

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Wednesday, June 27, 1979 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Private Bills Committee, I wish to report that the committee recommends to this Assembly that Bill Pr. 3, The Edmonton Convention Centre Authority Act, be proceeded with, with amendments.

head: **NOTICES OF MOTIONS**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give oral notice of a motion I propose to make tomorrow evening at 8 o'clock in respect of the re-examination by an indemnities commission of the salaries and other allowances of members of the Legislature.

This might be a good time to read the proposed motion, so that hon. members in the opposition will know of it.

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta request the Executive Council to appoint a committee of three Alberta citizens, namely Mr. Justice Tevie H. Miller, chairman; Mr. N. B. Coutts; and Mr. William S. McGregor with instructions to:

- (1) assess adequacy or otherwise of
 - (a) existing indemnities and expense allowances, including *per diem* living allowances, of MLAs, taking into consideration present and anticipated circumstances and the demands upon the MLA to meet his or her legislative and constituency responsibilities;
 - (b) existing salaries of the Speaker, Deputy Speaker, Premier, Leader of the Opposition, and members of the Executive Council;
- (2) make recommendations to the Legislative Assembly as to changes, if any, in the said indemnities, expense allowances, and salaries as may be fair and appropriate;
- (3) complete and publish its report on or before September 15, 1979, and deliver a copy of said report to the Speaker, the Premier, and the Leader of the Opposition.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

Bill 220
An Act Respecting
The Withholding or Withdrawal of
Treatment Where Death Is Inevitable

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a Bill, being An Act Respecting The Withholding or

Withdrawal of Treatment Where Death Is Inevitable. The purpose of this Bill is to permit any individual voluntarily to decline artificial life-supporting or -sustaining devices in the case of terminal illness.

[Leave granted; Bill 220 read a first time]

Bill Pr. 1
The Newman Theological College
Amendment Act, 1979

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 1, The Newman Theological College Amendment Act, 1979. The purpose of the Bill is to expand the board and to make provision for certain designations.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 1 read a first time]

Bill Pr. 5
The Merchants and Traders
Assurance Company Amendment Act, 1979

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill Pr. 5, The Merchants and Traders Assurance Company Amendment Act, 1979. Its purpose is to increase the capital of the company, to move its head office from Calgary to Edmonton, and to simplify the original Act, which was passed in 1917, to make it more consistent with present insurance legislation.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 5 read a first time]

Bill Pr. 2
The King's College Act

MR. MACK: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 2, The King's College Act. It will establish an alternative to postsecondary education in the city of Edmonton.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 2 read a first time]

Bill Pr. 6
The Prairie Trust Corporation Act

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 6, The Prairie Trust Corporation Act. The purpose of the Act is to incorporate the Prairie Trust Corporation.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 6 read a first time]

Bill Pr. 7
The Highfield Trust Company Act

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I also request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 7, The Highfield Trust Company Act, the purpose of which is to incorporate the Highfield Trust.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 7 read a first time]

Bill Pr. 8
The University of Alberta and
St. Stephen's College Perpetuities Act

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a

Bill, The University of Alberta and St. Stephen's College Perpetuities Act. The purpose of this Bill is to exempt the agreement between St. Stephen's College and the governors of the University of Alberta from The Perpetuities Act.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 8 read a first time]

**Bill Pr. 9
The Canadian Union College
Amendment Act, 1979**

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 9, The Canadian Union College Amendment Act, 1979. The purpose of this Bill is to allow Canadian Union College to grant degrees, if and when The Universities Act is amended.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 9 read a first time]

**Bill Pr. 10
The Our Lady of
The Rosary Hospital, Castor, Act**

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 10, The Our Lady of The Rosary Hospital, Castor, Act. The purpose of this Bill is to incorporate an association of religious women as a body corporate to carry out various charitable activities.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 10 read a first time]

**Bill Pr. 11
The Western Union Insurance Company
Amendment Act, 1979**

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill Pr. 11, The Western Union Insurance Company Amendment Act, 1979. The purpose of this Bill is to adjust the capital structure of the company.

[Leave granted; Bill Pr. 11 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table for the information of all members a brochure entitled How to Resolve a Complaint Against Police. Copies will be made available to all members.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a request by 172 people who recently attended a conference on energy and housing in the community of Fairview, requesting emphasis by the government of Alberta in the field of alternative energy.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual report of the Department of Business Development and Tourism.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege to introduce to you and to members of this Assembly 50 outstanding grade 5 students from the Charlie Killam school in the Rose City of Camrose. With them today

are two teachers, Janette Rotto and Sharon Gilbertson. They're in the public gallery, and I would ask that they now stand and be recognized by this Assembly.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, it gives me real pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 25 grade 5 students from the Mundare school in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Zyla, a chaperon and one of the parents, Mrs. Moroz, and bus driver Mr. Zyla. It is quite obvious that the Zylas have found the educational system a family venture. Nevertheless, both Mr. and Mrs. Zyla play a very important role in the community by participating in several organizations. At present, Mr. Zyla is the deputy mayor of the town of Mundare. I would ask that the students, the teacher, the chaperon, and the bus driver, who are seated in the members gallery, rise and receive the reception of the Assembly.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of rising to introduce two guests seated in your gallery: Mr. Roy Randolph from Edmonton and Mr. Ray Toews from Fort Vermilion. Mr. Toews is a member of the ID advisory council in Fort Vermilion. Mr. Randolph, active in the Metis association, is the grandson of Mr. Joseph Lafleur.

Members will recall that this year is the fiftieth anniversary of the famous flight of Wop May and Vic Horner to the community of Fort Vermilion. Mr. Randolph's grandfather and his uncle, Mr. William Lambert, were the two people who got the message out. They had to take it out by dog team in order to facilitate that famous flight in Alberta's history. I would ask both gentlemen to stand and be recognized by the House.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, two visitors from Oceanside in the state of California, Mr. and Mrs. Hopwood, who are presently stamping around Alberta, getting their passports stamped, and showing us there is in fact a way to get here from California. Would Mr. and Mrs. Hopwood stand and receive the welcome of this Assembly.

head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Department of Municipal Affairs

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to announce the completion of the work of the Provincial-Municipal Finance Council. Their report represents the completion of four years of work by that council, which was established in May 1975 and included representation from the provincial government, the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association, the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties, and the Alberta School Trustees' Association. Under the capable leadership of the former Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Hon. Dick Johnston, the finance council conducted an extensive investigation into all aspects of municipal finance assessment and taxation.

The actual terms of reference of the council, Mr. Speaker, were to examine and recommend upon which services should be provided by the provincial and municipal governments and the sources of funding

for such services; the requirements and sources of revenue of capital works in rapidly growing municipalities; municipal property assessment and taxation procedures; the Alberta assessment equalization procedure; matters raised in the report of the government task force on provincial-municipal fiscal arrangements, dated December 1972; as well as other matters that from time to time might be referred to the council. The council was also required to submit reports from time to time to the Executive Council, the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association, the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties, and the Alberta School Trustees' Association.

Mr. Speaker, the report contains some 84 recommendations, representing the consensus of the Provincial-Municipal Finance Council membership. The council was unable to reach such a consensus in only one instance, that being in the area of assessment and taxation of farm property. A minority report from the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties is included with the main text of the report.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation, as well as that of my colleagues, to the members of the council, who I feel addressed a very difficult and complex subject and provided in their recommendations many positive and constructive suggestions to the resolution of municipal finance problems as well as taxation and assessment.

Our government will now be reviewing the report, and I'm sure will be incorporating many of the recommendations into provincial policy.

Mr. Speaker, this report is being provided this week or early next week to all municipal governments and school boards within the province of Alberta for their review. In filing copies for the Legislature Library, I would like to indicate as well that members of the Assembly will receive copies later today.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: There seem to be some misconceptions, albeit mostly outside the Assembly, concerning the rules which members and the Speaker are expected to follow in regard to the question period in a parliament which adheres to the tradition this one belongs to. Misconceptions of this kind can lead to possibly unnecessary discussion of points of order, which perhaps could be prevented if we were to have a full understanding of these limitations and if we could avoid, for example, the loss of time in the question period which we had yesterday.

In the hope of avoiding that sort of thing I would like to say, first of all, that the question period is something very special to our parliamentary system. I'm sure you won't find it behind the Iron Curtain. You won't even find it in the United States. It wouldn't happen in an ordinary sitting of Congress or of a state legislature that the members would, for example, be able to quiz the President or secretaries of the various departments, or perhaps the governor of a state.

This unique institution of the question period is, of course, subject to certain rules in the interest of fairness. In April 1975, the traditional rules which govern the question period were summarized by the distinguished Speaker of the House of Commons. The summary is based largely on Citation 171, which has often been mentioned here, of the Fourth Edition of *Beauchesne*.

It's reproduced in this Fifth Edition of *Beauchesne*, published just recently. In the interests of saving time on other occasions, if I might impose on the time of the Assembly for a moment, I would like to refer to this summary prepared by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

The Speaker expressed some general principles in order to clarify the regulations and restrict the negative qualifications which traditionally have guided the Question Period.

A brief question, seeking information about an important matter of some urgency which falls within the administrative responsibility of the government or of the specific Minister to whom it is addressed, is in order.

- (1) It must be a question, not an expression of an opinion, representation, argumentation, nor debate.
- (2) The question must be brief. A preamble need not exceed one carefully drawn sentence. A long preamble on a long question takes an unfair share of time and provokes the same [kind] of reply. A supplementary question should need no preamble.
- (3) The question ought to seek information and, therefore, cannot be based upon a hypothesis, cannot seek an opinion, either legal or otherwise, and must not suggest its own answer, be argumentative, or make representations.
- (4) It ought to be on an important matter, and not be frivolous.
- (5) The matter ought to be of some urgency. There must be some present value in seeking the information during the Question Period rather than through the *Order Paper* or through correspondence with the minister or the department.
- (6) A question must be within the administrative competence of the Government. The Minister to whom the question is directed is responsible to the House for his present Ministry and not for any decisions taken in a previous portfolio.
- (7) A question must adhere to the proprieties of the House, in terms of inferences, imputing motives or casting aspersions upon persons within the House or out of it.
- (8) A question that has previously been answered ought not to be asked again.
- (9) A question cannot deal with a matter that is before a court.

There is reference here to an explanation of the sub judice rule in Chapter 7 under the Rules of Debate in this volume.

- (10) A question ought not to refer to a statement made outside the House by a Minister.
- (11) A question which seeks an opinion about government policy is probably out of order in that it asks for an opinion and not information. A question asking for a general statement of government policy may be out of order in that it requires a long answer that should be made on motion or in debate. Other questions inevitably deal with government policy and the general restrictions regarding such questions have never been applied.

Then there is the final reference under Number (12) of questions which anticipate a debate, but I don't think we've had too much difficulty in this regard.

I apologize for taking up the time of the House with this matter, but I should confess that reading those rules has also refreshed them in my own mind. [applause]

Annexation Hearings

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and ask if it's the government's intention to broaden the normal terms of reference for the Local Authorities Board when the board is set the task of looking at the annexation proposals from the city of Edmonton.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, it's not our intention to broaden those terms of reference beyond what is, of course, allowed in the legislation. With regard to the procedures that might be used by the division of the board that will hear the Edmonton annexation application, I should say that I'm not in a position today — nor will I be for some length of time — to undertake to provide to the House information about what those procedures might be in terms of differing from the regular procedures of the Local Authorities Board. Before doing that, I want to discuss those matters with whoever is going to be chairing the division of the board that will hear the Edmonton annexation application. I think it's fair as well that that individual, when named, should have an opportunity to consider the representations that have been and obviously will be made by the various municipal governments involved.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Has the government arrived at a decision as to whether the possible form of government in the Edmonton region will be included in the terms of reference for the upcoming hearings?

MR. MOORE: No, Mr. Speaker, we have not arrived at any decision at all on that. I have said publicly that it will be our desire, on hearing the Edmonton annexation application, to get as broad an opinion from the public as possible, recognizing that there have to be some limitations on the length of time that people appear before hearings, and on the number of people with a particular point of view who might appear.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I'm not at liberty to suggest what items might be considered by the panel of the board that hears the Edmonton area annexation application. But I suggest that indeed that panel would have to consider a good number of items that relate to the operation of municipal government and of other entities such as utilities, telephones, and power that relate to a major expansion such as is being requested by the city of Edmonton.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister as a supplementary question. Has the minister now had an opportunity to advise the city of Edmonton with regard to these matters, so that the city can finalize its documents in preparation for the upcoming Local Authorities Board hearings?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I was in a position earlier this morning to advise, in conversation with the mayor

of the city of Edmonton, that it would be our intention to try to complete our work — in terms of naming the panel that might hear the Edmonton annexation application — in early July. Until we have a chairman and two board members in place for that hearing, it would not be our intention to get involved in scheduling events to any greater extent than they've already been scheduled.

I can say that it would be our intention at this time, subject to review with whoever that chairman is, to begin the hearings in about mid-September, recognizing as well that every municipality that has a direct interest in this matter has to be given an opportunity to review the material that's being forwarded by the city of Edmonton. I think as well it's fair to say that the city of Edmonton must be given an opportunity, within some reasonable time frame, to review the material that might be submitted by other municipalities or groups.

I don't feel justified in setting a timetable on that at this time. I think it's a matter that has to be considered carefully by the chairman of that panel, with the thoughts of all those involved in mind.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Following the discussions the minister had with officials of the city of Edmonton today, is the minister in a position to indicate to the Assembly whether the city of Edmonton will now be able to finish their presentations, so that in fact they can be completed and get out to the public so that neighboring municipalities will have an opportunity to prepare their case before the Public Utilities Board?

MR. SPEAKER: I have some difficulty seeing now the minister should be able to report on the readiness of the city of Edmonton unless by chance he happens to have that information.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I did not discuss that matter with the mayor. I only advised him it would be my intention to move very quickly after The Local Authorities Board Amendment Act, 1979, was given third reading, in terms of the appointment of members that would hear the Edmonton annexation application. I did not ask the mayor what the Edmonton city schedule was at the present time with regard to release of documents. However, I had been informed earlier that it was their desire that the panel be put in place before they proceeded too much further.

Skylab is Falling!

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Premier and ask if it's the intention of the government to have any cabinet tours into the central Alberta region during the third week in July.

MR. LOUGHEED: No, Mr. Speaker, it's not.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, would the Premier be in a position to indicate to the Assembly whether any cabinet ministers will be in the central part of the province — I'm thinking particularly of the Olds-Didsbury area — during the third week in July? I raise the question in light of the announcement this morning by the Deputy Premier's people in Disaster Services

that during the third week in July the Skylab will be descending ...

MR. NOTLEY: He'd probably want the whole cabinet out there.

MR. R. CLARK: ... and according to the Deputy Premier's statement, it's only the area of Olds-Didsbury where Skylab may be falling.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, there was no intended target, I'm sure. I presume Disaster Services will very democratically and fairly cover all 79 constituencies.

Edmonton Housing Lot Supply

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for either the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the Minister of Housing and Public Works. In light of the public statement by the city of Edmonton that they would not service present annexations approved by the Local Authorities Board and would intervene as opponents in any private annexations, can the minister advise the present supply of average-priced lots, in the event the city is successful in its policy of not servicing, or preventing, private annexations?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, of course I find the question of lot supply a difficult one to get at. As I recall, the supply in the Edmonton area varies from something in the order of five years if one is talking to the industry, to 20 years if one is talking to planners. Regarding serviced lot supply, with the same reference, the numbers I recall are between six months and two years.

MR. KNAAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the department looked into the impact a shortage of lots would have on the price of lots, on the realistic assumption that the two major projects planned will go ahead in the near future?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, thinking back to the Alberta/Montana study, the recommendation was that one achieved the lowest costs if the lot supply were something in excess of 20 years, perhaps 25 years. I have asked the department for a current assessment of the Edmonton situation. When I get that I will be in a better position to respond. But obviously lot supply has a direct bearing, in my view at least, on the cost of the delivered lots.

MR. KNAAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister plan to make a presentation to the city of Edmonton with respect to that decision, in particular with respect to having them review that decision of intervening in private annexation proposals and not servicing land?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, that question might be somewhat hypothetical, in that we don't really know the ultimate conclusion there. However, certainly I would consider that when I get the response from the department, in terms of what the current situation really is.

Energy Discussions

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question either to the hon. Premier or the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources and ask whether there was any briefing by the government of Canada concerning the proposals the government of Canada will be making to the present Tokyo summit conference that have energy implications for the province of Alberta.

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, there was, Mr. Speaker. On Friday last the Prime Minister and I had a fairly extensive conversation about the Tokyo summit meeting. He called me and asked for my views and those of the government of Alberta. We discussed not just energy matters, because some bilateral discussions are involved, but the prime focus was on energy matters. They were discussed with the Prime Minister in anticipation of his trip to Tokyo this week.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. During the discussions with the Prime Minister of Canada, did the Prime Minister make any suggestion with respect to the use of the Alberta heritage fund in terms of investment in increasing Canada's energy supplies?

MR. LOUGHEED: Not on that occasion, Mr. Speaker. Of course we have had previous discussions with regard to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and I would presume the Prime Minister is well aware that at the moment there's a very substantial investment of the heritage fund in the non-conventional area relative to the Syncrude project.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Just for clarification, there was no suggestion by the Prime Minister that there should be additional investment from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund beyond the investment already in oil sands or research?

MR. LOUGHEED: Not directly, Mr. Speaker, although I raised with the Prime Minister the thought that he follow up on the initiative raised by the Prime Minister of Japan a number of weeks ago, of the interest of the Japanese government specifically in the *in situ* oil sands relative to technology, on the basis that we felt it would be good from the standpoint of trading relations between Canada and Japan to respond to that initiative — that it would be beneficial to Alberta to have technology from Japan involved in the Alberta oil sands, even though they might not be able to count on a supply arising from the technology. That was related to oil sands development but not specifically with regard to further investment of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

If I could though, Mr. Speaker, I would just say that simply by not discussing the matter with the Prime Minister I wouldn't want either the hon. member or the Legislature to take it that we rule out investments by the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund in future oil sands projects.

MR. NOTLEY: A further supplementary question to the hon. Premier or the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Did any discussion occur on Friday

last, or during the minister's trip to Ottawa, concerning the pace of development of the Alberta oil sands in view of present energy problems in the world?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it is a double question. For my part, with regard to the discussion with the Prime Minister, there was not. I refer the second part of the question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I did not have any discussions about the pace of development of the oil sands during my meeting with the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources on Wednesday last.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. During the discussions with the federal minister, was any suggestion made by the federal minister concerning investment from the heritage trust fund?

MR. LEITCH: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. Premier. During the discussions with the Prime Minister of Canada, was any suggestion made by the Prime Minister concerning voluntary conservation measures the province of Alberta might consider?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, of course I have some difficulty with these questions, because they involve discussions between the Prime Minister and me. I've responded to them to this point because of their nature and because I believe it's in the public interest to do so.

We had a fairly extensive discussion about energy issues and the energy pressures that would be placed upon Canada in these discussions, and one of them obviously included the matter of conservation and avoiding waste of energy in the country. I don't think I can respond further to that, other than that the subject was dealt with.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Is the government of Alberta giving serious consideration to new initiatives in the area of energy conservation, particularly with respect to changes in the building codes and the speed limits?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, no consideration is being given to speed limits. There's some debate, of course, as to the validity of that approach.

As we've said on other occasions in this House, we are looking at conservation on a Canadian basis. Because of our very special position in energy resources, I really think it would be very difficult to convince Albertans to undertake conservation measures that were not being undertaken across the country. So I really believe it has to be a federal initiative and certainly has to be taken with a high emphasis in those areas dependent upon imported oil.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary by the hon. member, followed by a supplementary by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray, a further one by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, and a final one by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question I would ask the Premier whether the Prime Minister gave him assurance, particularly in the light of a good deal of pressure from Europe for very tough conservation measures — whether conservation would occur only as a result of agreement between the federal government and the provinces, or whether the federal government would be taking legislative initiatives beyond a joint federal/provincial agreement.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it wasn't discussed in that frame of reference. I believe, and time will tell, that the Prime Minister is aware of the nature of our federal system, and that conservation measures of that nature cannot be imposed by the federal government, and within our federal state would have to be a matter of consensus between the provinces and the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray.

MR. WEISS: My question has been answered Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary McKnight.

MR. MUSGREAVE: My question's been answered, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Did the Premier discuss with the Prime Minister the increase in price per barrel? The indications from the Tokyo conference are that the Prime Minister favors a \$2 increase next January and a \$1 increase every six months thereafter. Did the Prime Minister discuss that policy with the Premier?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, not in a precise way. We discussed the general matter of energy pricing, but we recognized that our respective energy ministers had just had a meeting and had both publicly reported that it was a matter of giving the new federal government an opportunity to assess its situation, and that there would be discussions on that particular matter this fall, as the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources has reported to this House.

Northlands Park Dispute

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Solicitor General. Last Monday the hon. minister was asked certain questions related to the problems at Northlands Park. There was an article in the paper about the same subject. My question to the minister is: the article and the questions being diametrically opposed, did the minister give . . .

MR. NOTLEY: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Could the hon. member perhaps just come directly to the question, and especially leave out the article in the newspaper.

DR. BUCK: Speak to Farran.

MR. HYLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Did the minister give an interview to the paper expressing a different opinion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret very much to interrupt the hon. member. Possibly he might wish to have a moment of reflection to get the specific item of information in a different way. But it really would take up a lot of time in the question period if ministers were answerable here for their interviews with the media.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, is the minister's present position as was indicated in the House?

MR. NOTLEY: Changed his mind in two days.

MR. HARLE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the questions and answers on Monday are on the record in *Hansard*.

MR. HYLAND: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister have anything further to offer related to the solutions of the problems discussed?

MR. HARLE: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the matter involving the wobble at Northlands has been resolved. I understand that racing will resume on Thursday, missing today. The parties will try to reconcile their differences, and the chairman of the Racing Commission has agreed to have a meeting of the commission if necessary following a lapse of two weeks.

Herbicide Hazards

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Environment. There has been an increasing use of chemicals for spraying ditches in my constituency, and a strong lobby is building to cease spraying with the chemical 2,4,5-T. I wonder if the minister might comment if the department is going to continue to let municipalities use this chemical.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could respond to the Member for Grande Prairie by expanding a bit on the use of the chemical he refers to, 2,4,5-T. It is permitted in Canada under its licensing procedure, and is still permitted in the provinces and Alberta in particular.

Under our legislation, we license and give permits where it is applied close to water or in green areas. The licensing requires a fairly substantial testing of the operator and is permitted by commercial operators. My information is that not very much 2,4,5-T is being used in the province at present. We'll continue to monitor it because of its rather questionable properties.

Women in the Public Service

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister responsible for Personnel Administration. I recognize that normally these questions might have been put during study of his estimates, but regrettably I wasn't able to be present in the House.

My questions are in the area of female government employees. I'd like to ask the minister if he could

indicate what progress is being made in the promotion of female government employees to executive or supervisory positions; that is, the senior level, other than ministerial assistants.

MR. NOTLEY: Order Paper.

DR. BUCK: Very little.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased the Member for Edmonton Norwood has raised this question. It is a sensitive issue with all our public service of Alberta, nearly half of whom are female. I think it's also a concern to all men and women who may seek employment with Alberta.

Roughly half our employees are female, about 49 per cent — 51 per cent are obviously men. [interjections] In the Alberta service about four years ago there were 105 or so women in our managerial group. But I'm pleased to say that as of the end of last year, over 200 women are in our managerial group, a total of 7 per cent of our managers. And that's growing. The percentage of women entering managerial levels is growing at a more rapid rate than men entering the civil service.

MRS. CHICHAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister advise whether at the present time there are specific programs to encourage female employees who demonstrate competence to make applications for such positions as they become available?

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, the Personnel Administration department has an organizational development division, and within that division is a special career planning group. That group has as its special emphasis the need to instil reception and enhancement in our total managerial service in all departments — reception for the employment of our female employees, in fact all employees, and their growth in career service. So far we have a co-ordinator in each department who works with all staff to ensure there are no stereotyping or sex-typing practices in our positions. I hope they bring to their departments an awareness of the need for recognition of the merit of all candidates; that's part of our objective.

We have special training programs for our females. Preparing for the job interview is one. That may sound unusual, but many women have not had that experience. Perhaps they have been out and involved in family for 20 years. So preparing for the job interview is a key area for our women. Career development for women is also a program we provide. We've had over 1,000 staff enter those programs. We have programs on professionalism in secretarial and other areas.

Hopefully, we have ensured there are no sexist words in our personnel practice manuals. We have tried to produce a number of booklets on questions an interviewer should not ask. I hope these things will help our female employees grow and seek promotion.

MRS. CHICHAK: One more supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to respond perhaps to the retort about putting it on the Order Paper. But I'll ask my question here, because I don't take my direction from the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

DR. BUCK: You can ask it in caucus.

MRS. CHICHAK: I choose my questions in caucus. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to continue with my supplementary.

DR. BUCK: Well, ask the question.

MRS. CHICHAK: I'd like to direct my supplementary to the minister. To what extent have moves been made to narrow the gap in income levels between male and female employees in the government?

DR. BUCK: He just happens to have that here.

MR. STEVENS: No, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to refer to the average annual salary for all employees and show how it relates to our female and male statistics. In our annual report, which has been tabled and all members have, I believe the average annual salary for all employees is \$15,941. The problem is that as far as our females are concerned, the majority of whom are in the first two divisions in our bargaining unit, in clerical and secretarial roles, their salaries are \$12,509; whereas the average salary of males, the majority of whom are in trades, is in the range of \$19,751.

I guess it's the nature of society today that males tend to seek trade-related duties, enter universities, SAIT, or NAIT, and go into those areas in a great preponderance; whereas at this moment females in our service are entering the clerical/secretarial area. But we have encouraged and hope more women will take the other avenues. The opportunities are there for them. The gap is still there.

Petro-Canada Status

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources with regard to discussions the minister had with the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Was Petro-Canada discussed, and did the minister make any recommendation to the federal minister on behalf of Alberta?

MR. LEITCH: No to both questions, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister or his departmental officials doing any kind of assessment of the implications of the selling of Petro-Canada to private interests, possibly in Alberta?

MR. LEITCH: No, Mr. Speaker.

Prison Study

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Solicitor General. It's to follow up a question I asked several weeks ago on the prison review report the government requested and that was due to be completed this March. Is the minister now in a position to indicate if that review has been completed and if it is available to members and the public?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is referring to a study entitled Alberta Corrections Master Plan by the firm, Moyer & Associates Inc. of

Chicago. If he's referring to that study, it is almost completed, although the final report has not yet been received.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister indicate what Canadian companies were offered the contract, or did this prestigious American company request to do this report?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, the study was commissioned by the Department of Housing and Public Works. Perhaps my hon. colleague wishes to respond to that question.

MR. CHAMBERS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. When the department's recommendation came to me, I asked that very question. The answer of course was that in this specialized field of the structural aspects of correctional facilities, there aren't that many consultants. Moyer & Associates Inc. was the obvious choice.

Fort Saskatchewan Correctional Institution

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Solicitor General. From some of the information in the preliminary report, some facilities were inadequate. Can the minister indicate the future of the physical plant of the Fort Saskatchewan Correctional Institution? There have been some rumors that that facility . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has asked his question.

DR. BUCK: . . . would be closed down. Is that facility going to remain open?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, certainly for the immediate present that facility will be continuing. When the Edmonton Remand Centre is completed and ready to be used, that will of course relieve the pressure on the Fort Saskatchewan Correctional Institution. Certainly there are no present plans to make any change in the operation of the Fort Saskatchewan Correctional Institution, except that it will become an institution that does not have within it the remand population it presently has to contend with.

DR. BUCK: My last supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister assure the staff in Fort Saskatchewan that the female section there will remain open?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, as far as I am aware the female section will continue. As I believe I've said on other occasions, because of the increasing number of females involved in crimes, the population of female inmates is likely to increase. Therefore the female section in the Fort Saskatchewan Correctional Institution will probably be improved and expanded.

Housing in Recreation Areas

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Recreation and Parks. Could the minister indicate the policy of the government with regard to making Crown leases

available to individuals for building cabins in recreational areas?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I believe that question should be directed to the Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife.

MR. MILLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Generally speaking, our policy is not to encourage building cabins on Crown land. However, we have miscellaneous leases, which we generally issue to private groups or organizations for the benefit of more than one person; for example, Elks clubs, legions, or Boy Scouts. They obtain miscellaneous leases to put cabins on Crown land.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. I was thinking of cabins within recreational areas such as provincial parks. Is more leased Crown land going to be made available for building cabins in recreational areas, or are they going to phase out this program?

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, the policy within parks is not to recommend any more construction of cottages, and in some cases we're encouraging owners of cottages to sell back to the department for recreation purposes.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Bonnyville.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question has already been dealt with. Thank you.

Vietnamese Refugees

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct my question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Reading the telexes he tabled in the House yesterday, I wonder if he could indicate to the House whether he has had any meetings with the Minister of Employment and Immigration in Ottawa and, secondly, what input the government of Alberta has had in setting quotas for the immigration of Vietnamese refugees.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Ron Atkey, Minister of Employment and Immigration, was here yesterday. I met with him and his senior department officials for an hour and a half. During our discussions we reviewed the recently announced federal government position with respect to increasing the allotment of Vietnamese refugees that Canada is prepared to accept.

At that meeting I indicated to the hon. minister that Alberta was prepared to continue its full co-operation with the federal government with respect to the number of refugees coming to Alberta, and reaffirmed our position that we would not ask for nor look with favor upon any set quota in terms of percentages of the population. So whatever numbers will be received into Canada as a result of the recent federal government position will depend on a number of factors — as to the percentage that Alberta will receive within our borders.

MR. COOK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate roughly what percentage of the additional 2,000 refugees who will be brought

to Canada might be housed in Alberta? Secondly, has the Alberta government made any representations as to the extension of additional quotas, in view of the fact that 1 million people are about to become refugees from Vietnam?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think I should clarify one matter and bring to the attention of the House that 3,000 additional refugees will be received. The additional allotment of 2,000 which had been referred to earlier has been increased by 1,000 by the federal government.

With respect to the concerns expressed by the hon. member, I wish to advise the Assembly that I made it clear to the hon. federal minister that it was a matter for the federal government, in consultation with such international organizations as the United Nations, to arrive at a working agreement with respect to the number of refugees who will be received by Canada. But I emphasized again that it was not our intention as a government to request any quota system for Alberta. Indeed, the percentage we have received in the past several years and which will likely continue, in view of our economic circumstances, is well over 14 per cent. I've indicated that in discussion of the department estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary McKnight.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, my question has been asked.

Janvier School Closing

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, I address my question to the Minister of Education. Would he advise this Assembly what course of action was taken in regard to the school closure at Janvier, Alberta?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, at approximately 3 a.m. yesterday there was a case of assault against two teachers in the Janvier community. For reasons which were valid to those two teachers and to the rest of the teaching staff at that time, the decision was made and effected by Northland School Division yesterday that the school at Janvier would be closed effective yesterday. The teachers have been removed from the community. Members will be aware that the RCMP have been to the community and that, as a result, a charge of assault with a deadly weapon has been laid, according to my information.

I have asked the department, in consultation with the Northland School Division, to consider the question of whether or not it is feasible or desirable to reopen the Janvier school in September, given the serious question of whether qualified teaching staff would be available to provide instruction in that school. I expect to hear from Northland School Division and from the department in that regard in the very near future.

In the meantime, the school has been closed; the staff have been removed.

Cancer Risks among Oil Workers

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. Following a study released by the

United States National Cancer Institute which states that there is a high risk of cancer deaths among workers in petroleum industries and petrochemical plants in Texas, and since Alberta petroleum workers are viewing cancer danger as a major concern in contract negotiations, could the minister advise the Assembly if the division of health and safety is carrying out any studies regarding cancer risks among Alberta oil workers?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, as indicated the other evening during study of the estimates, we presently fund some \$10,000 to the W.W. Cross Cancer Institute in Edmonton to study the history and exposure, and to try to link the possible causes of cancer with mortality throughout the province in all areas. This would include oil workers.

MRS. EMBURY: May I ask a supplementary question please, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister advise the Assembly if the American study, when released, will be reviewed in the department to consider any implications that could apply to Alberta oil workers?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, we're always provided with information from south of the border. My officials are awaiting a copy of the report, which may in time be shared with the advisory committee on radiation.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is any effort being made by the department to review not only the United States report but reports of a similar nature around the world? Is there an ongoing process of reviewing these reports so that any research done in Alberta can be supplementary to information obtained from other jurisdictions, not just the United States but around the world?

MR. DIACHUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, these contacts are made. Several people in the occupational health and safety division were trained and educated in other parts of the world and keep in contact with other parts of the world.

May I point out at the same time that we are satisfied that the standards in Alberta are adhered to quite strictly. The question may be whether the standards are low enough. This is presently being reviewed in the review of the regulations.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary McKnight wishes to ask a supplementary, and I have recognized the hon. Member for Red Deer. Would the Assembly agree to deal with those questions, notwithstanding the expiry of the time for question period?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, my question was to the minister, and he partially answered it in his final answer. My understanding is that in the state of California the requirements are much higher than in other parts of the United States. Has there been pressure on his department from organized workers that the environmental standards regarding cancer, as brought up by the Member for Calgary North West, should be higher rather than lower?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, yes. When the representatives of the trade union movement met with me, they indicated that they are presently making representation and will continue, and they are sharing in the review of the regulations with the hope of bringing about an increased or higher standard.

Rail Passenger Service

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Economic Development. Can he advise the members if the results have yet been announced of public hearings held recently by the federal government on the closure of rail passenger service between Calgary and Edmonton?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge. But I will check for the hon. member and find out. I expect we would be notified as soon as that result is out.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS (Committee of Supply)

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

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

Department of Social Services and Community Health

Agreed to:

Total Vote 2 — Social Allowance	\$181,807,630
Total Vote 3 — Child Welfare Services	\$43,816,480

Vote 4 — Specialized Social Services

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think the minister indicated he wants to answer some questions at this point, and I suspect there may be some for him.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, questions were raised last night regarding a number of votes, and I did indicate at that time that it would be more appropriate to answer them when we got to that vote. Some of those question related to Vote 4, and I would like to make the following comments.

First of all, dealing with Metis settlements and some of the related incidents and the questions and concerns raised following last Monday's actions, one of the things I'd like to clarify for my hon. colleagues is that if we're going to discuss the issues, let's use factual bases, not innuendo or half-truths.

As a specific example . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: I certainly hope the minister will explain the statement he has just made about innuendos and not facts.

MR. BOGLE: I intend to, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there are any questions, I think you can take them up at the end of his comments.

MR. BOGLE: As a specific example, Mr. Chairman, I'll use some concerns raised by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview regarding the Isolated Communities Advisory Board. That particular body was funded through a PSS grant over a period of years, and the facts are that the announcement was made in April of last year that the funding would discontinue as of May 15. The rent for accommodations in the Canadian Native Friendship Centre in Slave Lake ran out on June 15. After that point in time the president of the Isolated Communities Advisory Board, along with the PSS director in Slave Lake, entered the offices. The files belonging to the Isolated Communities Advisory Board were taken by the president. The furnishings, which had been purchased or supplied through PSS, were redirected to other projects.

Now that's a far cry, Mr. Chairman, from the kind of situation presented for us last evening. When I say we should be dealing from a factual basis, that's an example of what I'm referring to.

Another example was given of a 5-ton dump truck and associated equipment from the Paddle Prairie settlement. Again, the facts are that the equipment was collected, a proper inventory of the equipment was made, and the equipment was returned to the settlement council.

Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to go through the long harangue of the activities again. If hon. members wish to raise questions on Vote 4, I'll attempt to respond to them directly. But again I ask, Mr. Chairman, that those questions be based on fact and not on fiction.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to comment on a couple of points that the hon. minister raised, because I think it is important that we discuss the facts of the situation. I should point out for the benefit of the minister that with respect to both the Isolated Communities Advisory Board and the Paddle Prairie situation, which I intend to go into in a little more detail, we have taken the initiative in contacting the former president of the Isolated Communities Advisory Board as well as the chairman of the Paddle Prairie Metis settlement. Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with both these issues, one at a time.

First of all, with respect to the Isolated Communities Advisory Board, the minister indicates that the furniture was deployed to other areas. That is true. That's my understanding as well. However, some of the furniture was given by people, and it was deployed by the department without any reference to the people who donated the furniture or, I should say as well, without reference to the Isolated Communities Board last year.

I think it should also be noted, Mr. Minister, that while the department terminated the funding — and we had a debate in this House more than a year ago over that — when PSS decided to cut off their share of the funding, that was an end of the funding but it was not a formal dissolution of the Isolated Communities Advisory Board. My understanding, in contacting the president of the Isolated Communities Advisory Board, was that while the funding was cut off there was not an intention on the part of the Isolated Communities Advisory Board to cease to exist.

What we're talking about here is an action by the

department on May 15 of last year. In my judgment we have furniture being seized, not given back to the people who donated it originally, and deployed to other areas without the consent of the people who gave it. But the point has to be made, as I understand it — and again I confirm that we discussed this with not only the office manager at the time but the president — that it was done not as a result of any initiative by the board. The board did not wish to cease. It was a termination of funding. They're two entirely different things, Mr. Minister. The termination of funding is one thing. That may be the prerogative of PSS; it may be the prerogative of the Alberta government. But whether or not there would be an Isolated Communities Advisory Board is surely up to the communities in question.

Mr. Chairman, I want now to deal with the events in Paddle Prairie. Again, so there's no misunderstanding — the minister has obviously talked to people in the department — my office has contacted Mr. Martineau, who has given us information that, in my judgment, is accurate. First of all, the material that was recovered was taken by the department. Eighteen spools of wire were returned, Mr. Minister, if we're going to get down to a detailed discussion of what was returned. But the other things that were taken were not returned. That is not an assessment made a few weeks ago. That's an assessment made yesterday — a matter of several hours before the questions were raised in this House — by Mr. Martineau who, in my judgment, is in a position to know.

So if we're going to talk about facts, I think we can look at both sides of this issue. As I see it, the facts clearly indicate that the development branch did not act in a correct way.

I'm not sure whether the minister mentioned the Peavine settlement with respect to the Caterpillar. I think I heard him mention it, but I'll await his response. If he does, I have some points to raise there, too.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, first, would the hon. member identify the former president of the Isolated Communities Advisory Board whom he refers to?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Beaver was the president of the Isolated Communities Advisory Board.

MR. BOGLE: Well, just to bring the hon. member up to date, Mr. Beaver resigned from the association when he became vice-president of the Indian Association, and Mr. Jerry Noskey became the acting president. It was through Mr. Noskey that we worked.

The hon. member may be interested in one other point, and I repeat: the lease expired on the premises occupied by the Isolated Communities Advisory Board on June 15. It was after that date that the equipment was returned to PSS, where it was immediately put to use for other community-related works through PSS in the Slave Lake area.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just to follow that up. Certainly Mr. Beaver resigned the presidency. But the point remains that there was no initiative, if you like, on the part of the Isolated Communities Advisory Board itself. Many people in the isolated communities wanted to continue the operation of the board. What we had, Mr. Chairman, was a decision by the govern-

ment to discontinue funding.

With respect to the furniture: whether or not it was reallocated to other community groups is, in my view, really something which should take into account the fact that it was donated to the Isolated Communities Advisory Board, not to PSS.

MR. BOGLE: That's not accurate, Mr. Chairman. I did mention earlier that the president of the Isolated Communities Advisory Board, Mr. Noskey — not the former president, Mr. Beaver, but Mr. Noskey — did take personal files of the Isolated Communities Advisory Board with him. Other furnishings were taken back by other members of the Isolated Communities Advisory Board. The equipment which was returned for other use in Slave Lake through our PSS branch consisted of two filing cabinets, one desk, and a chair.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just to follow that up further, and we can carry on for some time. The discussions my office had concerning this particular case would lead me to be firmly of the view, particularly after discussing the matter with the lady who had been the secretary in the office, that in fact the seizures had taken place, that there was strong opinion among many people in the Isolated Communities Advisory Board that they wished to continue, that what we had was a termination of funding, which is one thing. But whether or not the board wished to continue is surely another. I also had the very direct assertion made that furniture which was donated to the Isolated Communities Advisory Board was taken by PSS.

MR. BOGLE: Possibly, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would carry out his discussions with the man who was the president of the association at the time, he'll get his facts straight.

MR. NOTLEY: I think the facts are very clear. What we had was a move by the government in this particular case. One can get into a debate, and perhaps we should, on why the funding for the Isolated Communities Advisory Board was terminated. Mr. Chairman, that is another issue, but I think an important issue, too.

What we see, Mr. Chairman — and I come back as well to the case of the Paddle Prairie colony, Mr. Minister, right down to the facts of the case. Let's talk about the Paddle Prairie settlement. We have a situation where the so-called inventory of the things seized — the things returned were 18 spools of wire. Not all the things seized, but 18 spools of wire. Mr. Minister, if we're going to talk about facts, let's talk about facts.

MR. BOGLE: Again, Mr. Chairman, the incident raised yesterday by the hon. member took place two years ago. I ask the hon. member who is raising the concerns: did he speak with the person who was the chairman of the settlement at that time? The information I have is that the material was properly inventoried and returned to the settlement council.

But on a broader question, Mr. Chairman, surely I don't have to remind the hon. member of the right of the opposition to designate a motion. If this is such a great concern, designate it, and we'll have a good, open discussion on the matter.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the best place to have an open discussion on any matter in this House is in the well-established tradition of the minister's estimates. That's the best place to have a discussion, where there is no restriction on time, where we can put questions that should be answered in the House. I just say again to the minister: despite the information he was given by his department, the same department that last Monday commissioned these seizures . . .

DR. BUCK: Raids.

MR. NOTLEY: Raids, yes. Seizures, to put it in the most delicate parliamentary language.

This is the department which took material from the Paddle Prairie settlement two years ago. The minister says, well, two years ago, so what? The fact of the matter is: whether it was two years ago is totally irrelevant. The people who are now in the settlement were contacted as to what material was returned from that seizure two years ago. I'm told 18 spools of wire were returned, not all the things the minister implied. If we're going to talk about facts, Mr. Minister, let's talk about facts.

Let's talk about some of the things, too, in some of the other settlements. I raised the question of Peavine last night, and the fact that they now have a Caterpillar doing brushing. That's a good thing. I think most members of the committee would think that would be the kind of initiative a settlement should be taking, somewhat similar to the objectives outlined here the other night by the Minister responsible for Native Affairs. But it took three months to get it, and then only after a deputy minister had specified that they not buy it. They had to get it on a rental/purchase basis.

Or we have the problems in Peavine with the community hall. Here again, Mr. Chairman, we had just one horror story after another. I can go into some detail. In my view, the fact of the matter is that we have an attitude on the part of the branch which still reflects the view that these people living in the settlements are really in colonies. I thought when we changed the terminology, and no longer called them Metis colonies, that we had recognized, with The Human Rights Act passed in 1972, and The Individual's Rights Protection Act, that we're talking about people who have rights living in settlements, and not colonies any more. Yet when I see the actions of the branch, Mr. Minister, all too often it appears to me as if we're still talking about colonies and colonists, rather than people who have full rights as individuals in this province.

MR. BOGLE: I don't want to belabor the points, Mr. Chairman, but it seems to me that if I wanted some information on how this government operated between 1935 and 1971, I would ask someone who had been in that administration. I wouldn't be asking someone who represented the government either prior to or since that time. Again I come back to this issue: if you want the facts on the Isolated Communities Advisory Board, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member speak with the man who was president at the time. If you want the facts on the Paddle Prairie Metis settlement, speak to the person who was the chairman of the settlement association at that time, and you will get them.

MR. NOTLEY: The fact of the matter is, Mr. Minister, that someone hasn't come along with a magic wand, and all the people who lived in the Paddle Prairie settlement two years disappeared and we have a completely new group of people living there. Let's show some respect for the people who have been elected to these councils.

What we have, Mr. Chairman, is a statement made yesterday by Mr. Martineau, whom I assume the minister would recognize as a person who can speak with some authority on behalf of the people of the Paddle Prairie settlement, that we had 18 spools of wire returned from what was a very significant removal of material two years ago. If we're going to talk about facts, let's get down to the basic facts and not draw all sorts of red herrings across the scene.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister if he's in a position to outline to the committee at this stage where things now stand in terms of the relationship of his department and the legal counsel, Mr. Cote. What is the avenue of communication for any further proposals that have ramifications concerning the Department of Social Services and Community Health?

MR. BOGLE: Before responding to that, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the hon. member is aware that Mr. Martineau, to whom he has referred so many times today, was not — I repeat, was not — the chairman two years ago.

MR. NOTLEY: So what?

MR. BOGLE: It's fairly relevant. You speak with the people who were involved at that time. [interjection]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. BOGLE: With regard to relations between the branch and the Metis people, I did have a meeting last Saturday with the chairmen of the various settlements, along with the executive of the Federation of Metis Settlements, and I would deem it a very positive meeting. We talked about the future, about the things the Metis people are trying to achieve, and the things this government's trying to achieve in terms of the settlement councils assuming more responsibility for operation of activities in the settlements. I see that as an ongoing process.

Last night I well recall the hon. member mentioning housing as an example, almost suggesting that the department went into it kicking its feet. On the contrary, I well recall the proposal Helen Hunley brought forward to cabinet and our caucus to transfer the responsibility of housing on Metis settlements from the Metis betterment branch of the department to the Department of Housing and Public Works, so that the Metis people could work directly with that department through their elected councils. That was done. Not only did it have our concurrence as a government; it had our blessing. That's the kind of thing we've been trying to achieve for some time and will continue to work toward, in consultation with the Metis people.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, we've had different reports on the meeting that took place last week. The minister has said it was a very constructive meeting; the president of the settlements association is not quite so enthused about it.

Did the minister indicate at that time that he would refuse to discuss the seizures of last Monday because the matter was now going to be examined by the Ombudsman?

MR. BOGLE: I did indeed, Mr. Chairman. In fact my office indicated that to the settlements' representative when a request was made for such a meeting, when we discussed the agenda. That's the standard procedure; you don't go into meetings without knowing what you're going to talk about.

During those discussions between my executive assistant and an official for the Metis federation, it was well understood that we would not be discussing the actions of the previous Monday for a very simple reason: the Ombudsman had been requested by the federation to investigate the matter. That had the full concurrence of our department. The matter is under investigation. Once the investigation has been completed and a report given, we'll sit down and discuss it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, what we saw then was the minister saying to the federation and to representatives from the settlements that because the matter was under review by the Ombudsman, the minister would not discuss it. So in fact we had an agenda drawn up by the minister.

Mr. Chairman, my question following up that comment: will the minister assure this House that the department will immediately act upon the Ombudsman's recommendations? And if the Ombudsman finds that seizures have been made in a very questionable way, will the minister assure this committee that action will be taken, even of a disciplinary nature, if the Ombudsman's investigation suggests that in fact there was a problem?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, the first question was with regard to the agenda for the meeting. The agenda was primarily of the making of the Federation of Metis Settlements. I recall that we covered five areas during that meeting, and all five were presented by the federation.

One of the reasons I indicated that from my point of view it was a positive meeting, is that a request I made of the federation was that they sit down with the various settlement councils and work out a proposal, that might be submitted in the near future to both my hon. colleague the Minister responsible for Native Affairs and me, whereby they would identify the kinds of responsibilities and activities they see themselves in. I indicated we would use that as the framework for a future meeting. That seemed perfectly agreeable to everyone present. We set a date for our next meeting, July 9. I see that as an ongoing relationship, similar to the relationship my predecessor had with the Metis settlements. I well recall that during the last 12 months alone, she met at least twice with the federation, possibly three times. So I see that as positive.

With regard to the Ombudsman's report, I know the hon. member is not asking me to prejudge the recommendations the Ombudsman would make. The hon. member also knows it has been the practice of this House, and of this government, to weigh very seriously any recommendations given us by the Ombudsman. Once the Ombudsman's report is in, I will look at it very carefully. If there are areas in it that suggest an

impropriety, that's one of the things that I'll look at most carefully.

MR. NOTLEY: Would "looking at" involve disciplinary action, if disciplinary action is required?

MR. BOGLE: I won't rule out any activities. The Ombudsman's report could come out suggesting anything on a broad scale. It might say on one hand that there was nothing wrong. From a legal point of view, I understand that is absolutely accurate. You're speaking of government offices, government files, government employees, and the government receiving back its own files.

Last evening some hon. members raised the question of personal files that happened to be in those filing cabinets. I'm sure hon. members are aware that before each set of files was removed, someone from the settlement examined the filing cabinets. Some material was taken out in each and every case. The fact that some material was not removed is something that happened. That's the kind of thing I felt very badly about, as did my officials. We responded immediately and saw to it that files which clearly were not the property of the government of Alberta were returned. Again, the Ombudsman may come in with other recommendations. Once they're in, I'll review them very carefully.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. In the meeting with regard to this agenda of five items, was there a request by representatives of the Metis settlements to review or examine the files that are still in government care to see if any other files may be theirs by their definition?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, that question was asked in the question period several days ago. Possibly the hon. Member for Little Bow wasn't in his seat at that time. When the question was asked, I did indicate that one of the settlement chairman made a request for such an observer, if you like. I raised the concern with the group. I asked: do you want me to instruct officials to stop going through the files now, to hold up that process, or do you want me to get on with it so I can ensure that all the files will be back in the hands of the settlement councils and back in our offices on the settlements by Friday of this week? As there was no further discussion on that, I took it that they preferred the latter action. That has been done. That's exactly the direction officials from the department have taken.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, when the seizures were made on Monday of last week — is the minister in a position at this stage to outline clearly to the Assembly under whose orders they were in fact acting? We had the minister indicating that the lawyer, Mr. Cote, had asked that the documents be recovered. We had the Attorney General saying in the House that he apparently wasn't notified. We had the minister, if my memory serves me right, saying he wasn't notified. We had the Minister responsible for Native Affairs saying he wasn't notified. We had the head of the Metis development branch apparently authorizing the recovery of the files.

I would assume that if people were recovering files, they would indicate to the people in question that they were recovering files on the order of the head of the Metis development branch. But I am advised by the

chairman of the Gift Lake settlement that in that particular case the individual recovering the files indicated he was acting on orders of the Department of the Attorney General. Now it seems to me there couldn't have been any orders from the Department of the Attorney General, because the Attorney General didn't know anything about it. This particular gentlemen could only be acting upon the orders of the Metis development branch. I can't imagine the government would be saying that the lawyer representing the Crown in this case would be in a position to be issuing any orders at all.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, if we were to go through *Hansard*, I think we would find answers to the various questions which have been put. Some of the assumptions the hon. member has made today are not accurate. I'll try very briefly to go through the scenario once more.

First of all, the solicitors acting on behalf of the government did make a request through solicitors in the Department of the Attorney General that they wanted the opportunity to review all government files, in preparation both for the litigation and more immediately, for the discovery which is to take place during the month of July. The request for files was then transmitted from officials within the Department of the Attorney General to officials in my department. At that time the executive director of the Metis development branch reviewed the situation. When he, in consultation with others in the branch, plus our native consultant, decided on a course of action that, as I previously indicated, was cleared with an acting deputy minister. I personally did not know of the actions to be taken and, as I've said in this House before, and I'll say it again now, nor should I have been. How procedures are carried out is an administrative matter. There's no way a minister can ask his officials to clear with him each and every item such as that.

Obviously when we're talking about procedure, I've also indicated that there's always an ongoing review between every minister and his or her department as to procedure. I meet with the management policy committee of the department on a regular basis. We discuss how best we can serve the citizens of Alberta, how best we can provide services and do a lot of things. That's part of the ongoing process.

MR. NOTLEY: What we have here is a situation where in six of eight settlements the files were given to the people making the seizures. The question really comes down to: on what basis were these requests made? If these requests were made by officials of the Metis development branch, Mr. Chairman, I think there would be a much greater tendency on the part of the settlement councils to say, no, we're not sure we will surrender the files. In the case of two settlements, they chose not to surrender the files. But when we get representatives from the development branch, Mr. Minister, who say they are acting on orders of the Department of the Attorney General and the Attorney General doesn't know anything about it, and we have the request by the legal counsel and then it goes to the Metis development branch, it seems to me that people who are recovering files on behalf of the Metis development branch should have represented themselves as representatives of the development branch acting upon the

orders of the director of that branch, not on orders of the Attorney General.

MR. BOGLE: Well there is a lot of assumption mixed in with the innuendo from the hon. member, Mr. Chairman. The Ombudsman is reviewing the case. The Ombudsman will make a report. If what the hon. member is suggesting happened, I'm sure that will be covered. We'll look at it at that time. But I certainly don't accept the points raised by the member, because they conflict with reports I've been given.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that when the minister has an opportunity to meet with the chairman of this particular settlement, he may get a slightly different view. But I raise the point, Mr. Minister, and I think it directly relates to your department: I am not suggesting that as Minister of Social Services and Community Health you can be held responsible for every single action of every single social worker. Far from it. No one is making that assertion in the House. But it seems to me that when we get a situation where files were recovered in the way they were, I find it rather strange that either the director of the development branch or the deputy minister it was cleared with did not consult the minister. I really find that rather strange. No one is suggesting that because we're dealing with an issue — and one could argue the importance of it. But the government must accept the fact that it is relatively important, because we now have an investigation by the Ombudsman. So we're talking about something that is very important. It just isn't possible to sort of slide around something as basic as this and say, this is an administrative matter, it's not my department. Because the importance is already demonstrated by the fact that the minister stood in his place and said, we recovered files that didn't belong to us; we've had to send them back. I've met Mr. Anderson a number of times, and I believe his comment: we will wait and see what the Ombudsman says. But the fact of the matter is that the Ombudsman is now looking into it and, as the minister said a moment ago, with the support of the government.

That being the case, Mr. Minister, you can't look upon this as a simple little administrative matter somewhat parallel to a given social worker making a wrong judgment in a given case. You are talking about a pattern of activity which you have to be responsible for, not just from an administrative point of view, but also from a policy point of view in this House.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I think the real crux of the matter is whether or the offices were government offices. Surely if we're speaking of an office which was not a government office and files that were someone else's, then the concerns raised by the hon. member go a long, long way from what I understand the facts to be. We are talking about government offices, government employees, and government files. The fact remains that on each of the six settlements where the files and the filing cabinets were removed, a member of the settlement perused the files very quickly to glean those which may have been in the filing cabinet inadvertently. They missed some. Fine. Those files which were missed were identified by the department and were returned as quickly as could be done. Other files pertinent to the operation of our government offices in

the settlements will be returned no later than this Friday.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the minister has still not answered the question of who is really running this department. It seems to me that a very serious situation has developed over the last few days. The director made a decision that apparently was checked with the deputy minister, but for some inexplicable reason the minister wasn't consulted. We can argue that point. The minister says, well, it's just a case of recovering government files from government buildings. In fact, Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with a pattern of relationships between the settlements on one hand and the government on the other. Yes, we are, Mr. Minister. Everyone in this House and in the province knows the settlements are very unhappy with it. They're not unhappy with it because four or five members of the opposition have been raising it; they're unhappy with it because they didn't like the way the department did it.

The minister says: I'm in charge of policy; I'm not in charge of administration. Well if you're in charge of policy, you're also in charge of the way that department operates vis-a-vis the settlements so you maintain good will. I can't imagine a minister sitting back and saying, it's not up to the director to consult me because it's an administrative matter, if that administrative decision sets back efforts on the part of government to establish a climate of understanding between the government on one hand and the settlements on the other. That's the thing I find rather strange about this whole case, Mr. Minister.

I find it equally strange that the government's counsel didn't communicate the settlements' proposal for joint review of the files, which would have avoided this problem. So you have the government counsel not communicating this information, you have the director of the Metis development branch authorizing the seizures without consulting with the minister, and you have an action which is creating ill will between the government and the settlements. You are responsible for that, Mr. Minister. The buck stops at your door on that score.

MR. BOGLE: Before going on to the matter of policy and administration, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member again has raised as a fact something which has not been demonstrated; that is, the question as to whether or not a proposal was made by the settlements' solicitor to our government solicitor that there should be a joint examination of the files. That is not a fact. That has not been demonstrated. Mr. Chairman, we're going to have great difficulty if the hon. member continues to rely on hearsay, because that's what seems to be happening.

Now, on the other question of policy and administration, I can appreciate the hon. member wanting to blur the two. That would be very convenient, but we have a responsibility as members of this Assembly. Those who are in Executive Council have a responsibility. There are 24 hours in a day. Certain things can be handled and certain things cannot. To suggest that administrative matters should be brought to the minister's attention is completely unworkable.

We do have a responsibility — and it's an item I've raised before on numerous occasions — in what I'll refer to as procedure, carried out by both the public and

the elected arm of the department. To that avail I meet on a regular basis with the management committee of the department, and we discuss some of the procedures. We discuss how best to respond to requests from citizens at large, how to deal with constituency concerns, how much information should be provided: a whole host of things. That's part of procedure: how best to serve the public, how to improve the system. In that area and, as I've said before, in the overall area of the operation of the Department of Social Services and Community Health, I am responsible. No question. As long as I hold this position, I have ultimate responsibility for the actions of my officials as well as my own actions. I'm not ducking that one iota, Mr. Chairman. But to suggest that the minister should know each and every move made by each and every one of his officials is completely ludicrous.

MR. NOTLEY: [Not recorded] missing my point. I just got through making the distinction. There are a large number of employees in the Department of Social Services and Community Health, and no one in this House is suggesting that the minister can possibly be answerable for the quality of performance of every single member of the department.

Mr. Minister, we're not talking about that sort of situation. You see, you are attempting to suggest in this House that what occurred last Monday was just a minor administrative question: government going in and retrieving government files from government buildings. We've had that over and over again. The fact of the matter is the settlements look upon the settlement offices as their offices; they look upon the people in the settlement offices as really part of their staff, paid by the government. That's how they look at it, at least in the settlements I've been in. Mr. Minister, the settlements are so angry because they feel the actions were unnecessary and that the information could have been obtained in other ways.

Mr. Minister, you are responsible for developing with the settlements that bridge of understanding we talk about, because the betterment branch comes under your department. You and the minister in charge of Native Affairs have a primary responsibility in this field. When you have administrative procedures which widen the gap rather than bridge it, that is of sufficient policy significance that you have to be concerned about it.

I find it really quite surprising that the director and the deputy minister would not have consulted with the minister. You know, we weren't born yesterday, Mr. Minister. We know that this has been a controversial matter for the last five or six years. For heaven's sake, we have a \$30 million court case as a result of the controversy. Let's not try to slide around this by: government documents from government buildings. We have a major court case; it's a very sensitive area.

It would seem to me that if you are dealing with that kind of area, you just don't let public servants, however well-motivated they may be, make these decisions. It occurs to me that if those decisions are going to have ramifications on the relations between the settlements and the government of Alberta, those are the sort of things that should be checked with the minister, not whether Mrs. Jones should have a \$10 voucher or a \$12 voucher for extras. No one is saying that. But we're talking about a pattern of conduct in an area that the minister knew was sensitive, the director of the devel-

opment branch knew was sensitive, and that the solicitor for the government knew was sensitive. That's why I find it rather difficult to understand why this consultation didn't take place.

MR. BOGLE: I responded to that question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, just two comments and a question to the minister. As far as I'm concerned this whole situation — the way it has occurred in this Assembly, and the way the questions have been raised and answered — has certainly damaged the relationship between the Assembly and the minister, the minister and the Metis settlements, and the future of the people on the Metis settlements. I think that's unfortunate.

The minister raised some new information today. Last evening it would have been good information, indicating that someone at each office had the opportunity of reviewing the files before they were carted off to Edmonton. I wasn't aware of that earlier. That was very interesting information.

But it still doesn't take away the responsibility of the minister and the government for taking private property of other individuals or groups without, in a sense, due process of law. I raised the question last evening about the possibility of contravening the Bill of Rights. That concerns me very, very much. I think we have a long way at this point in time to try to bring back the confidence of those people that we really are concerned about them here in the Legislature. That's my first point.

The second point I want to make to the minister is: I believe that because this has happened, the needs and future of the Metis people must be a top priority concern of his in the next two years, a priority over other problems he is confronted with. The help and reassurance they need can only come from the minister. It sits with the minister on his desk. That's the second point, and there are ways and means by which that can be done.

The third point is with regard to my concern with the Bill of Rights and the actions taken two weeks ago last Monday. It refers to the investigation of the Ombudsman. Has the minister requested the Ombudsman to investigate that area specifically with regard to the Bill of Rights? Was there a conflict? Did the department act in an inappropriate manner or not? Has the minister specifically asked for that to be in the terms of reference?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, before the hon. minister answers — perhaps it could just as well have been after — I thought I should make a remark or so, limited to the question of the legal proceedings involved. That matter has been intermixed with the questions hon. members have been raising in regard to the documents in the case, and the manner in which they were obtained for examination by the solicitor acting in the case for the government. The reference to due process particularly concerns me. The hon. Member for Little Bow says, and I believe says again, that in his view there is some question about whether due process was followed. There isn't the slightest doubt whatever that due process was followed in all respects of what was done.

The hon. member raises another question: the pres-

ence in government files of some information belonging to others. I wonder how hon. members think that something could be more in accordance with due process than for a person, who is acting on the advice of a solicitor, to proceed to acquire his own documents. I wonder where you go from there, how far afield you wander, before you try to conclude there is something in those circumstances which does not accord with the due process of law. I suggest that those references are not fair.

Further, I particularly want to mention the question about the involvement of a private firm of solicitors. Since yesterday I have had the opportunity of speaking to Mr. Cote. I need not go into all the questions asked yesterday, although I'd be pleased to if that's relevant. But I want to deal with two items. One relates in the manner that some documents, belonging either to the settlement council or individuals in the settlements, were in files which my hon. colleague has correctly maintained belong to the government. Whether they should have been there is perhaps a matter for controversy.

I think it's proper to mention that in discussions with Mr. Cote it came to my attention that a representative of the law firm acting for the Metis settlements association had, prior to the occasion we have under discussion, availed himself of the opportunity of going through the government documents in those files. I'm not commenting on the propriety of his having done so, but I'm saying that that occurred. I couldn't have expected hon. members opposite to take that piece of information into account, because it was unknown to them. But that information came to me a few hours ago in the meeting I was able to arrange with Mr. Cote. There is no question that the documents were obtained at Mr. Cote's request and that there was a prolonged exchange of correspondence between the two solicitors, getting to the point where the documents would be exchanged each for the other side to see. The other day in the Assembly I mentioned that that was the normal process, and I'm sure that's well understood.

The reference, though, to the possibility that the documents might jointly be examined by representatives of the two law offices did not occur. There was no proposal made to Mr. Cote that that be done. If it occurred in some other way, it has not come to my attention. I'm sure it has not come to my hon. colleagues' attention either. I shouldn't even speculate on whether that approach was made or thought to be made by someone. Clearly in the circumstances no approach should have been made nor could it in any practical sense be made, except in one way; that is, in the exchange of correspondence between the two firms of solicitors who were preparing the case. They had examination for discovery dates set for July. We're quite right in assuming that it became a very important and urgent matter for each side to see the other's documents, or they might unnecessarily delay the progress of the examinations for discovery.

What occurred between the two firms of solicitors was a general understanding that when each side succeeded in getting their own documents together, they would make them available as they gathered them in fairly large quantities. Each party wasn't sure how many sources the documents came from.

So the understanding was basically: when we have enough documents for it to be worth while for you to

see, shall we provide them to each other to see, even though we haven't yet finished the affidavit of documents for the discoveries in July. Understandably, both sides agreed to that. I don't think there's anything in the sense of their formally agreeing to it; it was something referred to in one piece of correspondence. Both senior solicitors involved, Mr. Macdonald on the one side and Mr. Cote on the other, had the same understanding — as the matter has come to me through Mr. Cote — that when either side had a collection of documents significant in any way in what they had been able to pull together, they would then provide them to the other side.

I can conclude by saying that what happened next is that Mr. Cote asked for the documents he should have from our side in order that he could do that, and the other events transpired. But to suggest that there was some offer to do the thing jointly in a different way from what I've described, simply did not occur. Mr. Chairman, I thought I should add that information.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, briefly in response to . . . [not recorded]. Yes, I will continue the practice established by my predecessors in meeting regularly with the Federation of Metis Settlements.

Number two, with regard to priorities, I outlined at the outset that one of the instructions I gave my chief deputy minister two months ago was to accelerate the litigation process, if at all possible, so that we can get on with the job of helping the Metis people in a way in which we now seem hindered.

The third point, regarding the Ombudsman, I know the hon. member wasn't suggesting we should tell the Ombudsman how to conduct his business. My chief deputy minister and I have discussed the matter, and the department will co-operate fully with the Ombudsman. From the government's point of view, he will have any information he requires. [interjection]

Well, it would be rather presumptuous on our part to suggest the terms of reference to the Ombudsman. What I've said is that we will co-operate in any way possible — if he wishes to examine files, interview individuals, what have you.

MR. HIEBERT: To the hon. minister, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the patience of you and other members of this House in dealing with the many questions pertaining to an isolated, albeit sensitive, incident. But surely Vote 4 must deal with some positive aspects or merits. My question is: how many people are actually involved or affected by programs under Specialized Social Services? Has the money appropriated in the past had any real impact on affecting the quality of life in Metis communities?

MR. BOGLE: I have some difficulty, Mr. Chairman, with the first question as to the number of people affected. If I'm looking at Vote 4.1, the program is primarily to help people in a transition stage, whether we're looking at women's shelters, assistance we provide to the Salvation Army, WIN House, that kind of thing.

Could the hon. member repeat his question regarding Metis settlements? Was it with regard to the number of people we're dealing with in the settlements?

MR. HIEBERT: I was looking at the number of people. And have past appropriations had any real impact on their quality of life?

MR. BOGLE: Very much so. First, the number of people. There's a combined population of less than 3,000 people in the eight Metis settlements. We can point to any number of areas of activity where in fact they are much better off today than they were in the past. That's really in keeping with life as a whole, whether it be in housing, transportation, or activities on the settlements.

Agreed to	
Total Vote 4	Specialized Social Services
	\$6,361,100
Total Vote 5	Benefits and Income Support
	\$78,525,500

Vote 6 — Vocational Rehabilitation Services

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Minister, could you elaborate very briefly on how far these opportunities go? Are they funded totally? Are some of these disadvantaged adults required to pay back some of their costs? In what way is that funding carried out?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman the level of support depends on a couple of factors: first, the type of handicap the individual has and, secondly, the amount of assistance required by the individual. It's a broad range, from the full-time resident of an institution, where all associated costs are borne by the people of Alberta through the government, right over to handicapped people in group homes or community-based homes, where there is partial support.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Minister, is this vote just for the handicapped?

MR. BOGLE: Well, we've been going through them very quickly. In Vocational Rehabilitation the primary services we're looking at would be Michener Centre and the many community-based organizations. You may recall that several weeks ago I rose in responding to the Budget Address and spoke about the shift over the past eight years. Eight years ago, I believe \$3 of every \$4 that we used in this area went directly to institutions like Michener Centre — in fact to Michener Centre — whereas \$1 of \$4 went to community-based programs. Today more than half the money is going to the community-based organizations.

Agreed to	
Total Vote 6 — Vocational	
Rehabilitation Services	\$9,192,120

Vote 7 — Services for the Handicapped

MR. BOGLE: Not wishing to prolong the estimates, Mr. Chairman, but a question was raised last evening with regard to what services are available in Alberta for autistic children. I'd like to provide some information very briefly. If the hon. member who raised the question would like something more specific, possibly he could contact my office.

Funding is provided to Margaret House in Edmonton, as well as sheltered employment through the mental health workshop. So there's a range of activities. Mr. Chairman, it depends upon the severity of the disability, and is an attempt to find a way to allow an individual to reach full and maximum potential.

Agreed to:	
Total Vote 7 — Services for the	
Handicapped	\$49,462,720
Total Vote 8 — Treatment of Mental	
Illness	\$47,299,130

Vote 9 — General Health Services

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister might review for me the paramedical personnel area, with regard to what licensing procedures are in place, or what changes the minister may be contemplating in that area.

MR. BOGLE: I'd have to take that as notice, Mr. Chairman, and provide the hon. member with specific information as to the licensing of paramedical personnel.

Agreed to:	
Total Vote 9 — General Health Services	\$10,838,110
Total Vote 10 — Financial Assistance	
for Community Preventive Services	\$66,234,240
Total Vote 11 — Alcoholism and Drug Abuse	
— Treatment and Education	\$10,400,608
Department Total	\$539,445,698

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

[Motion carried]

Department of Labour

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you have any opening remarks?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be in order to make a few remarks this afternoon. Perhaps I could do that most readily simply by referring to the various votes. I'd like first to comment upon the labour relations aspect of the Department of Labour.

As would be fairly obvious by the nature of our province, there's been a fair degree of industrialization and change from the agrarian economy we had in years past. At the present time about 28 per cent of the population is organized in the union movement. That means we have roughly 72 per cent whose fair wages and fair employment practices are assured by the labour standards aspect of the Department of Labour.

There are quite a variety of labour standards. Today I would like to emphasize that in the past two years, and particularly in the last year, we have endeavored to remove some of the enforcement function by engaging in educational programs. You may or may not have noted some of these in advertisements in the newspapers. The Department of Labour, through the labour standards branch, puts on seminars and evening programs very extensively and very effectively. I'm

pleased to say that the way we have been doing this has come to the attention of our sister province to the west, and I understand they're now trying to emulate some of our program.

We found it extremely effective in removing some of the complaints which formerly came to the department. Complaints are of a variety, but some arise quite innocently through employers not being aware of minimum employment conditions. In those situations the educational program has been very effective. So that's one thrust, if you will, of the department in that particular area, and I thought it would be worth while to bring it to your attention.

With respect to labor relations, two years ago the former minister initiated some discussion and then a formal organization — perhaps I could outline it quickly — called a Construction Industry Industrial Relations Council because it was felt that perhaps the construction industry was the possessor of the worst labor relations record of all industrial sectors in the province. Through the Construction Industry Industrial Relations Council, which is chaired by the minister and which meets roughly once a month, we have been able to pull together representatives of the construction owners, the construction contractors, the building trade unions, and the Department of Labour. I think I could safely say that these meetings have exceeded our wildest expectations in terms of the climate change which has been produced, the ability of individuals to understand one another, appreciate differing viewpoints, and appreciate the circumstances each party has to consider when making decisions.

Of course, it's an open question about how much of that can be translated into a change in actual results during negotiations. But I'm very hopeful that it will be productive in that sense as well.

As a spinoff from that type of co-operation, two other initiatives have been undertaken. One case involves a fair number of people, 16 in total, representing again a variety, but basically the management/employee viewpoints. This group is looking at ways to improve some of the differences which currently exist around construction projects in terms of hours of work. There is quite a divergency between the craft unions in terms of their negotiated hours of work, and this creates a problem on a jobsite. There are 16 people in total now addressing that particular item.

Mr. Chairman, the department has under way some other initiatives as well to try to improve the labor/management climate. An extensive survey was done last year to try to identify what each of the interest groups saw to be the common disturbing concerns in labor/management relations, if I can put it that way — the problem areas that each group saw. When we examined the results of the surveys and questionnaires, we were able to identify a number of matters that were of high priority to all parties. One of these is improved competence in both arbitration of grievance matters, which arise out of interpretation of a collective agreement; and arbitration, potentially, of substantive issues. In the coming year it is our intent to develop an improved capacity in the area of arbitration. That will probably not develop very rapidly, but we do hope to develop a procedure and a plan by which this may occur over time.

Perhaps this would be an appropriate point for me to say that hon. members may be contacted by participants in the construction industry with respect to labor legis-

lation for that industry. I should indicate that the department has been discussing with all parties the possibility of change in existing labor legislation. The particular interest is with respect to large or megaprojects. We are interested to determine, first of all, whether or not we need special labor stability provisions for major project construction. Second, if the answer to the first question is determined to be yes, we're interested to know whether the legislation should be similar to what now exists under Section 93(1) of The Alberta Labour Act, which is basically the legislation applied to the construction of the Syncrude project. That debate will occur through the summer, and I suspect some hon. members may be engaged in it at a function I understand is taking place this evening.

In the same area of the department, I should identify that we are responsible in a minimal way for overseeing private pension plans. This area had been the subject of some hearings within industry which commenced two years ago and concluded about a year ago. That awaits the further attention of the department.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a couple of comments with respect to Vote 3, which deals with general safety services. Members may encounter this area by virtue of the many regulations which emanate through the department under The Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act, The Alberta Uniform Building Standards Act, The Electrical Protection Act, The Elevator and Fixed Conveyances Act, The Gas Protection Act, and The Amusements Act.

Let me just comment on one area which has been the source of some discussion: uniform building standards. In the late '60s the former government undertook a study of the general safety requirements for buildings and as a consequence produced a report which, in 1974 I believe, led to The Alberta Uniform Building Standards Act. That was the commencement of the branch of the Department of Labour which now establishes or makes recommendations on and then follows through, with the assistance of municipalities, on inspection for building standards. In a short period of about six years we have proceeded a long way. From the day when the only regulation was municipal, and in some cases there was absolutely no minimal structural building requirement, we went to The Alberta Uniform Building Standards Act and to the development of additional standards.

The original intent was, and still is, that we adopt the national building standards as closely as possible. So if an architect, contractor, or builder moved from one end of Canada to the other, hopefully he would be familiar with and reasonably expect to find the same kinds of building requirements. It didn't happen that way totally, but it's my objective that we should gradually move that way.

I should indicate to hon. members, Mr. Chairman, that it's a complex issue. The National Research Council and representatives of the provinces provide input to the national building code. The code is totally reworked about every two or three years. The problem is to react quickly enough through the process from the national code to review and adoption by the provinces. By the time you reach that point with this continuing rapid review, usually there's another national code in the wings to be worked on. To me, that is a disturbing phenomenon. I don't believe it's either necessary or

desirable that the code should be changing that frequently, and I hope Alberta will be able to provide input to assure that in future the evolution of the code is somewhat more leisurely.

I might point out that the Alberta Building Standards Council is the appeal body which is available in the case of anyone who feels aggrieved by a decision of a building inspector — that there's been a misinterpretation of the code, or that the code is simply unjust in the particular circumstance. I think that council will come to have a higher profile in the near future.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Board of Industrial Relations which interprets and adjudicates — it's a quasi-judicial board in the labor relations area — I would simply like to say that the organization of that board is somewhat changed from a year ago. We now have the capacity in the board to sit as two panels, so that the board can actually meet in Calgary and Edmonton, or wherever else, at the same time. That is a departure and an innovation.

Hon. members will recognize that Vote 5 deals with the application, implementation, and administration of The Individual's Rights Protection Act, and therefore the Alberta Human Rights Commission. There should shortly be a full Commission again, and a number of matters will be brought to the attention of hon. members. Since some of those already have, I think I'll leave it at that, Mr. Chairman. If there are questions, I'd be happy to deal with them.

Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$974,714
Total Vote 2 — Labor Relations	\$3,413,950
Total Vote 3 — General Safety Services	\$8,932,604
Total Vote 4 — Industrial Relations Adjudication and Regulation	\$605,500
Total Vote 5 — Individual's Rights Protection	\$772,675
Department Total	\$14,699,443

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I move the vote be reported.

[Motion carried]

Municipal Affairs

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, do you have any opening remarks?

MR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a few brief opening remarks. I believe the changes in the Municipal Affairs budget have largely been explained in the Legislature as a result of legislation brought forward.

First of all, I indicated to members that there would be some major changes through the legislation with respect to the property tax rebate program and senior citizens' renter assistance. I should explain that the substantial reduction in the estimates of the municipal debenture interest rebate program is a result of fairly substantial amounts of debentures which were subsidized under this program being paid off because of the municipal debt reduction program. Because perhaps there has been some wrong information, I should indicate that the debenture shielding program is still in place and will continue to be utilized as it was before

we announced and implemented the municipal debt reduction program.

I believe there are no other major increases in expenditures, although there is a fairly sizable increase of 19.2 per cent in respect to support to regional planning commissions in Vote 4. That's largely a result of the fact that our new Planning Act of 1977 has laid on regional planning commissions a requirement to develop regional plans and hold hearings. All the things they are required to do under that new Planning Act resulted in a fairly substantial and rather abnormal increase, for one year, in the funds we provide to regional planning commissions.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the only other thing I could speak about that would be of interest to members during the estimates is the entire matter of property assessment and taxation. It was raised, I think very effectively, by a number of members during debate a week or two ago as it reflected on acreage owners and others. As some members said at that time, I expect that the major problems in that area will be resolved as a result of the recommendations and debate that will now flow from the recommendations of the Provincial-Municipal Finance Council. I know that hon. members have not yet had an opportunity to review that report. As I said earlier today, copies are being made available to all local governments. It wasn't by design that the report happened to be tabled the same day that my estimates came up. I received it about three and a half or four weeks ago and immediately asked my department to print some 3,000 copies, so every municipal councillor and school board member in this province will be mailed a copy of the report later this week or the first of next week, as fast as we can get them out.

I would like to make a few comments about the report. First of all, by the nature of how it had to be put together, the report does not represent the policies of the government of Alberta nor of the other organizations: the Urban Municipalities Association, the Association of MDs and Counties, and the Alberta School Trustees' Association. It wasn't possible to write a report that represented the firm policy of all those governments. In my view, however, it does have a lot of good recommendations. In addition, there's a lot of food for thought in the background material provided in the report.

On the issue of assessment and taxation of acreage owners in particular, it's my view that we can come to some resolution of their problem. It isn't the one that's largely touted as solving the problem; that is, simply to assess and tax farm homes. Indeed, my review has indicated that in many municipalities, the county of Strathcona being no exception, the mere assessment and taxation of farm homes will not lead to any dramatic decrease at all — in fact a very small decrease — in the amount acreage owners are now paying. We only have a situation, then, where they could say, well, misery loves company.

In my view, we need to do two things. We need to recognize that it's no longer possible to have a maximum ceiling of \$40 per acre on farmland taxation. As the report recommends, there has to be some way in which taxation on farmland can gradually move up. When other properties in a municipal district, county, or municipality are taxed at a percentage of market value, I think it's unreasonable to forever have a maximum on farmland. So our objective will be to find a way. It certainly won't be market value, in that

I don't believe that you can tax agriculture on a market value basis, but certainly you can look at a taxation system that's based on productive value. That's what the report largely recommends, and it's my view that that idea is well worth considering.

I'm not sure the report addresses the other thing we can do: look at land owned by acreage owners on the basis of what they are doing with that land. They're not developing it; it's left in its natural state, either tree-covered or grass-covered or what have you, and if it's agricultural land it is available in years to come for agricultural production. I ask the question: why should it be taxed at market value? Mr. Chairman, I throw out the suggestion to the Assembly: why couldn't we look at a system with a classification of land called farmland and conservation land? If land that belongs to an acreage owner isn't being developed commercially or for residential purposes, either left in its natural state or tree-covered, indeed we might be able to fix the maximum assessment on that land at somewhere near farmland values.

My understanding is that the problems acreage owners have are really not related to the assessment on their home *per se* but rather to the very rapid increase that has occurred with respect to the assessment on the land they own. So I'd like to try to tackle the concern which they validly expressed to many members of what we can do to avoid excessive increases in the tax on the land holdings of acreage owners.

I have said publicly before and don't mind saying again that I am reluctant to suggest that we should move into a situation where we assess and tax farm homes and other farm property. There are two or three problems with that. First of all, somebody has to go around and do these things. In the Department of Municipal Affairs we have about 175 assessors who do a lot of assessment work outside the two major cities of Edmonton and Calgary throughout this province. We're presently in a situation where we have a general assessment every eight years in each municipality, and it takes a tremendous number of people if you get into a new field of assessment or have to do a complete general assessment.

In that regard, I want members' views on whether or not we should look at some new system of assessment. I have only recently learned that we still go out and actually stick a spade in the ground and turn over the soil to see if it's the same as it was eight years ago. In 1979, with aerial photography being done in this province by no less than two or three federal and provincial agencies almost every year, and with our requirements for development permits, permits to hook up water, sewer, electricity, and you name it, I believe it's possible to implement a system where you have an up-to-date and accurate assessment in every municipality in Alberta every year. You don't require an eight-year assessment; it's always up to date.

In that regard, we should be computerizing the whole system of assessment. We shouldn't be moving around looking at every single parcel of land. Enough information is being fed to local governments to allow us to know what's happening. If you had an up-to-date assessment on a yearly basis in every municipality in Alberta, I don't see that there would be any need for the Assessment Equalization Board.

As well, Mr. Chairman, I don't see the need to increase the assessment staff in the Department of Municipal Affairs. I believe we should be looking at a situa-

tion where we ask municipalities, depending on their size — certainly we would have to continue to do some of the smaller ones — to employ a full-time assessor tied in with their municipal office, who has the advice of agricultural fieldmen and all kinds of other people in that office who know what's happening out there. Subject to my inexperience in this portfolio and being proven wrong, I don't think there's anything wrong with looking at some pretty extensive changes in how we're doing that assessing.

I say that because this report recommends that we go from an eight-year to a three-year general assessment period. The conclusion reached by many from that report is that we need to have two and a half times the number of assessors in my department. I'd like to find a way that we don't have to do that; a way that we can make that whole area of assessment more efficient.

That is tied very closely to the key of how you have fair and equitable property taxes. If you're doing general assessments only every eight years, and nobody knows what's happening on a property between times, you build a situation where you have inequities that get corrected only every eight years. When that happens, you have a whole bunch of people out there who are pretty upset and concerned. Being a person elected to office, I don't like that to happen.

I make those few remarks about property taxation because concern has been expressed in this Legislature. It relates in a fairly extensive way to my estimates, and it relates to the report we tabled today. I think the estimates before you, Mr. Chairman, are pretty straightforward, other than those areas where there have been some major changes as a result of legislation we've brought in or commitments we've made as I've explained to you this afternoon.

With those few remarks, I'd like to urge the members' support for the expenditures in the Department of Municipal Affairs.

MR. KNAAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, just a brief question to the minister. Being one of the MLAs from Edmonton, I have a concern that I expressed in question period. This question is slightly different. Given the position the city of Edmonton has taken with respect to the intervening as opposing any private annexations until their formal annexation proposal is dealt with; given that they don't want to service present annexations that have gone through the Local Authorities Board; given that each landowner is entitled to appear before the Local Authorities Board; and, in addition, that representations have been made to me and other members of the Edmonton caucus that the six-month timetable for Local Authorities Board hearings is probably optimistic: it is likely that a strategy may develop to drag the hearings out for a year or two.

In the event that this kind of stretching out of the hearings occurs, does the minister have some contingency plan to speed up the hearing process? I ask the question because if the two developments occur that we anticipate — that is, Cold Lake and the Alsands project — I see a severe lot shortage in the Edmonton area, an escalation of housing lots that would create real hardships on the residents of Edmonton.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of brief comments. The contingency plan with respect to the large Edmonton area annexation application that

we've referred to is really contained in the Local Authorities Board amendments that I brought before the Legislature. I don't think we can do anything other than what we've done already; that is, make sure we have one division of the board that can hear it without having to do any other work, and to do it as quickly as possible.

On the other issue of lots, I know the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works has some concerns and, indeed, expressed some views this afternoon. I simply don't have good judgment on that whole area, except to know that many people are expressing concern about the availability of residential lots in Edmonton and region. If the decision by the Edmonton city council not to service lands that might be annexed to the city is meant to be some leverage or some pressure exerted on this government or anyone else with regard to the larger annexation question, all I can say is, I'm not very impressed with it.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Having heard the motion by the hon. acting House leader do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolutions and reports as follow:

Resolved that for the fiscal year ending March 31,

1980, amounts not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the Department of Social Services and Community Health: \$35,508,060 for departmental support services; \$181,807,630 for social allowance; \$43,816,480 for child welfare services; \$6,361,100 for specialized social services; \$78,525,500 for benefits and income support; \$9,192,120 for vocational rehabilitation services; \$49,462,720 for services for the handicapped; \$47,299,130 for treatment of mental illness; \$10,838,110 for general health services; \$66,234,240 for financial assistance for community preventive services; \$10,400,608 for alcoholism and drug abuse — treatment and education.

Resolved that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1980, amounts not exceeding the following be granted to Her Majesty for the Department of Labour: \$974,714 for departmental support services; \$3,413,950 for labour relations; \$8,932,604 for general safety services; \$605,500 for industrial relations, adjudication, and regulation; \$772,675 for individual's rights protection.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

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, I move we call it 5:30.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 5:27 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]