the skilled worker factor, has a formula been reached for support of such citizens who come into the various provinces? Of course we're dealing with the province of Alberta at this time.

Perhaps the hon. minister might cover that area to begin with. I may have some further questions.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, the subject of migration into Canada is a very difficult question in some ways, because it involves a joint sharing of responsibilities by the federal and provincial governments. It is my understanding that while there is some provision for consultation in the new federal legislation, a good deal of evidence suggests that provincial influence will only be effective with a formal agreement. At the present time no formal agreement has been arrived at. From my review of the material available to me in the department, there has been a great deal of consultation with the federal government by my predecessor and other ministers sharing this type of responsibility. I think it's also true to say that the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs has taken a very real interest in what is happening in this particular area.

Of course there has been a change of government at the federal level, and at this stage I'm not certain what that will result in. I think it's fair to say that negotiations will continue, and I look forward to meeting and discussing this matter with the new federal minister at the earliest opportunity.

The subject of migration to Alberta is difficult. Once a person has been admitted to Canada as an immigrant, there is nothing to prevent a flow of people between provinces, depending on whatever their skills may be. There are other concerns related to immigration, such as the question of refugees and how that is being handled at the present time, which the hon. member may wish to ask questions on. At the present time a committee is working on this problem. I think the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs is in the process of working on principles, and we hope that that may lead to a draft agreement proposal for subsequent negotiation with the federal and other provincial governments.

I don't know whether that answers the question raised by the hon. member, but I do believe we will have to adopt a certain amount of "wait and see", if I may say so, as to what happens with the new federal government's policy in this regard.

I think one other area the hon. member touched upon related to the question of skilled manpower coming to Alberta. As I indicated in my remarks the other day, of the 8,000 apprenticeship certificates presented by the department this past year, 3,400 were graduates from Alberta institutes; the other represented people coming into Alberta and obtaining recognition of their certification from outside the province. So

I think that is at least a measure of what is happening with regard to migration to Alberta from other provinces. There is considerable movement of skilled personnel into Alberta and we, through the manpower division and the trades certification branch, are recognizing their qualifications from outside the province.

When an unskilled person comes to Alberta, of course a number of training methods can be utilized. Our vocational centres, at the four locations throughout the province I have mentioned earlier, are handling a number of these individuals through a number of academic upgrading courses. These academic upgrading courses are also available at public colleges, and in a large measure as well are available through the Department of Education and the various school boards in Alberta. So there are a number of ways by which individuals who come to Alberta without skills can upgrade their level of education and obtain skills.

I think it's also important to note that we have in place a number of career counselling offices through the department, which will assist new arrivals in Alberta in obtaining information with regard to the training facilities available in the various institutions in the province. These are now decentralized to several centres, and also are available of course in a number of locations in the major metropolitan areas. So in that way I think we are moving towards providing information as to how people can upgrade their skills and obtain certification in the various trades and other educational requirements they may need.

I hope that has answered some of the questions of the hon. member.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of additional questions. One is on a matter the hon. minister made reference to resulting from my question, and that's with regard to refugees. I wonder if the minister could advise how the matter of support participation has been resolved between the federal and provincial governments with regard to education, health care services, housing, covering the refugees who have come to Alberta.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, the subject of refugees, of course, has received a good deal of attention in the past few years, and rightly so. I think it's important that members of this Assembly understand that Alberta has been in the forefront in providing services to refugees. If I could just cite some information, keeping in mind that Alberta's population is roughly 8 per cent of that of Canada: in 1975, Alberta received 15 per cent of the total refugees who came to Canada; in 1976, 14.3 per cent; in 1977, 15.3 per cent; and until the end of July 1978, 14.2 per cent. Interestingly enough, Mr. Chairman, and for the information of hon. members, during the first seven months of 1978, Alberta accepted 25.4 per cent of all the small-boat refugees admitted to Canada. When other provinces began to participate in the program, Alberta's proportion at the end of last year was 15.6 per cent from that particular movement. I think that has been largely ignored in some of the comments made on that subject. In addition it's useful to note that during 1977, Alberta accepted 38.7 per cent of the Chilean refugees admitted to Canada. Those figures continue to be emphasized, and should be. Any suggestion that Alberta has been less than diligent in its attention to this matter of international, national, and provincial con-

cern is completely unfounded.

With regard to the specific question of the level of co-operation between the federal and provincial governments, I think it is important to emphasize that there has been, and hopefully will continue to be, a splendid level of co-operation by the two levels of government. Through the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission, the federal government has provided a broad range of services to assist in resettling refugees. Those include reception services, which simply means meeting refugees at the point of destination and informing them of the services available; employment services, which include placing refugees in jobs and ensuring that programs to support placement are made available; emergency financial assistance; emergency medical assistance; language training; other occupational training; and considerable aid to voluntary agencies. I want to emphasize that voluntary agencies are performing a very vital service as we welcome these refugees to our shores. The federal government also provides transportation loans.

Services available from the provincial government: a refugee, like any other immigrant, is entitled to the full range of provincial services immediately upon arrival. These include hospital and medical care. They're eligible to receive social assistance once they have been placed in employment of a continuing nature or have resided in Canada for one year, whichever is the lesser period of time. The province also offers several specific services to aid in the settlement of newcomers. These include, particularly, language training. Programs in English as a second language are offered by a number of postsecondary institutions in the province. Funds, which are cost shared with the federal government, are provided to continuing education groups for adult English as a second language program.

In addition, in the past fiscal year the department made \$40,000 available to voluntary agencies in the province to assist these immigration settlement service agencies. Also, sponsorship groups are now making assistance available to refugees. We are presently examining an additional range of services which could be developed to assist in the settlement of newcomers. We're all aware of what is taking place, and I have suggested to the hon. federal minister that we will assist as best we can in full co-operation. But I do want to emphasize that in terms of our population as it applies to the rest of Canada, Alberta has been accepting almost double the number of refugees that our population might indicate would be the appropriate number. And I don't suggest for a moment that we tie ourselves to any formula in that regard. I think we will continue to work with federal authorities in meeting refugees as they arrive, advising them what services are available, and continuing in the spirit that has been demonstrated by the government of Alberta of compassion and due attention to the needs of refugees coming to this province.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Chairman, I would like clarification on one point the hon. minister commented on. Is there a consistent aid participating policy between the federal and provincial governments, or is this done on an *ad hoc* basis for each new wave or group of refugees that may arrive in the country? And did I understand the minister to say it is his preference that a formula not be applied insofar as this assistance is concerned? Or did he indicate he would prefer that the

level of sharing or participating be determined as each group arrives?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I believe my position is accurate, that there is an agreed formula for cost sharing between the two levels of government.

As to the level of immigration to Alberta, I believe that matter should be discussed between the levels of government, but that there should be no fixed formula. I believe it should be based upon a number of factors, including the expressed desire of the refugees as to which part of the country they might wish to settle in. Therefore I think it would be inappropriate to establish a formula based on Alberta's percentage or proportion of the total population of Canada. I emphasize the fact, however, that in that regard we are and have been taking into Alberta, and working effectively with the federal government, almost double the percentage our population forms of the country as a whole.

MRS. CHICHAK: One more question in another area, Mr. Chairman; that is, with respect to the education or training of the handicapped. If my understanding is accurate, currently the physically or mentally handicapped generally remain in the training institution until the age of 16 or 18. I think it is 18; I'm not sure. Then very often they will not continue in that particular institution, perhaps because they feel that no further assistance or learning takes places beyond a certain point.

A difficulty some of the young people find themselves in is that they really are not able to find employment outside the training centre, and there really doesn't appear to be a program available to place them in some sort of setting. I wonder if the hon. minister has had representation with regard to this problem, and if he has had the opportunity to do some thinking on it and consider some directions in that regard.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, those particular types of training institutions really do not fall within the department for which I have responsibility. Where my responsibility is very current is with respect to training people to work with multihandicapped Albertans. Therefore I think those questions might very well be appropriately reviewed with the hon. Minister of Education or the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health during their estimates.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could just add a couple of comments, more than anything else, on this question of the refugees and the boat people in particular. Using statistics, the minister pointed out that we had accepted a larger number than our share of the population. That's correct.

However, before we get carried away patting ourselves on the back — and I hope we aren't doing that — I think we have to put this in context, Mr. Minister and members of the Assembly. One has to look at it not from the vantage point of the percentage of population in Alberta, but I think probably a better way of reviewing our capacity to absorb refugees is to judge by the number of jobs created and the investment. If I look at the budget this year, our share of the investment is 18.4 per cent. I note that our share of the jobs created is about 15 per cent, 47,000 of 320,000 jobs. So one could look at the figures last year and it would

appear that our share of the refugees was approximately equal to our share of the jobs generated in the country. While that is worth while, at the same time I don't think it makes us appear unduly generous. Far from it.

Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I rise in my place because it seems to me that as opposed to dragging up what happened in past years, we're facing a rather more serious situation. Over the weekend Malaysia decided it is not going to take the boat people, and we're looking not at just a few hundred people or even a few thousand but literally tens and tens of thousands of refugees. Mr. Minister, I would be interested specifically in what discussions you see as appropriate with your counterparts in other provinces and the federal government, to examine what Canada should be doing on a much larger basis than we've ever had to face before.

To put this into context, many refugees from Vietnam have skills and abilities, but not as high a percentage as was the case with Czechoslovakia in 1968, Hungary in 1956, or when people fled Chile in 1974, '75, and '76. Most of the people who have come to this country are highly educated, with university degrees or technical training, so they can be fit much more easily into the Canadian economy. I think we not only have a moral problem of some magnitude here, but the difficulties in working out at the provincial level a nuts-and-bolts approach to finding jobs on a much larger scale, I suspect, than anything we've had to look at before.

I make the point to the minister, Mr. Chairman, that I think we as a country have an obligation to participate with other countries of the world in trying to provide some kind of home for these people who are now just drifting offshore from Malaysia. It's going to be a very serious problem, and one that strikes me is going to require an urgency that I hope normal federal/provincial negotiations will not allow to be dragged on. I think we're going to have to move much more quickly.

MR. HORSMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all, I agree with the latter part of his remarks with respect to the urgency of the matter. I have indicated as well that my contact with the minister at the federal level will be that Alberta will continue its full co-operation with whatever program is decided upon.

But with respect to the earlier part of his comments, I wasn't suggesting to the members of this Assembly that we were patting ourselves on the back. I was trying to dispel anybody's misplaced apprehensions that Alberta had done anything less than its full share in terms of accepting unfortunate people to this province. Mr. Chairman, in that respect I wish to emphasize that we have done our fair share and that we will continue to do our fair share in dealing with these very unfortunate people, individuals like you and I, Mr. Chairman, who have been severely misplaced as a result of very unfortunate circumstances.

In that respect, I want to underline once again that this province and the people in it feel very strongly that we should do our fair share, in co-operation with the other provinces and the federal government in our Confederation, as we deal with what is going to be a very serious problem for those individuals. We will do our fair share.

Agreed to:

1.01 — Minister's Office	\$143,100
1.02 — Minister's Committees	\$184,343
1.03 — General Administration	\$4,991,997
1.04 — Planning and Research	\$419,560

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we vote on the total, I'd point out that the total figure also includes the capital vote, which is noted below.

Agreed to:

Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services \$5,739,000

2.1 — Program Support	\$14,867,983
2.2 — Provincially Administered Institutions	\$72,741,565
2.3 — Public Colleges — Operating	\$50,709,600
2.4 — Private Colleges	\$1,686,000
2.5 — Universities — Operating	\$209,393,000
2.6 — Public Colleges — Capital	\$14,126,400
2.7 — Universities — Capital	\$51,311,000
Total Vote 2 — Assistance to Higher and Further Educational Institutions	\$414,835,548

3.1 — Manpower Development	\$14,477,475
3.2 — Training Assistance	\$8,301,307
Total Vote 3 — Manpower Development and Training Assistance	\$22,778,782

Total Vote 4 — Financial Assistance to Students \$11,902,751

Department Total \$455,256,081

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move the votes be reported.

[Motion carried]

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolution, reports as follows, and requests leave to sit again.

Resolved that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1980, amounts not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower: \$5,739,000 for department support services, \$414,835,548 for assistance to higher and further educational institutions, \$22,778,782 for manpower development and training assistance, and \$11,902,751 for financial assistance to students.

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

HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, just before calling it 5:30, I should inform the House that this evening, it's proposed to begin with second reading of some Bills

on the Order Paper. Those would be the ones shown on today's Order Paper as being ready for second reading except Bills 3, 24, 25, 27, and 28. If there is additional time this evening, the House would resolve into Committee of Supply.

I move we call it 5:30.

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

HON MEMBERS: Agreed

[The House recessed at 5:25 p.m. and resumed at 8 p.m.]

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

Bill 6 **The Fuel Oil Administration** **Amendment Act, 1979**

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 6, The Fuel Oil Administration Amendment Act, 1979.

This Bill is very important for air lines in Alberta, particularly commuter air lines. At the moment there is a 3-cent tax on aviation fuel in Alberta, and it produces about \$3 million to the government of Alberta. Certainly, with the very active commuter air lines in Alberta. For example, Time Air's fuel bill last year was about \$100,000. So in no small way this is very significant to the third-level carriers in the province. The savings are 'guesstimated' to be in the area of \$300,000.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that's particularly significant for the air lines of Alberta, in accordance with policy enunciated by the previous and by the present Minister of Transportation, who recognizes that third-level carriers, commuter air lines, have a very important role to play in the province of Alberta. All things being well and if this Bill passes, the intention is that these savings would pass on to the air lines in Alberta after July 1.

Mr. Speaker, I think I should point out that in the four western provinces, the present aviation fuel tax is 5 cents in Manitoba, 6 cents in Saskatchewan, 3 cents in Alberta, and 5 cents in British Columbia. I think this is in concert with the budget speech a week ago Friday. This is another way the government of Alberta feels it would be in order to allow yet another so-called small business in the province to reap some of the benefits of the wealth in Alberta.

I think it's particularly important, Mr. Speaker, that it's applicable only to aircraft in Alberta under 34,000 kilograms, that is, about 75,000 pounds. So it would exclude the airbuses of Pacific Western Airlines, the 737s. They wouldn't be in a position to take advantage of this, which I think is probably very appropriate in recognizing the competitive edge that small air lines have to have in competing with regional air carriers such as Pacific Western.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's an extremely timely piece of legislation, with Pacific Western Airlines wanting to stay in the black and produce that bottom line. They

are certainly carrying out their management objective of running the air line at a profit. In a very real way, it tends to affect air lines such as Time Air of Lethbridge, which has 135 employees and is a very meaningful small business in the province. I would hope that in some small way the passage of Bill 6, removing that 3 cents per gallon tax, will do much to alleviate the fears of the small air lines competing in Alberta. So I would urge all members to support Bill 6, The Fuel Oil Administration Amendment Act, 1979.

Thanks very much.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few comments on Bill No. 6, I believe the hon. Member for Lethbridge West couldn't have been more correct when he used the term "in some small way", because that certainly describes the impact of this Bill. As I understand it, we're looking at a total amount of assistance of \$300,000. But in my checking with the carriers in the province, in the case of Time that's going to be about \$36,000 over the year or \$3,000 a month. No air line is going to look a very modest gift horse in the mouth; nevertheless, I think it is correct that it is a very modest gift horse.

I would say to members of the Legislature that in my view a couple of things might really be more useful and important. When the hon. member introduced the Bill, we were talking of course about this proposal of the 3-cent tax. But it was my understanding last fall, as a result of the question period, that the government of Alberta was developing an overall policy that would provide additional incentives to the smaller commuter air lines in the province. I understand at this stage that the managements of the air lines are still waiting for those discussions to take place. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we have more in mind than simply the elimination of the 3-cent tax.

Suggestions have been made that range all the way from the provision of navigational equipment — that certainly would be helpful to Gateway, for example, on its run to Hinton, Jasper, and then to Vancouver. At the present time Gateway is providing the navigational aids for its service in that particular community and airport. The suggestion has also been made by the Minister of Economic Development on several occasions that we should guarantee a certain number of seats on various runs. Again that has been met with some questioning, I guess would be the best way of putting it, on the part of the air lines' managements.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if we really want to please the officials of Time Air and Gateway in this province, we would say very bluntly to the management of PWA: you're a regional carrier, we want to see you take on CP and Air Canada and make PWA beyond any doubt an absolutely top regional carrier. But I really wonder why it's necessary for us to try to move in on the run to Cold Lake. I really question how valuable it is to go into Lethbridge. The impact on Time Air of that kind of decision, should the Transport Commission grant it, can only be negative.

So what we have in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is a very modest *quid pro quo*; the *quid* is very, very small compared to the *pro quo*. I think the regional carriers, the smaller carriers in this province, would be much more enthusiastic if the hon. Member for Lethbridge West rose in his place to tell us that the government had decided that PWA would be correctly adjusting its ambitions to some of the larger horizons — in particu-

lar the run to Whitehorse, with the possibility of the Alcan pipeline proceeding — taking on Air Canada and CP where that's appropriate, but leaving the commuter air line business to two air line firms which in my view have been doing a very good job, and at this stage are hardly in a position to meet the competition of jet service for a long time. A long time may be only three or four years, but it's three or four years of taking off the profits that make it possible for a line like Gateway to stay in business.

It's no secret, Mr. Speaker, that a large part of the financial success of Time Air is the Lethbridge to Calgary run. I have some very serious doubts about whether this \$3,000 a month is going to make up the shortfall for that particular air line.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Lethbridge West conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the comments of the Member for Spirit River-Fairview relative to Time Air. He mentions a \$3,000 a month saving to Time Air which, depending on how you look at it, could be a 300 per cent saving, I guess, from 3 cents to zero. My information tells me the savings could be from \$75,000 to \$100,000 a year. But I don't want to make that comment here. I'm sure it will come out.

I'm not at liberty to comment on government policy regarding the government's buying seats on dead-heading aircraft, block seating or, indeed, Pacific Western Airlines seeking new routes. Obviously, some of that is a decision of members of Executive Council. However, I think the Member for Spirit River-Fairview should be aware that the 50,000 citizens of Lethbridge are represented in a very responsible way, I suggest, by ...

MR. R. SPEAKER: By whom?

MR. GOGO: ... their elected body, the Lethbridge city council. You may choose to believe they don't represent anybody.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Why don't you speak up?

MR. GOGO: But I suggest that people who are very avid clippers of newspapers read what they say. The Member for Spirit River-Fairview may disagree in substance with the fact that the Lethbridge Chamber of Commerce — certainly the official opposition doesn't; they endorse everything chambers' of commerce say. What do they say with regard to Pacific Western serving the people? I'd like to hear that comment.

MR. R. SPEAKER: What do you say? MR. GOGO: In closing, Mr. Speaker, I think we should be cognizant that ... And if I used the words "in some minor way". I would apologize. I think it's a significant way for Time Air, Gateway, Eldorado, and Wapiti.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Where do you stand?

MR. GOGO: Henceforth, they don't have to pay this 3 cents a gallon. I think it's a very positive move, Mr. Speaker.

I move second reading of this Bill, and I would urge hon. members to support it.

[Motion carried; Bill 6 read a second time]

Bill 11
The Alberta Income Tax
Amendment Act, 1979

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 11, The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1979.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, contains three significant initiatives. First, it puts about \$38 million in the pockets of over a quarter-million of our lowest income taxpayers. Secondly, it will boost renter assistance credit by approximately \$3 million. In doing that, it zeroes in on helping those most in need. Thirdly, it leaves about an extra \$40 million with the more than 17,000 small and growing Alberta businesses which provide the jobs and are the engine of our economy. In those three ways this Bill provides major new initiatives to keep the province moving ahead.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in responding to second reading, it's our intention to support the Bill. But frankly, let me say that we don't think the Bill goes as far as we'd like it to. When you combine the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and the general revenue surplus for the province, at the end of this year the provincial government is going to have over \$8.6 billion accumulated. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, we could have gone far, far further in the direction of income-tax initiatives. My colleagues and I would like to have seen us move in the direction of not paying provincial income tax on the first \$16,000 that Albertans have as taxable income. We don't think this initiative moves far enough in this direction.

As I say, we plan to support the bill. We think it's a small step in the right direction. The other comment I would make before I conclude my remarks is that while the \$40 million the Provincial Treasurer uses as a figure of assistance for small business in Alberta will obviously be helpful to small business, let all members in the House remember that a tremendous number of small businesses in this province don't get to the point where they ever pay income tax. That's the reason we see the large number of small business failures.

I'm not suggesting that the rate of mortality, if I might use it that way, is a great deal higher in Alberta than in other provinces. I believe we're among the highest. But possibly on the longer term, the government could be looking at something to help as far as venture capital is concerned. There are pros and cons to that kind of initiative. But obviously the government should be looking at something in addition to the Alberta Opportunity Company.

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to be able to speak on second reading of Bill 11. As the hon. minister pointed out, the Bill has a really good balance. It provides \$38 million for the low-income taxpayer, \$3 million for rent subsidy, and \$40 million to private business. So approximately \$41 million is going to the low-income earner and \$40 million to small business. The other similarity between the two groups is that they both struggle, and as such I think it's well worthwhile supporting this group.

I might point out from past statistics, if my memory serves me correctly, approximately 90 out every 100 businesses that commence are out of business five years from the date they started. So only 10 businesses succeed, and only some of these have outstanding success. We can see those that have in Alberta today.

The need for start-up capital and for working capital as a firm expands has increased significantly. Just to clarify, the tax reduction affects small, incorporated businesses. "Small" is defined as a company earning \$150,000 taxable income — while the rate applies to that if they earn more, the reduction doesn't — and it has to have earned less than \$750,000 eligible taxable income since 1971. So they're actually reasonably small businesses.

The maximum benefit to a company is \$9,000, a very significant reduction. As a matter of fact it constitutes a 25 per cent tax reduction for a small business. I agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition that by its very nature this particular kind of tax measure cannot help the companies that don't earn taxable income. I'm sure this government is looking into ways to solve that problem over the next four years.

I might mention that this program could not and is not particularly designed to help the unincorporated business. However, it should be recognized and emphasized that this measure could be of significant benefit to the farming community. In the event the farmer incorporates and at present earns taxable income, it will significantly reduce his tax rates.

The other measure I should mention is that although it's designed to benefit the small businessman directly, the eventual benefit is intended to be much larger. The purpose is part of an industrial strategy to encourage small business or free enterprise without directing various sectors to grow; in other words, no direct government interference in promoting the health of private industry. I think that's the way it should be.

The growth of small business is essential if over the long run we are to diversify and have a solid base of employment for future generations. To that extent, the idea is to maintain high levels of employment, and I think this will go a long way in doing so. Mr. Speaker, I recommend support for this Bill.

Thank you.

MR. PAHL: In speaking in support of Bill No. 11, Mr. Speaker, with reference to a reduced personal income tax rate for lower income taxpayers, I should like to place this initiative in a fuller context. It's my view that it's a measure, first, of our extremely good fortune and, second, of the good management of our government and the fidelity to our principles, that in reducing the tax burden on our lower income earners we're not shifting that burden to the all-too-often victimized average taxpayer.

In addition, the government's continued resistance to provincial sales tax is a progressive taxation measure in the fullest sense: A retail sales tax and the recently eliminated gasoline tax are termed regressive in that their application to the necessities of life means they will take a very much larger proportion of the lower income earner's budget than that of a higher income earner. Thus these are what might be termed — and I agree — highly progressive initiatives and will remove some 114,000 citizens from the Alberta income tax rolls. Approximately 30 per cent of the 1

million labor force in Alberta will benefit from this measure.

Perhaps greater than proportional benefits will be enjoyed in Mill Woods because of the extremely high participation rate in the Alberta labor force in my constituency. I'm going to have some pleased people. In my view, this measure should also encourage people at the margin of the labor force to participate in the labor force, because their earnings will be diminished less by income tax.

In the course of growth in Edmonton Mill Woods, which enjoyed or perhaps suffered a population increase in the order of 180 per cent over the five years from 1972 to 1977, a wide variety of housing accommodation was necessarily provided. It has resulted in a split of about 50 per cent single-family dwellings and 50 per cent multifamily housing units. From that, it is estimated that approximately one-third of the households in Edmonton Mill Woods rent their homes.

The provision in The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1979, for an enrichment to the Alberta renters' assistance tax credit will be welcomed by citizens not owning their homes. As with personal income tax rate reductions, I'm pleased to see that this measure will focus on the lower income earners, and thus presents further application of the progressive nature of the tax.

I have spoken before on the reduction of corporate income tax. As a small-business owner who has been incorporated since 1971 — and, according to that definition, perhaps not successful but a survivor none the less — I welcome this initiative. For those of you who appreciate the nature of the small business — and I'm sure a lot of you are in that category — you don't look around after your year end and say, hey, I made this much money. What you do is carry on with your forward commitments. In six months when your accountant comes back to you and says, this is how much you made and this is how much tax you have to pay, then you scramble around and find out how you can 'decommit' money you've committed to your future growth and survival.

So I think we have to look positively at it. In this measure to improve the climate for small businesses, we must not remove that very important opportunity for businesses to fail. If we overdo it and try to reach too far into those areas, to where they're not earning income, we then wind up subsidizing perhaps mediocrity or even failure.

So we have to look very positively at the corporation tax rate reduction from 11 per cent to 5 per cent on small businesses, because that's going to mean that about 17,000 businesses in Alberta are going to have an injection of something like \$40 million. I for one am very pleased with that and would urge you all to support Bill No. 11.

Thank you.

MRS. EMBURY: I'd also like to add my support to Bill 11. In doing so, I'd like to narrow in on the reduction of the corporate income tax from 11 per cent to 5 per cent and to indicate to you how it will benefit some of my constituents in Calgary North West.

It is most gratifying to speak to many of my constituents and hear them say how pleased they are that the Alberta government is stimulating the economy by this direct assistance to small businesses. Contrary to some comments made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, there are many, many people and young busi-

ness people in my area who are very, very grateful for this.

There is a new jewellery business in my constituency which is owned by a young goldsmith. His wife works with him in the store. They find it very difficult to keep pace because they are in a competitive area where large corporations dominate the market. My constituent tells me there are three jewellers in one shopping centre, all with different names yet owned by one corporation. The rents in new shopping malls are very high, along with staff wages and corporate taxes. Therefore, the merchant raises the price of his goods to the point where they are no longer competitive. So the benefits of this tax reduction to him will be that they can pour more money back into their new, expanding business.

A middle-aged businessman in my constituency undertook a new endeavor over a year and a half ago. The benefit of this tax reduction to him is twofold. At the present time his business is 50 per cent ahead of last year, and there is an expanding market and a heavy demand for his product. This will allow him the capital to continue to expand by buying the much-needed additional equipment to meet the needs of the market. He also sees that it creates a chain reaction in business. If he is able to employ more people, people who have some technical expertise, this obviously creates jobs in somebody else's business. So the market keeps expanding.

A very young couple from Ontario have started a picture-framing business in a new shopping centre in my constituency. The timing of this new legislation is advantageous to them, as it gives this new business an added advantage in just starting out. Specifically, it would assist this couple in the following ways, by increasing the advertising budget to help promote more business; by expanding the business, either by increasing or diversifying their inventory, or hopefully opening up more stores in the city; by hiring more employees so they can take on more commercial work; by beginning a new and related enterprise, such as an art gallery; and by passing on the saving to their customers, thereby becoming more competitive with the large chain stores in this business.

Lastly, an oil and gas service company incorporated in 1976 employs 40 employees with a gross pay roll of just under \$700,000. The company's gross revenue is approximately \$2 million; the hard assets are \$700,000. The benefits to this company will be \$9,000 this year and next year. The small business corporate tax reduction is beneficial to this start-up operation where cash flow is always a problem, particularly where large investments are needed for capital assets. For this business, long-term financing is almost non-existent. So this reduction is important, as it allows a Canadian company to compete with the same quality expertise available as other corporations in the oil service industry which take large sums of money and their investment back to the United States.

These are but a few examples of how many of my constituents in Calgary North West feel this will benefit directly and contribute to the growing economy of Alberta.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise and support Bill No. 11. It's a very solid contribution to a very favorable tax climate for small business.

I'd like to speak for a moment on the importance of small business to the Alberta economy. I might just

note that for the past few years I worked in a business that would certainly qualify under this heading. It had a very small income, was very labor-intensive, and was Alberta based. I think those are some of the virtues of small business in Alberta. By and large, they are native Albertans who have a tremendous sense of loyalty to their community that is in marked contrast to multinational or large firms, which can change their priorities in business development from jurisdiction to jurisdiction without any real consideration of the effect on a local area.

Particularly it's going to help small service industries in Alberta, and I think we're on the threshold of some pretty exciting developments. As Albertans start gearing up to take advantage of and participate in these exciting new developments, this kind of assistance — a \$9,000 credit, if you like, or reduction in their taxes payable — will be of enormous assistance as they try to develop their capital and lines of credit.

May I also talk, Mr. Speaker, about a couple of other things of interest to me. The Alberta economy is probably one of the most dynamic and interesting, not just to Canadians but to people in North America. I cite some key economic indicators developed by the U.S. embassy in Canada. In September 1978, providing information to American entrepreneurs to take advantage of market opportunities worldwide, their comments on the Alberta economy are: the market growth is strong, best economic prospects are in oil and gas equipment and supplies — all these remarks apply to Alberta companies as well to try to take advantage of these opportunities — there's opportunity for specialized financial services, construction materials, heavy transportation vehicles, earth-moving equipment, and equipment for the chemical industry, especially control instrumentation. That's the United States State Department telling their people that Alberta is the place to go if they want to take advantage of a pretty exciting market in Canada. In fact, they note in their stats that Alberta is the most exciting part of the country.

In another, more recent bulletin sent out to offices throughout the United States, they note that there are just tremendous opportunities for U.S. exporters in oil and gas well and earth-moving equipment. All these sources of economic activity, Mr. Speaker, are areas where small business is active: small contractors, small earth-moving companies, people gearing up for an Al sands plant, a Cold Lake plant. This kind of assistance is going to be of tremendous support.

If I could finally note, this is also going to be very important for our manufacturing industry. I go back to the comments by the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud. You should think of this, Mr. Speaker, as part of a much larger economic strategy the government of Alberta has developed and is developing. It's an exciting development.

In a recent review, Statistics Canada noted that Alberta has had a pause in development. But it's interesting to note that over the period of 1970-71, in about a dozen headings of economic activity, Alberta has shown an average annual growth rate in furniture manufacturing shipments, for example, of 20.6. That's exports outside this province. We've increased our paper manufacturing economy by 25.7. A lot of these items are small businesses: small furniture manufacturers, Mr. Speaker. Metal fabricating and machining has enjoyed a 19.3 per cent annual growth rate over the last

seven years — the years that the Progressive Conservative administration has been in power.

If I can just sum up by saying that at a time when the economy is rapidly expanding, when there's lots of opportunity, it's most important that we equip our small entrepreneurs — who have a strong sense of loyalty and identity with this community, who are going to provide jobs because their businesses tend to be labor-intensive — to be competitive with a lot of people who are looking at this province and this economy as about the only bright spot in the Canadian economy.

So I salute the Provincial Treasurer and congratulate the administration. It's a fine step, in keeping with a fine record.

[Motion carried, Bill 11 read a second time]

Bill 13

The Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, 1979

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 13, The Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, 1979.

This Act will authorize the Workers' Compensation Board to increase compensation and pension benefits by 10 per cent. It will also provide an organization for the board to be able to work on a calendar year. At the present time they've been working on a year from July 1 to June 30.

The recommendation of 10 per cent is one of several made to the minister by the advisory committee on workers' compensation. It is putting Alberta benefits almost in line with the rest of the provinces, with the exception of two provinces which have a higher ceiling for maximum pension. Other than that, it basically provides 10 per cent increase in benefits.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I read the Act, we're moving to the calendar year, from July 1 to June 30, and the benefits are going to be increased by 10 per cent. So in fact we're looking at a 10 per cent increase not annually but over one and a half years, as I note the budget indicates on page 17. We're talking about 18 months and an increase of 10 per cent, which in fact is an increase of 6.66 per cent on an annual basis.

It's a little difficult for me to get into an obvious quarrel with the minister on behalf of the advisory committee to the minister but I certainly recall no suggestion of a 6.66 per cent increase. What we have to look at, Mr. Speaker, is the inflation rate. I note in the budget that the provincial government estimates the inflation rate is going to be at least 7.5 to 8 per cent. That's a very cautious estimate. Many people at the OECD conference are suggesting that inflation rates in the western European countries and North America could be considerably higher. It all depends, really, on what happens to energy costs, but we could be looking at a continuation of 9 to 10 per cent inflation rates.

So here, Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the most cautious estimate of 7.5 to 8 per cent, which over a period of a year and a half should lead the government at least to increase the awards, pensions, and compensation by that amount over 18 months, what we have is a 10 per cent increase. This means that at the end of the period, when this Legislature has an opportunity

again to review pensions for beneficiaries under the Workers' Compensation Board, these people will have lost the equivalent of at least 1 to 2 per cent of their purchasing power.

I ask members of the Assembly whether we can really justify that kind of policy when we're dealing with people in our society who are hardly able to fight back. We're talking about the totally, permanently disabled. We're talking about the partially disabled, about widows, about children of workers who have died as a result of an industrial accident. I really say to members of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker: is this the place to practise not only restraint — I would think restraint would be benefits that parallel the inflation rate — but is this where we're going to say, we must reduce purchasing power? Because that's what's going to happen. We're looking at a 7.5 to 8 per cent inflation rate, and all we're doing is increasing the amounts by 10 per cent over 18 months. The inevitable result is that at the end of that 18-month period, the people receiving pensions will have less available purchasing power than they have today.

I say to members of the Assembly that certainly I intend to vote for the increase, because an increase of 10 per cent is better than nothing, but I would argue that we should be indexing these pension benefits to the inflation rate.

Compare what we're doing here, Mr. Speaker, with the present arrangement as far as the old age security and the guaranteed income supplement of the federal government are concerned. Both these pensions are indexed to the cost of living. If the cost of living goes up 10 per cent, these pensions go up 10 per cent as well. If the cost of living goes up 8 per cent, they go up 8 per cent; if it goes up 6 per cent, they go up 6 per cent.

Surely our objective should be at least to maintain the purchasing power of beneficiaries under the Workers' Compensation Board. What we're doing — and we should not be misleading anyone at all, Mr. Speaker — is shrinking purchasing power. We can debate how much shrinking is going to take place; we can quarrel over whether the inflation rate will be 8 per cent, 9 per cent, 10 per cent. But even using the figures the Provincial Treasurer has inserted in his budget, there will be a net loss in purchasing power among people who can least afford that loss.

Mr. Speaker, I would just conclude my remarks by saying to the hon. minister and members of the government caucus: surely this is a place not where we need to be overly generous, but at the very least where we commit ourselves to maintaining the level of purchasing power this year, and at the end of this period, that the claimants have at the present time.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to make one or two comments with regard to the Bill. Number one, I believe it's acceptable for the minister to take the advice of the advisory committee. I understand there are MLAs on the committee. They should be in tune with the people in what they recommend — I say, should be. Secondly, I think the recommended increase in compensation benefits of 10 per cent over 18 months is a good indicator that the government is responding to concerns out in the field. But as the hon. Member for Spirit River Fairview has done, I would be very concerned with the effectiveness of the 10 per cent increase to meet the needs of those receiving compensation

benefits in the province of Alberta.

The other evening we studied the estimates of the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Through selective sampling across the province by home economists and other personnel, it was determined that the rental rates across this province have increased around 13 per cent, food has increased in the area of 15 per cent, as well, clothing has increased very significantly. All are above the 10 per cent increase — never mind when we calculate it on a yearly basis alone, the effective increase comes to something like 6.66 per cent. I think the increase is inconsistent with the actual government figures used to determine the incomes of the unemployed employable in the province of Alberta and many of the handicapped. People receiving workmens' compensation are no different.

Number one, I think the minister has just accepted it wholeheartedly and not examined it in his own responsibilities. As a new minister of a portfolio and someone who's sat in this Legislature for a number of years, I think he should have had some concern with regard to that type of thing, maybe shown some leadership to the committee, sent the recommendation back, and had it reviewed under inflationary conditions at the present time — projected inflationary conditions issued to us by the Provincial Treasurer. But no, we just accept it and pass it on, and the minister collects his pay cheque and goes home again.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's good enough leadership in Alberta. We have to have something better than that. This is a very obvious error of management in the department at this point in time. I'd say that even the MLAs sitting on this advisory committee — and I don't recall who they are — should have been a little more in tune with the present general trends in Alberta. Maybe they had better pay back a little of the money they've already earned on committees such as this.

Mr. Speaker, I'd hesitate to support the Bill because of the attitude that prevails in it: a bit of irresponsibility by the new minister, not showing some leadership. The principles are acceptable, and on that basis I'll accept it. Hopefully the government reassesses its error and has a little broader viewpoint on issues such as this.

[Motion carried; Bill 13 read a second time]

Bill 16

The Calgary-Canadian Pacific Transit Agreement Act

MR. LITTLE: I move second reading of Bill 16, The Calgary-Canadian Pacific Transit Agreement Act. The purpose of this Act, Mr. Speaker, is:

to ratify, validate, confirm and declare binding upon the parties thereto a lease agreement executed by the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, Canadian Pacific Limited and the city of Calgary as of November 1, 1977.

The leasing [agreement] permits the city of Calgary to use approximately 6.5 miles of a portion of the existing Canadian Pacific main line from 42nd Avenue South [to the Anderson Road] for the purpose of constructing and operating trackage for its Light Rail Transit. This right of way is approximately 100 feet in width, of which the City requires about 36 feet. It is this proximity

which caused Canadian Pacific Limited to take the position that the land would be available at a nominal rent, (\$5,000.00 per mile per year), but that the Canadian Pacific Limited wished to structure an indemnity to the effect that the City would pay for all damages to Canadian Pacific's operations caused by any L.R.T. accident and that in the event that Canadian Pacific had an accident, even if caused by its own negligence, its liability would be limited to that which would have occurred had there been no L.R.T. operation within the right of way. Thus if Canadian Pacific has an accident and collides with the L.R.T. operation, the City would be responsible to repair its own equipment and pay any additional damage to Canadian Pacific operations caused by contact with the L.R.T. In addition, the city would indemnify Canadian Pacific for any liability incurred as a result of lawsuits for personal injury [or death] arising from the collision.

Now the reason for the legislation Mr. Speaker, is as follows:

These provisions embodied in Articles 4.01 and 4.02 of the sublease [copies of which were supplied to every member]

but to the extent that the City is incurring a liability for Canadian Pacific's negligence causing damage to a public [liability], the contract contravenes ss. 297 and 304 of The Municipal Government Act. Canadian Pacific has required legislation to overcome this statutory disability contained in the general legislation conferring authority on Alberta Municipalities and have declined to accept any form of indemnity which would be consistent with existing legislation.

Rather than amend The Municipal Government Act which would affect all Municipalities it was felt more appropriate that this particular transaction be ratified notwithstanding the Act so that all other municipal business would continue to be governed by the existing [legislation].

[Strictly] as a matter of information the City is required to insure the L.R.T. operation for \$17,000,000.00 and will in fact carry a policy of approximately twice this amount. While the proximity of the Canadian Pacific Limited and L.R.T. operation presents a hazard greater than if they were separated it has been estimated that to acquire a right of way across private land for the same amount of property would cost a minimum of \$70,000,000.00. Because it was estimated that to delay the L.R.T. project for one year pending this legislation would have cost nearly \$10,000,000.00 in inflationary increases, the City has already ... committed over twice this amount in equipment and other matter that could not be recouped if the L.R.T. cannot not be implemented.

[Motion carried Bill 16 read a second time]

Bill 22
The Legislative Assembly
Amendment Act, 1979

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in moving second reading of Bill 22, The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1979.

In doing so, I think it's important to remark on the

essential ingredients of one concern often expressed about the way the legislative process and the democratic representative system operate at present in many jurisdictions of the western world, including the 11 governments in Canada. Over the last generation or so people have often remarked that the operation of representative, parliamentary, and legislative government as such leaves some things to be desired, in the sense that government is now a very, very big business and a massive affair for anyone to try to contemplate and influence in any way as a private individual citizen, voter, or taxpayer.

For that reason, in jurisdictions on the North American continent and in other jurisdictions where there is a similar type of representative government, volumes have been written about the apparent decline in some areas in influence of legislators, as distinct from administrators. This Bill is aimed at attacking, among other things, the concern that people who bring with them the views of constituents they represent — as elected people do — could have more, but in many respects have had less, opportunity for input on the part of those constituents. The government's view in this respect is of course consistent with some of the provisions of amendments made three or four years ago by which elected members began to play an increasing part in work being done by certain government agencies, and in what you might call near agencies, as in the case of the importance the government attached to representation by the elected people on the Syncrude board, that not being a government agency as such. Other agencies under discussion are distinctly boards, commissions, and the like.

We, as a government, have tried to answer the concern of any apparent falling off of involvement by elected people in the process over the last generation or so. There have been times in history when elected people have been the most instrumental — perhaps they still are, I hope they still are — in the creation and implementation of policies on behalf of the general citizenry. But this legislation is directed at that lingering concern that more could be done on the part of those actually elected. Of course, this government has maintained throughout that the direction given to the course of public affairs, insofar as they are the responsibility of this government at present, is tied very closely and very tightly to the concept that the caucus of the government party is necessarily a very, very important instrument in everything done in the sense of enactment of public laws and the carrying out of public administration.

Mr. Speaker, it seemed to us that one of the ways in which this participation could be ensured and enhanced would be for members of the Assembly to join with their fellow citizens who are serving and giving of their time on numerous boards and agencies; that if the elected member could join with them on such boards and agencies a very useful input on the part of the constituency of such member and certainly the views of caucus colleagues would then be possible.

I think the status quo this government found when it came to office a few years ago did not contemplate that particular initiative on the part of elected members. We have not hesitated to enhance the area through which the representative philosophy of the government and the representation of people can be brought forward. And I suggest that bringing it forward and enhancing it in this way is a very, very

useful and timely initiative, one that had been overlooked over the years.

What it achieves, of course, is to harness the very considerable energies of numbers of citizens who are able to make a very, very useful contribution, who have chosen for the time being to offer themselves for elective office and look to the opportunity to bring their skills, along with their clearer position as responsibly representing their constituents, into the operation of government in this direct way.

Now in making these remarks, no one would want to overlook the importance of the boards and agencies affected by this proposed legislation. The private citizens who work on these agencies — some of them for, say, one or two terms, primarily on a volunteer basis — are very important to the process and deserve every commendation. I know all hon. members, whatever their disagreement, if any, in respect to other parts of the Bill, would certainly agree that input by voluntarily manned agencies and commissions of government, where people can serve on a part-time basis, is an extremely useful thing in government. It's widely used.

The work is generally, if not in all cases, assumed to be part-time, in which a person gives of his time primarily in a voluntary way. As far as the work of members of this Assembly is concerned, I think the situation is generally accorded to be also a part-time occupation, except for those who hold positions that would include, say, the Leader of the Opposition, a member of Executive Council, or perhaps Your Honour's position as Speaker. But generally, going from a few years ago, when legislatures in this province sat for six weeks and the business was generally done in the spring session, the workload — and nobody complains about that at all — has grown slightly, to the point where approximately three and a half to four months of a person's time is to be occupied by his duties in this Chamber if he or she is elected.

With the fact that the essence of the member's work still remains part-time, I suggest it is entirely fair that if such a member, who commits the period during the normal session and receives his indemnity for that as do others, takes on additional duties, it's entirely fair that some additional remuneration be made in that respect. I think that is the undisguised central issue of this Bill, and one that hon. members in addition to myself will perhaps direct some remarks to. But I would caution that the new aspect of this system, by which members are no longer in the purely traditional position they had been in under the previous type of administration, should be given a fair look and a fair trial.

I'm sure hon. members who had remarks to make three or four years ago when some similar steps were taken will at least have to acknowledge that the boards and agencies involved in those cases have benefited as a result of the steps taken at that time. That will undoubtedly continue to be the case with the expansion of the same principle involved in this Bill.

I don't think I need make any other remarks at this time, Mr. Speaker, in respect to the principle of the Bill, and would encourage all hon. members to support it.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in taking part in second reading of this particular Bill, might I say at the outset that I found the Government House Leader doing what I think was a admirable job of trying to

defend a rather difficult situation.

I thought it was rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, in defending Bill 22 this evening, the Government House Leader said there were four reasons for the Bill being put before the Legislature. The first he referred to as a feeling of decline in the influence of Members of the Legislative Assembly — elected people — a decline in their ability to perform, compared to administrative personnel. The solution the government is recommending here is that rather than enhance the role of Members of the Legislative Assembly as a group, MLAs are put into situations where they're — if I can use the expression, and I say this in the most charitable terms possible — in bed with the administration. [interjections] I hear complaints from the back row, and I'm sure we'll hear more of that. But that's really what we're being asked to agree to here tonight.

The hon. Government House Leader talked about decline of the influence of Members of the Legislative Assembly the very evening when the Minister of Social Services and Community Health wouldn't take responsibility today in question period for the actions of his officials. Now if we really want to enhance the role of Members of the Legislative Assembly, one of the first things we should do is see that ministers are in fact responsible for the actions in their departments, rather than trying to say, we're responsible for the policy but not for the administration. We're responsible for cutting ribbons and opening things up and taking pats on the back. But when anything goes wrong, well, I talked to my chief deputy minister, and he was the person who got us involved in all this.

The second reason the Government House Leader gave for this legislation was that the government felt the caucus is an important instrument — I think that's the term he used. I don't quarrel with the Government House Leader's assessment. I think any government feels that way about its caucus. But let's remember that in the strictest parliamentary tradition, the caucus is a private meeting of the members of any particular group in the House. Public business is to be done in the Assembly, and the caucus doesn't take the place of what is to go on in the Legislative Assembly. I'll have more to say about that later.

The third justification the Government House Leader used was that this would enable the government to harness the energies of the MLAs. I don't think many sets of harness will be snapped in the course of being put on.

MR. NOTLEY: Or after they begin to pull.

MR. R. CLARK: Frankly I don't think there'll be much pulling or pushing.

The point the Government House Leader made is that they're going to harness this energy, and that Members of the Legislative Assembly aren't prepared to put that energy forward unless they're remunerated for it. The Government House Leader talked about part-time MLAs and a heavy, increasing workload. We on this side would have no objection to looking very seriously, if the government wants to at the idea of full-time Members of the Legislative Assembly. In our judgment, that would be a far better situation than what we're developing at this time.

In a very conciliatory gesture, the Government House Leader said we should really have a fair look at this; we should give it a fair trial. After all, in 1972 or

'73 there were rather lengthy debates in the House on this matter when we first moved in this direction. Then just after the last election, we had round two. The piece of legislation we have here is really round three, the grand finale.

Let's look at this legislation for a moment or two, not from the standpoint of what the Government House Leader or this government might or might not do with it, but from the point of view of how it can be abused. We're being asked to agree to a situation where MLAs will be placed on government boards and agencies, first of all without reference to the Legislative Assembly, at a salary without any reference to the Legislative Assembly. That's a fight we've had in the past.

I would draw the attention of members to Section 2 of the Bill which, if it's looked at carefully, not only allows the Executive Council and individual ministers to appoint committees with MLAs on them, but goes far further than that. Anyone who is delegated the powers of the minister within the terms of a department is able to set up committees and appoint MLAs to them. I think to go that far is a very dangerous situation, regardless of the best intentions of the government — I don't care who it is. That is simply unrealistic. It gnaws away at the whole concept of roles of elected officials. In its many years in office, the federal government that was just turned out — admittedly they have a Senate — never moved this far in appointing members of the House of Commons to ventures such as this.

I'm sure many hon. members are sitting back and saying, these are only the views of the opposition, the members of the opposition can't or won't or don't want to be appointed to these kinds of committees, this is something only MLAs in the opposition would think up in their wildest moments. I'd like to refer Members of the Legislative Assembly to the Ontario Commission on the Legislature, more commonly referred to as the Camp commission report. Some members in the House may be familiar with a certain Dalton Camp...

MR. NOTLEY: He's *persona non grata*.

MR. R. CLARK: ...who was the chairman of this Ontario legislative committee. Admittedly, Ontario has moved in this direction for several years. If hon. members would like the reference, it's the May '73 edition of the interim report.

On page 38 it talks about the preliminary observations of the committee and about this idea of appointing government members to various committees. I want to quote from the report for a moment or two:

Arguments in Support of the Practice

- (a) The presence of a politically astute person provides an input to, or a check on, an agency usually at arm's length from public opinion.
- (b) The Member serves as a useful information source for the Legislature, and especially for the Government Caucus.
- (c) It provides a training ground for talented Members.
- (d) It is a means by which the Premier can reward loyal Members of long service or young ambitious M.P.P.s aiming towards a future Cabinet position.

Those are the pluses in the words of the Camp commis-

sion report in 1973, commenting after the Ontario government had moved some distance in this direction.

But what were the Camp commission's criticisms of the practice? I think members should pay very, very careful heed to this:

- (a) It gives too much patronage to an executive which already has too much domination in the Legislature — i.e. the rewards keep Backbenchers [independent in their] mind — in the Caucus the Assembly and its committees.
- (b) The appointees do little or nothing for their rewards and have an unfair advantage in terms of income and perquisites over their colleagues.

Thirdly, they go on to point out that Ottawa has not made such appointments, despite the fact that they have the Senate there. Fourthly, and this is vital also:

- (d) The appointees have no legislative responsibilities for their agencies — i.e. they do not answer questions in the House, neither do they put through their agency's estimates. They serve an "executive" or "administrative" function, neither of which is consistent with the nature of legislative responsibility.
- (e) The practice conceals a "fat" level of remuneration for Government M.P.P.s which the public [really] doesn't know about.

The last point I want to make is that it's a substitute, in our case, for full-time appointments.

Mr. Speaker, I think members of this Assembly have to keep four points in mind in looking at this Bill tonight. First of all, regardless of where we sit in this Assembly, whether we're full-time or part-time, each of us is first and foremost a representative of the people who sent us to this Assembly.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, if the major concern in moving in this direction is financial, we can increase the salaries. That's generally done every four years. I said earlier, let's look at full-time MLAs, if that's what we want to do. That would be far better than to follow this legislation. But when the Assembly gets to the point where you add up the cabinet and the number of MLAs on special committees — appointed either by the Executive Council, by ministers, or by appointees of ministers — and there are more MLAs and cabinet ministers on committees like this than members who are not, then the government dominates the majority by means of the money that's going to them.

The government owns the government caucus then. The government owns the Legislature by the means of appointments to these committees. And in principle, Mr. Speaker — in principle — that is absolutely contrary to the very best traditions of parliamentary democracy.

If it's a matter of getting more MLA input, as I've said earlier, let's increase the salaries *and* make it a full-time job as it is in Ottawa, and in Ontario and other provinces. MLAs will then have the time, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope also the inclination, to keep themselves abreast of what's going on in a variety of agencies.

One of the things we might do Mr. Speaker, is set up a legislative committee, accountable to and appointed by this Legislative Assembly itself, that would monitor a number of the government agencies on an ongoing basis, not go the route we're going.

Mr. Speaker, in going in this direction, this third

and final step, we're making legislators not only legislators but, even further, administrators — and they lose their objectivity. Which comes first: their legislative responsibilities or the administrative responsibility for the agency they've been appointed to? Who has first call on their loyalties? Is it the person, or the cabinet, or the minister who appointed them? Or is it their constituents back home? That's the very essence of what this building is all about.

There's no accountability in this kind of system. At least as far as ministers are concerned, there's an opportunity in question period every day and in the estimates, like the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower this afternoon. We don't have to like the answers he gives; he doesn't have to like the questions we ask. But at least there's the opportunity for an exchange of points of view, and some accountability. But with what we're doing here tonight, this third, last, and worst step of all, Mr. Speaker, there's no accountability.

I would underline the point again to members of the Assembly. What is the caucus? Caucus is important for any party, whether in government or in opposition. But as far as this Legislative Assembly is concerned, Mr. Speaker, the caucus has little, if any, significance. This is the place where the decisions are to be made. Caucus, in its simplest form, is a private group not at all accountable to the House.

I want to conclude my comments by simply saying that I know very well there are MLAs in this House who at this particular time can likely see nothing wrong with what we're starting on. Before very long, those very same MLAs are going to find themselves in the situation: to whom are they accountable first? To their constituents, to the cabinet, or to the ministers who appoint them? Mr. Speaker, from the standpoint of this Assembly, what kind of accountability is there for the appointments being made? My colleague from Little Bow commented earlier on the appointments to date.

I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, and I know I'll have more to say on this when we get into committee. I think this is the most serious piece of legislation we're passing this session. I want to say to the colleagues in the Assembly — not that I begrudge any member of this Assembly getting \$30,000 or \$35,000, if that's what we should be getting; fair ball to any member, wherever they sit — let's do it on a strong legislative basis. Let's not pass legislation now that allows us to put MLAs in this Assembly in a situation where they compromise their constituents, or where they're not accountable to the House.

This province has pioneered as far as the heritage fund is concerned. Mr. Speaker, we're not pioneering here. We're going back light-years when we move in this direction with this legislation.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in addressing my comments to Bill 22, one has to look back over the last two terms. I remember in 1972, the first session when this matter was debated. I believe we went until almost midnight the evening when the question arose of MLA task forces. At that time the opposition House leader, the former Member for Drumheller, made some very telling arguments about the propriety, really, of paying government members to sit on caucus committees.

I remember the rhetoric at the time, Mr. Speaker. The

government was a government of 49 members — all cabinet ministers. They were going to be a government of all 49 members. Therefore it was necessary to move in the direction of MLA task forces which could be paid for the normal caucus work that had been done without remuneration before.

Then, Mr. Speaker, in 1975 we had the next step that the Leader of the Opposition alluded to. A good portion of the week in June 1975, I recall amendments being debated to the legislation that allowed the government to appoint backbench MLAs to boards and agencies. We are taking yet another step today.

I'd just like to review some of the comments made by the hon. minister who introduced the debate. I must agree with the Leader of the Opposition. I can't think of anyone who could do a better job of introducing this debate in such a quiet, reassuring way than the hon. Attorney General. For the sake of public argument, I somehow wish it had been the Deputy Premier who introduced the Bill, so we would have had the thing put in a somewhat sharper focus. Well, I'm not sure whether it would be focused, but sharper anyway. In any event, Mr. Speaker, we had the most reassuring speech.

But the hon. Attorney General made a number of comments. One comment I found rather strange, and I say this seriously, was his suggestion that members in fact would be representing their constituencies when they sat on boards and agencies. I say to members of the government caucus that we represent our constituencies when we sit in the Legislature. But the suggestion that we would represent our constituencies as members of a board or agency, in my view, is fraught with some very serious dangers when you look at some of these agencies we're going to stick people on: Surface Rights Board, the provincial Planning Board, the Local Authorities Board. Mr. Speaker, you're not seriously suggesting that government members who sit on boards of that nature are going to represent their constituencies, or we are going to be in very serious trouble indeed. No, the place to represent our constituencies is quite properly in the Legislative Assembly.

The second point the hon. Attorney General raised was that there was a decline in the influence of legislators. I say to members of the House: let's take a very serious look at that. You know, the very first Speech from the Throne that this government brought in in 1972 paid a great deal of attention — more than lip service — to the role of select committees of the entire House that would examine various subjects. We had a select committee on foreign ownership; we have the select committee on workers' compensation, which has been reappointed today. But there were a whole series of legislative committees representing the entire Legislature. We looked at surface rights; we looked at the crop insurance program. I thought that was a correct position to take.

As members of the Legislature, in undertaking our legislative work we should be reviewing the operation of government from a policy standpoint. And rather than moving in the direction of appointing all these eager young members of the Legislature who have just been appointed to boards and agencies, would it not make a great deal more sense for this government to undertake the kind of review of government operations through legislative committees representing both the government and the opposition? Admittedly

such a course would be rather difficult, for our little opposition to man the various committees. But in principle I think it would be much better.

Even though I quarrelled with the task forces, I think the effort to have legislative committees in a number of areas during the first four years of this administration brought in some excellent reports which changed the whole course of legislation in a number of areas. A good example is workers' compensation. Another, even better example — I see the Minister of Agriculture here — is crop insurance. A legislative committee travelled all over the province holding hearings on crop insurance, and major changes were made in the province's crop insurance program, changes that are still in effect. MLAs on both sides of the House sat on a legislative committee that didn't get into the nuts and bolts of administering crop insurance, but looked at the rights, the wrongs, the pluses, and the minuses: where crop insurance could be strengthened from a policy point of view. Mr. Speaker, surely that's the kind of thing we should be asking ourselves about now. If it was properly done before, why can't it be done in the future?

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Attorney General mentioned the caucus. I don't want to reiterate the points the Leader of the Opposition has already made. No one is so naive as not to recognize the importance of the caucus in making decisions in any government. But that doesn't alter the fact that it is in the Legislative Assembly that we have *Hansard*. It is to the Legislative Assembly that people can come and sit in the galleries, as a few people are tonight. It is the Legislative Assembly that the press can cover. It is the Legislative Assembly that allows the elected representatives of the public to do business in public.

I say to hon. members of this House, before we pass this legislation, let's stop and ask ourselves: is it really a step in the right direction? I suggest to hon. members that it isn't. I suggest that other courses will allow the government to harness the energies, as the minister indicated, of all these people in the caucus whom they're worried about putting to work. Let's make use of our legislative committees. But let's harness those energies in a manner consistent with the role of MLAs, which is not to be administrators but to be those people who represent their constituents and who must ultimately weigh policy decisions that guide the province. I believe that would be a much more appropriate course, and one consistent with legislative supremacy, as opposed to the principle contained in Bill 22.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, there should certainly be other members who are willing to speak on 'Bill 22. I think the recipients of the welfare payments that are going to come out of this Bill should stand up, speak up, and tell why they really support it. Why didn't the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, who is going to be one of the recipients of the Bill, stand in his place and say, I need the job.

MR. R. CLARK: One thousand dollars a month.

MR. R. SPEAKER: One thousand dollars a month. A 66.66 per cent increase in salary, while the new minister stands in his place and says, we have given the people of this province who are receiving workers' compensation benefits an increase of 10 per cent. And he didn't

admit that it was over 18 months. How stupid can we get? How ridiculous can a government get? How irresponsible can all these welfare recipients be?

Other members who come only as MLAs to this Legislature receive — and I guess that's their own judgment. When they were elected, they said they would be full-time MLAs. Maybe that's a commitment to their constituents. Then they should take on that responsibility of being a full-time MLA on the some \$18,000 a year that we receive. Why should they come to this Legislature and sit quietly? The Bill is supposed to release energies. What energies? They're sitting on the back benches saying nothing, waiting to get up to the trough. The hon. Member for Lethbridge West is still smiling. He can just taste that trough. Unbelievable. I see a few others smiling and feeling good about it.

It's nice to have the extra income, because they can have a holiday in the summer. They can travel back and forth to Edmonton, down to Winnipeg, down to Ottawa, back here, research this committee, that little item, this one — get the extra income.

But, Mr. Speaker, the biggest default that occurs, the most irresponsible action, is that we in this Legislature, in the public arena, hear exactly zero of the results from those members. They can't speak up in the Legislature. We've questioned them in earlier sessions of the Legislature; they can't answer the questions. Either they don't know how, or the Premier won't let them speak. Now he's going to pay them \$1,000 a month to think about what they're doing. And we in the Legislature can't hear their wisdom.

I think it's totally irresponsible for this kind of legislation to be presented before us. I think any member of the Legislature who supports this kind of Bill is putting a black mark on the democratic process, on the responsibility of coming here, representing their constituents, speaking out without any hindrances. The hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake shakes his head. He's got himself a cabinet portfolio; it doesn't matter to him now. He can shake his head that way.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's totally intolerable when an hon. member comes here and allows himself to be placed in a position where he can't speak out for his constituents on any subject. Number one, he isn't speaking for his constituents; number two, the possibility of the hon. member speaking out any more than he did before just doesn't exist.

I've felt it in this Legislature since 1971 that the control sits with the Premier and the cabinet. If any member of the back bench stands up and speaks out, he's certainly told when to sit down and what not to say. Mr. Speaker, we're not going to get any new information in this Legislature to hear decisions. The taxpayers of Alberta are going to pay a bigger bill to people who are not creating anything new for Albertans.

The Legislature will work best when, number one, a member of the Legislature is independent financially, some from his own sources and some from the sources of the Legislature; number two, when he's not tied to some committee that makes that Legislature member hold his tongue. And number three, I think the best example I have noticed is some of the new members in this Legislature. I've found some of the new members very refreshing. They have spoken out on some subjects, maybe because they haven't been in this environment as long as some of the other members. Just as an

aside, as an observer, I would say the secret to the long-term success of any organization — and this time it happens to be the Conservative Party — is the ability to allow these members to continue to speak out, as they have done since the opening of this Legislature.

But, Mr. Speaker, the legislation we have before us, the past performance of this government, subdues that kind of participation. This legislation is an attempt to bring voices into the Legislature through the back door. It will not work. We will not hear any refreshing attitudes or voices the way it is. It only supplements the income of some people, pays them off. And as far as the people of Alberta are concerned, we as Albertans will not benefit one bit.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I got baited, so I have to rise to the occasion. It's been interesting listening to the three men over here talking about whether or not MLAs or anyone else should get extra pay for a little extra work.

When I got elected, I always considered it would be a full-time job. I'm one of these people who may receive some remuneration for a committee I'm working on. It was great the last time. I worked on it for three years, enjoyed it, never received any pay and never expected to. But if there's pay to come — and certainly there were times when my family wondered why I was here and there and so on and not getting anything extra for it.

But I think the hon. members' objection is ... The Leader of the Opposition said that perhaps we should make \$35,000 a year. Well, if he feels that way, if he thinks he's worth that much — I don't think he's worth that much — then why doesn't he bring in a Bill? Why stand up and just bellyache because he may not be on a particular committee that's doing extra work? He receives a little extra money for being Leader of the Opposition. I don't hear him grumbling about that. The members who were on the boundary redistribution committee received a little extra money; I don't see that as any slap in the face to their constituency.

I just can't understand how these men can say so many words and have so little to say. I think the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, certainly since 1971, has proven to the rest of Canada that it works. This certainly isn't the worst possible thing that could happen. I've seen many instances where many people on a caucus committee or a legislative committee spend many, many hours, weeks, and months preparing, gathering, and documenting information, at great expense to their families and, in some instances I suppose, to their constituency, and don't get any remuneration. Using the logic the opposition has been using and spouting tonight — and as usual they talk the same line — would mean that the people in cabinet are not looking after their constituencies. I just fail to realize how anyone can feel that because you're on a committee — whether or not you get paid for it is beside the point — or you're a member of cabinet, you're not looking after your constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this Bill, not because I'm one of the members who may or may not receive some remuneration. To me it doesn't matter that much. But certainly for some of the members who are spending many, many hours and days on these committees, where they're away from any possible chance of making extra money or doing other things, but perhaps have to give up their family time, holiday

time, or whatever to work on these things, I don't see how anyone can begrudge them a little remuneration.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make just a few remarks in closing debate on Bill 22. First of all, I think I enjoyed the speech of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I appreciated the way in which he approached it, what I would call near good humor. He made his points very effectively.

I can't say the same for the hon. Member for Little Bow, and would only want to say to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that maybe we can each trade one mistake in our presentations this evening. The hon. member pointed out that I had incorrectly conceived the reference to constituents, and I'm inclined to agree with that. I didn't mean that a member who goes on a board or commission represents a constituency as such, in the manner in which it is represented here. Perhaps what I should have tried to convey a little better was that it gives an opportunity for a person who is a representative, and who presumably has the feeling of a constituency and of his constituents, to bring the views of the citizens at large, no doubt, to an agency such as one of those described.

When I said that I think we can trade mistakes of fact, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview made a real dandy. He chose to read from the excluded list when he made his argument in saying, surely we're not going to appoint people to these important boards and agencies. And we of course agree with that. He was reading from the existing law which defines a number of agencies to which members cannot be appointed, and that section will remain in that form.

I wanted to say just a few other things about the concerns hon. members have put forward. I don't think I've ever tried to suggest that this area would be free from controversy, and hon. members' opposite have made a number of points. I think it is probably important that there always be scrutiny of what is done, not only in respect of the Bill 22 concept before the House now, but of course in all the various areas in which members, ministers, and public servants involve themselves. The whole system assures that scrutiny exists day in and day out right across the government, to the extent that people are able to provide that scrutiny. These are fairly high-profile appointments that are proposed for some members, and I don't doubt for a minute that they will be well scrutinized, in the sense of their contribution to these agencies and boards, in everything that will take place.

If I could just comment on one or two other things. I said that over the last generation or so there was a feeling that the elected members, or at least the representative institutions, were the object of a certain amount of concern in regard to their ability to represent people. I hoped it wouldn't be taken the wrong way. I really think that's still the important point.

The concern might well be expressed by the man on the street, by any of our constituents, that the huge apparatus of government is so overwhelming and so awe-inspiring to the average person who has so little to do with it from day to day, except that it affects him so much, that it is in danger of drifting too far from the citizen's view. Bill 22 is a vigorous answer to that, in the sense that in a number of important agencies, including ones where people will be affected in very much a social, personal program sense, the input on

behalf of that citizen will now be more direct.

I want to say in passing that I'm disinclined to quote some of the people the hon. Leader of the Opposition quoted here this evening. I don't think I'd be any more inclined to quote Dalton Camp than I would be to quote the hon. Member for Little Bow.

In respect to the hon. leader's comments about full-time members, the time may come for that. In many respects, I think a lot of people in this Assembly would hope that it doesn't come too soon for our Legislature in our province. The political or governmental structures of Ottawa, Quebec, and Toronto — which I believe are the only jurisdictions that presently work on virtually a full-time, year-round basis in their parliament or legislature — have certain disadvantages in that they tend to create professional politicians as representatives, as opposed to those who are able to come to the Assembly, make a contribution and, in the individual case, return to the private sector from time to time. As long as it can be the case in Alberta, I think that would probably be the preference of most people.

The enrichment that I think takes place in a Legislative Assembly when people come as citizens — in fact, part-time as public servants and part-time as people in the business world, the farms, the professions, and wherever they may be in their private life — is a very good, balancing feature. So I hope we don't get to the stage of full-time members in this province too soon.

I think it's also important to note that the chairmen of the agencies that are proposed for the naming of members will be answerable in the House. That's an important distinction, in respect to one of the arguments made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, those are the principal closing remarks I would like to make. I urge hon. members to support Bill 22.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we vote on Bill 22, it may be appropriate for the Chair to share a concern with the Assembly, that is, whether a member who has been given an assurance of an appointment pursuant to the provisions of Bill 22 may be free to vote on that Bill, having regard to Standing Order 31.

The situation is somewhat different from that of voting on an amendment to The Legislative Assembly Act in which the interests of all members are the same. Here we have possibly special interests by members who may have been assured of appointments in the event of Bill 22 being passed.

Under those circumstances, as I say, I have misgivings about it. If such members vote, I would have to question whether their votes may be counted under Standing Order 31.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker I want to be clear, if I might, on the remarks Your Honour has just made. I was in the process of looking for Standing Order 31 when Your Honour was concluding. Was it your intention to indicate that those may be present without their votes being counted, or that they should excuse themselves?

MR. SPEAKER: The responsibility of voting or not voting is of course, on the individual member and not on the Chair. My responsibility comes when a decision may have to be made as to whether those votes are going to be counted. I would assume that a member who decided he should not vote, having regard to the

provisions, of Standing Order 31, would probably leave the Chamber under the provisions of Standing Order 31.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, as a matter for clarification with regard to Section 31, would it be the intention of the Speaker that that includes any member who has some intention expressed to him or her that they would benefit from the legislation as such?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not privy to this kind of information, nor should I be. It would be up to the individual member to decide whether he or she has been given assurance of an appointment in the anticipation of Bill 22 being passed.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, in view of your comments and the attention drawn to Section 31, and the appointment as chairman of the hospital facilities review committee having already been announced, I would wish to excuse myself from the Chamber on the voting of this matter.

[Several members left the House]

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, before the Assembly empties, I appreciate that Your Honour does have . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly hon. members who wish to leave the Chamber — I don't want to influence them either way — may wish to hear any debate there may be on the point of order.

MR. KOZIAK: I noticed, Mr. Speaker, that when you raised the matter of concern with members of the Assembly, you did so in a rather perplexed tone, which indicated to me that it was a concern that had bothered you. I was left with the impression that you were perhaps open to discussion on this particular point. I think the discussion might be useful. I have concern, not necessarily with respect to your concern relative to this amendment. But were your ruling to apply, I wonder about the approaches we might take in the discussion of the estimates of each department.

For example, included in the estimates of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and in the estimates of each department is an appropriation which includes the minister's office. Included in the minister's office is the minister's salary. In each case the minister, when guiding the estimates of his particular department through the Committee of Supply and through the Legislature, remains to vote on his salary. That is a very individual appropriation, applying only to that particular individual.

I wonder not so much about the consideration we may have on this particular vote, but the ramifications of the concern you expressed this evening on other business that comes before the House and how the extension of that philosophy might affect the ability of this House to conduct its business.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think I would feel in any way uncomfortable about a minister voting on the estimates of his own department. That practice has certainly been followed by parliaments of our tradition for decades or centuries. I'd rather question whether there is a direct analogy between that situation and this one. I'm not in a position to make a ruling on the point. I

don't think it is necessary. The standing order is there. I think it's the decision of each individual member as to whether or not he is going to vote.

The occasion for me to become concerned very directly in the matter would be in the event I had to decide whether a member's vote was to be counted. That situation is hypothetical; it has not yet arisen. I do not yet know, and may never find out, whether a member who has been given an assurance of an appointment is going to be voting for or against Bill 22.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

MR. SPEAKER [addressing an hon. member entering the Chamber]: Order please. Order please. I believe the hon. member is a little too late to enter the Chamber.

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

C. Anderson	Kushner	Payne
Appleby	LeMessurier	Pengelly
Cookson	Little	Planche
Crawford	Mack	Russell
Cripps	Magee	Schmid
Diachuk	McCrae	Schmidt
Embury	McCrimmon	Shaben
Fyfe	Miller	Thompson
Harle	Moore	Topolnisky
Hiebert	Oman	Trynchy
Horsman	Osterman	Weiss
Hyndman	Pahl	Wolstenholme
Knaak	Paproski	Young
Koziaik		

Against the motion:

R. Clark	Notley	R. Speaker
Mandeville		
Totals:	Ayes — 40	Noes — 4

[Bill 22 read a second time]

Bill 23
The Glenbow-Alberta Institute
Amendment Act, 1979

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure this evening to move second reading of Bill No. 23, The Glenbow-Alberta Institute Amendment Act, 1979.

This amendment is companion to a consequential amendment in The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act. The Glenbow-Alberta Institute Act is being amended to provide that the institute may remunerate the members of the board of governors at the institute for their services.

[Motion carried; Bill 23 read a second time]

Bill 26
The Election Finances
and Contributions Disclosure
Amendment Act, 1979

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move

second reading of Bill No. 26, The Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Amendment Act, 1979.

Mr. Speaker, the principle of this Bill is straightforward. It is simply to relieve our volunteer financial officers of the dual responsibility of filing a return for the election period, a six-month period during which they would have no receipts, because the contributions go to the campaign fund of the candidates. Nor would they have any expenses during that period, because the expenses would of course be paid by the campaign committee. With the deletion of this requirement, the financial officers will still file a return for the 12-month period, which encompasses the six-month period we are referring to. But it will relieve them of the dual responsibility and take a burden off their shoulders.

Mr. Speaker, it's a very important Bill, and I would request that all hon. members give their support to it.

While I'm on my feet, might I make a couple of brief comments on the past election, as it relates to The Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Amendment Act, 1979. This was our first election, and to my mind it turned out quite well. I'm not necessarily referring to the numerical strength of the government. But I would say the committee that researched this question and brought this important piece of legislation to the floor of the House must have done a very good job indeed, because we've had few problems in this very complex area. To my mind, there have been few or probably no defalcations, serious errors, or breaches under the statute.

I think that says two things. As I have just mentioned, it testifies to the tremendous research job done by the committee that brought this Act to the floor. And I think it's a testimonial to the hard work and integrity of our volunteer workers on the campaign front.

I would also say, Mr. Speaker, that the sections of the Bill allowing a tax credit against donations have been an important addition to the election laws of this province. There's no doubt that fund raising became much easier for candidates involved in the election process. Additionally, it expanded the base of those contributing to the election campaign and thereby, I would think, increased the interest of the citizenry in the election process.

All in all, I think the Bill we are amending today is a very important piece of legislation and has served us well. It probably will require some modest future amendments, but by and large it is a good piece of legislation.

The amendment I am recommending tonight is a modest one that will relieve some of the burden on our volunteer workers. I would ask the support of all members in this Assembly.

[Motion carried; Bill 26 read a second time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it's proposed that the subcommittees sit again tomorrow evening and, other than the normal afternoon, that will be all the business for the day.

[At 10:10 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]

