

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Tuesday, March 25, 1980 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

Bill 2

**The Consumer and Corporate Affairs
Statutes Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 2, The Consumer and Corporate Affairs Statutes Amendment Act, 1980.

The Bill provides for amendments to four separate statutes, including The Cemeteries Act and The Prearranged Funeral Services Act. The amendments will provide for the transfer of administration of those statutes from the Alberta Securities Commission to the consumer relations division of the department. The amendments to the Co-operative Marketing Associations and Rural Utilities Guarantee Act will eliminate the requirement of double reporting by the Provincial Treasurer.

Finally, Part 2 of The Frozen Food Act will be repealed, putting that part of the Act permanently on ice.

[Leave granted; Bill 2 read a first time]

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Assembly agree to reverting to Introduction of Visitors? I see that we have two distinguished visitors, who have just arrived in the Speaker's gallery.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the interruption. I can't see them, but I understand that we do have two visitors in your gallery.

The first guest is a former member of the federal House and federal government, a former Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce who, in 1972, went back to the real world for eight years. During that time he was co-chairman of the task force on national unity along with the former premier of Ontario, Mr. Robarts. He is now back in government. I'd like to give you the Minister of Transport Canada, the Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin.

With him, Mr. Speaker, is a fellow I can talk about with a little more authority, for I started him out as a floor sweeper in our business back in about 1950. By the way, he didn't do that very well. He's progressed through various stages and found the U of A of some help to him. In the late '50s he wound up as Alberta's Rhodes scholar, was 11 years with External Affairs, a year and a half with the Treasury Board in Ottawa, then deputy minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Last spring he became deputy minister to the then Minister of Transport

Don Mazankowski, and is now the [Deputy] Minister of Transport with the hon. member I have introduced: my younger brother Arthur. Let's see you Art.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

(continued)

Bill 9

**The Electric Power and Pipe Line
Assessment Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 9, The Electric Power and Pipe Line Assessment Amendment Act, 1980. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to this Assembly.

[Leave granted; Bill 9 read a first time]

Bill 13

**The Municipal Taxation
Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 13, The Municipal Taxation Amendment Act, 1980. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

This Bill together with the Bill I just introduced are the two pieces of legislation that are required to implement the government's reforms with respect to assessment in taxation in rural Alberta. Some two weeks ago hon. members received copies of our proposals which these Bills are meant to implement.

[Leave granted; Bill 13 read a first time]

Bill 14

**The Municipal Election
Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, The Municipal Election Amendment Act, 1980. The purpose of this Bill, in addition to some administrative matters, is to make it entirely clear that persons in this province living on military bases have the right to vote in plebiscites and municipal elections.

[Leave granted; Bill 14 read a first time]

Bill 3

**The Attorney General Statutes
Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to introduce Bill No. 3, The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1980.

Four provincial statutes are dealt with in this Bill. The Administration of Estates Act is amended with respect to small estates in order to simplify and update certain procedures and make it easier for people dealing with small estates to have them processed. Two Provincial Court Acts are to be amended in regard to the remuneration of judges, and The Uniformity of Legislation statute is to be amended in order to increase the number of

uniformity commissioners who sit upon the Law Reform Commission of Canada.

[Leave granted; Bill 3 read a first time]

Bill 10

The Colleges Amendment Act, 1980

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 10, The Colleges Amendment Act, 1980.

The Bill will make provisions for certain aspects of collective bargaining agreements between college boards, staff associations, and staff members, and will deal with certain other relations between the academic council and the board of governors. It will also clarify certain aspects of the granting of guarantees by the government to private colleges in the province of Alberta.

[Leave granted; Bill 10 read a first time]

Bill 7

**The Radiation Protection
Amendment Act, 1980**

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being The Radiation Protection Amendment Act, 1980. This Bill provides for the deletion of the effective date, which is now redundant, and for the expansion of the Radiation Health Advisory Committee and the opportunity to appoint one of them as a chairman.

[Leave granted; Bill 7 read a first time]

Bill 5

The Distress of Leased Chattels Act

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 5, The Distress of Leased Chattels Act. The purpose of the Bill is to give the lessor of chattels the same rights of repossession a vendor would have under a sales agreement.

[Leave granted; Bill 5 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 5, The Distress of Leased Chattels Act, be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

Bill 203

An Act to Amend The School Act

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 203, An Act to Amend The School Act. The purpose of this Bill is to restructure the board of reference to achieve the objective of more local control over the settlement of disagreements between teachers and school boards under Section 85 of The School Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 203 read a first time]

DR. BUCK: Is that a government Bill?

Bill 202

An Act to Amend The Builders' Lien Act

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill

202, An Act to Amend The Builders' Lien Act. The principle of this Bill is to make it possible for the supplier of goods and services and suppliers in the province of Alberta, with particular reference to small builders, to have the opportunity of extending the time period in which they may make a lien on a property.

[Leave granted; Bill 202 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table copies of volumes I and II of the Public Accounts for the year ended March 31, 1979 and, at the same time, file copies of a new companion document to those accounts entitled Financial Summary and Budgetary Review, 1978-79. Members were provided with these documents when they were made public on February 28.

The other documents I wish to table are copies of the annual reports for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1979, for the following four pension boards: Local Authorities, Public Service, Universities Academic, and Public Service Management. As well, I wish to file with the Assembly copies of the '78-79 annual report of The M.L.A. Pension Act. Copies of these reports will be made available for members of the Assembly.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table three reports. The first is the advisory committee report on wilderness areas; the second is the annual report of the Alberta Gaines Council; and the third is the annual report of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Attorney General I'd like to file with the Legislature Library preliminary recommendations of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Gaming, which was made public today.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce a group of 90 grade 5 students from the Queen Street school in Spruce Grove. I've had the pleasure of addressing Mr. Ibsen's grade 5 class for the last seven years. Today they are accompanied by Mr. Ibsen, Mrs. Funk, Mrs. Maage, Mrs. Sinkwich, and student-teacher Mr. Hancock. They're in both galleries. I'd ask them to rise and receive the recognition of this Assembly.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure today to present to you and to members of the Assembly a class of students from Grant MacEwan college, Cromdale campus. They're accompanied by their teacher Ian Kennedy.

I have only one regret today. Usually when I have a class of students attending the Legislature from Grant MacEwan college, I make it a point to spend some time in dialogue with them on questions they have, procedures that may be followed, and what impact or input they can have in their government and the mechanisms that are available. Unfortunately when this group arrived today, I was in a meeting and did not have the pleasure of meeting them personally. I hope I will at a future time.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I hope they enjoyed their tour of the building and are finding the proceedings of great interest for the time that they will be observing in

this Legislature. There are approximately 30 in the public gallery. I'd like them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to introduce to the Assembly a group from Camrose, the rose city of Alberta. They are here on a direct invitation from the Minister of Education to meet with his officials this afternoon. With the group are Mayor Rudy Swanson of Camrose, public school board chairman Mrs. Frances Elliott, and spokesman Mrs. Darlene Haesloop. I will ask the group, who are seated in the members gallery, to rise and be recognized.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

Public Lands and Wildlife

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to Members of the Legislative Assembly the initiation of a program of range improvement assistance on Crown lands commencing in the 1980-81 fiscal year. Eligible lands include public lands held under grazing lease, grazing permit, forest grazing licence, or head-tax permit disposition administered by the public lands division of Alberta Energy and Natural Resources. A total of \$1.5 million, funded through the General Revenue Fund of the province, has been approved for the 1980-81 fiscal year.

The public grazing land improvement program will stress that assistance priority be given to small-scale farmers and ranchers, and to grazing associations and co-operatives. A significant proportion of the increased grazing capacity which will be developed on grazing association or co-operative lands will be made available to new members.

Improvement projects to maintain or increase the grazing capacity of public lands will be eligible for technical and financial assistance and will include the following: clearing, breaking, working down and seeding of brush-covered land and other low productivity lands to tame forage species; the construction of cross-fences, water facilities, trails, et cetera, to enhance range utilization; and range management and the control of brush encroachment through spraying, prescribed burning, mowing, fertilization, or other control measures.

Improvement projects will commence only after a range development plan has been drawn up for the public lands which is acceptable to the disposition holder, the public lands division, Wildlife, and other resource agencies which have a definite management interest in the lands being considered for improvement. The plan will consider, enhance, or protect all resources such as wildlife and coniferous timber stands. Since the approved projects will be 100 per cent publicly funded, the Crown will retain ownership of the improvement.

The improvement projects will be carried out by local contractors or by the holder of the disposition. Holders of grazing dispositions will be receiving a circular explaining the program in more detail in the near future. It is stressed that eligibility criteria will be designed to give priority to small-scale farmers and ranchers, and to grazing associations and co-operatives. Applicants who clearly do not meet the eligibility criteria may be considered at a later date, after those applicants with the greatest need are given assistance. If there is significant doubt that the applicant meets the eligibility criteria, the applicant will be referred to the local agricultural development commit-

tee for review and recommendation.

The application forms for improvement assistance should be available after April 21 of this year. To be considered in the 1980-81 fiscal year, applications should be returned to the department by July 1, 1980. Further details of this program may be obtained from the public lands division, Alberta Energy and Natural Resources in Edmonton, or from the district offices located throughout Alberta.

Alberta Research Council

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Alberta Research Council, I am pleased to announce the successful negotiations between the city of Edmonton and Alberta Housing and Public Works for acquisition of one quarter section of land south of Mill Woods. This land will locate the new Alberta Research facility adjacent to the Edmonton Research and Development Park.

This decision marks the beginning of the implementation of the recently announced Alberta Research Council long-range plan.

The location assures an improved interface with industry, and will be the focal point of this government's effort to encourage and develop high technology and research and development activity in Alberta. It should encourage new, exciting industry in the Edmonton park, as well as ensuring a continuing interchange of ideas and personnel with the University of Alberta.

These new facilities will comprise approximately 500,000 square feet of building area which will house laboratories, pilot plants, administrative offices, computer banks and staff facilities.

It is anticipated that construction will commence in 1981 and will be developed progressively over the next several years.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Gaming Policy

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Attorney General. It pertains to the preliminary report of the citizens' advisory committee on gambling. What action does the government plan to take, in light of the preliminary report which was tabled in the Assembly this afternoon?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think the government caucus is basically of the view that the report is a very good one, and one that is useful to the government in developing policies. Discussions have been had already and input received from Members of the Legislative Assembly with regard to the report that was made public today. It is the report of a citizens' advisory committee. Because of that we believe it represents current views in the community in regard to gaming and work that can be done in charitable and religious areas as a result of that activity. Because of that, Mr. Speaker, I believe the result will be that during the course of events this year the report published today will in fact form the basis — give or take a few adjustments, perhaps not of a very great degree — for a new policy and set of regulations by the government.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General. One of the recommendations in the report was that future

changes should take the form of orders in council. In essence, policy would then be determined through order in council and there would be no, shall we call it, omnibus piece of legislation that would be discussed here in the Assembly prior to the implementation of — I think the minister used the term — adjustments.

My question to the minister: is it the intention of the government, by means of a white paper or bringing legislation or a resolution to the Assembly, to go that route of ensuring not only debate in this Assembly but on a far wider range across the province prior to the changes the minister alluded to in his initial response?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, my belief is that the publication of the report will, by itself, achieve a good discussion of the subject by the public generally. I don't know whether or not a resolution with respect to that may be presented by some hon. member, to bring some of the debate into the Assembly directly. As a matter of fact, whether any legislation at all is required in order to implement the policy is a matter that, as far as the refined legal opinions are concerned, we hadn't given priority to, and are looking to that as one of the things that has to be dealt with in the course of implementation of any policy. But I would point out that the framework for gaming activity already exists in legislation. Because of that it may well be that all that is required is a policy document in the sense of rules and regulations for each type of activity, widely disseminated and generally available to the public and to volunteer groups, as recommended by the committee.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister. In light of the rather narrow interpretation the advisory committee took of its terms of reference — and that isn't meant as a criticism of the citizens' committee, but the committee did not look at the broader implications of gambling in this province. I suppose on one extreme we might have almost the Nevada route, when one looks at the increased amount of money involved in gambling in this province. Is it the policy position of this government that there will be increased amounts of gambling in this province? Or is it the position of the government that Alberta has about reached the point where the degree of gambling, if I might use that terminology, is sufficient? I ask the question in light of the fact that the committee gave no consideration to that matter, at least in their recommendations, and to date there's been no definitive position of the government placed before the Legislature on that matter.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think it should be noted that an expansion along certain lines would require amendment to federal legislation. People who want to introduce some questions about a Las Vegas style into the current discussion about gaming in the province are really addressing themselves to whether or not the existing federal legislation would permit that. Our view is that it does not. I know of no present intention by the federal government to accommodate those desires on the part of some people. Although circumstances change over the years — and within the last four to five years we have seen an enormous growth with respect to gaming activity — at the present time my own impression would still be that the existing level of gaming, dedicated as it is to charitable and religious objectives, is appropriate.

Hog Marketing

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Agriculture. My question flows as a result of representation, certainly that my colleagues and I have had in our office, dealing with the price of pork at this time: something in the vicinity of \$47 per hundredweight. Is the government giving active consideration to establishing a floor price for pork at approximately \$57 per hundredweight during the time the Foster committee and the Alberta Marketing Council are directly involved in hog marketing in Alberta?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the hog marketing board, on behalf of the producers in the province, has submitted to us a program of stop-loss, which of course recognizes the lowering price of hogs today. That submission is made for our consideration, and at the present time we are looking at the submission.

At the same time we have indications that the federal government is very interested in looking at a much broader program that would institute some form of stabilization to the hog industry across Canada. Shortly after receipt of the submission from the producer board for the province, we had the opportunity to meet collectively with the western ministers of agriculture. Of course the hog stabilization proposition was one of the topics of discussion. At that time it was agreed that we should contact the new federal minister to have consultation with him as to the program, the amounts, and of course how it would affect and guarantee to producers across Canada on an even base, a form of stabilization. To that end, we are waiting at the present time for that joint meeting. No decision has been made.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of past experience on how fast the federal government moves on a variety of matters, especially agricultural matters, can I ask the minister if the Alberta government has under active consideration at this time a program of floor price or stop-loss — whatever term the minister wants to use — that could slide into place the day the Marketing Council takes over responsibility of the hog marketing board, until such time as either the western provinces or the federal government comes in with some stabilization plan?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the time factor involved will be fairly fast. If this doesn't prove to be fast enough, certainly the ongoing figures we have before us, as represented by the submission by the hog marketing board, and indeed the work our people are doing in the figures they have come up with, will certainly put us in reasonable stead to bring forth a program at that time if it is necessary.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Is the Minister of Agriculture in a position to advise the House that the government is in fact prepared to move on a stop-loss program, notwithstanding the fact that there will be no estimates in the budget this year, should it not be possible to work out a satisfactory agreement with the federal government?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, a lot of guesswork is involved in the question. I would say that in regard to stabilization it has always been the position of this gov-

ernment that rather than be in open competition one province to the other, for the best interests of the industry stabilization should be on a Canada-wide basis. Because of the time frame we're faced with, I would suggest that I would wait until we have that opportunity to hear of the program that, hopefully, will be submitted and have a chance to evaluate it before any decisions have to be made.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister for clarification. Is the minister advising the Assembly that the government of Alberta is changing its long-standing position that stabilization must be federal, and that in the event that federal initiatives don't take place the province will not move? Or in fact are we now opening the door to following on the recommendations of the Foodwest consulting firm made to the Pork Producers' Marketing Board?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I see no change in either philosophy, the opening or closing of any doors. But if a stabilization program becomes necessary, and if it is the wish of producers across the nation that stabilization to a particular industry is the way to go, then a federal program which deals with the industry within each province — because basically it affects the input costs related to the industry itself, and we bid on a North American market. Therefore if we are going to keep some stability province to province, that federal stability has to come through that stabilization.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Will the minister indicate to the Assembly what specific impact the brief presented to the minister by Swift Canadian had on the minister in authorizing the Marketing Council to invade the pork producers' board? I ask the question because my reading of the document put forward by Swift Canadian indicates that the recommendations of Swift and the council's authority are in fact one and the same.

MR. SCHMIDT: I'd have to say none whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. To my knowledge the submission from Swift would be close to a year ago, nine months ago.

MR. R. CLARK: A very recent one.

MR. SCHMIDT: Not the one I'm aware of, Mr. Speaker. But regardless of the timing, no bearing whatsoever on either the dedication or direction of the independent review board.

MR. R. CLARK: A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister saying that he hasn't received any representation from Swift Canadian Co. Limited in the past 12 weeks dealing with this question and leading up to the action the minister has taken as far as the hog marketing board is concerned?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I have received submissions on behalf of all packers, and indeed on behalf of Swift as well. I say to you that whatever was in the submission on behalf of Swift has no bearing on the documentation represented on the individual independent review board.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is the minister standing in his place this afternoon and telling us

in this Assembly that the representation made to the minister by Swift Canadian Limited, and in fact the recommendations Swift put forward, are basically the same recommendations that ended up in the council's authority? Mr. Minister, are you telling us that there is no relationship there at all? [interjections] Well, a bunch of baloney.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, if the comments in the documentation the hon. member is referring to are for an orderly system, yes, of course they have a bearing.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister had an opportunity to review the amended regulations with respect to the powers of the Marketing Council as it relates to the Pork Producers' Marketing Board in this province? Has the minister had an opportunity to assess the regulation, in view of the concern expressed by the Pork Producers' Marketing Board that the amended regulation gives not only the power the minister indicated in the House last Friday, but sweeping power far beyond the scope that the minister indicated in this House was his intent?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, one must be clear that the documentation the hon. member refers to is that provided by the Marketing Council. I am aware of the intent and the direction of the council. If that documentation — and it's a legal document — goes beyond the intent, then I would suggest it has to be changed. If it is the total intent of the Marketing Council and does not exceed that — in other words, if it covers the total submission of an interim system of marketing on a temporary basis — then the documentation is correct.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one additional supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. During the discussions with the Pork Producers' Marketing Board, was the minister given any information, in an affidavit form or in the form of a copy of affidavits, relating to alleged buyer collusion in the market place?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, as I stated yesterday, documentation of mimeographed articles — declarations were made available to me if I wished to peruse them. Part of the submissions of course — names, places, dates — were obliterated, and they were made available for my perusal. I have them at the present time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. After receiving this information containing copies of affidavits alleging buyer collusion, did the minister give any consideration to referring this information to the law officers of the Crown in order to make judgment as to whether or not the appropriate course to follow would be a public inquiry?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the documentation was made to many other areas and many other individuals. The documentation was not presented to me in a way that would be easily submitted to anyone for perusal because of the obliterated portions — names, dates, places. In light of the fact that the hog marketing board had indicated its move towards the commencement of an

action, it was their prerogative, their evidence, and their material to do with as they saw fit.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. After receiving this information, did the Minister of Agriculture consider it appropriate to consult with the hon. Attorney General concerning the information?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I've had the opportunity to discuss with the Attorney General's Department the total problem of hog marketing, the legal aspects involved and, of course, the rights and the direction of the hog marketing board.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to either the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs or the Minister of Agriculture. Has there been any monitoring at the retail or wholesale level of the pricing of pork products to the consumer? It seems to me we've had a decrease in our pork prices of up to 20 cents, but it hasn't been felt at the consumer level.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the consumer votes every day when he or she approaches the market and purchases. [interjection] I think the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview should listen to this, because I believe he missed this lecture when he was in university, and it seems to show rather starkly in the philosophy he brings to this Chamber.

One of the useful approaches of course is that in the area of protein, consumers have other products they can purchase — beef, poultry, fish, lamb products.

DR. BUCK: That's not the question he asked, Koziak. Answer the question.

MR. KOZIAK: Dr. Buck will also benefit from this discussion. Of course the rises and falls that take place in these various areas cause shifts in consumer purchasing habits. For example, recently there was some concern about the drop in the price of beef and whether or not that would reflect in the prices the consumer paid. That has, in fact, taken place. In terms of the information we have with respect to pork products, those are fairly reasonable, having regard to the cost of living today.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask if he's had an opportunity to examine the brief presented by the representatives of Swift Canadian Co. Limited to the agricultural marketing council on Thursday, March 6, 1980, at 1:30 p.m. Has the minister seen the representation that was made by Swift? The question is important, because many of the points included in this brief end up as terms of reference for the Marketing Council.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, Swift made a submission to the Marketing Council. It would not be necessary that I would receive a copy or whether it would go direct.

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture. The minister has indicated that he does have some of the evidence, with the names blanked out, from the hog marketing board. On the assumption that the allegations are true, has the minister asked for legal opinions whether the information dis-

closed would, in fact, constitute an offence against any law of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member asking a question of law?

MR. KNAAK: No, I'm certainly not asking a question of law, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking whether the minister has asked the Attorney General's Department to give him an opinion whether or not the facts disclosed in the affidavits would constitute an offence.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, not being of a legal mind, I have looked at what was made available. There are neither dates, nor places, nor names in the material I have. I had the opportunity of showing what was made available to me to legal counsel. To me it constitutes nothing really.

Hospital Sites

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll resist the temptation of yet another supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture and direct this question to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Could he advise the members of the Assembly why there was no formal consultation with the board before the relocation of the hospital at Berwyn — the hospital had been there for 54 years — to Grimshaw, and whether the minister had considered formally requesting from the board a recommendation as to site.

MR. RUSSELL: No I hadn't, Mr. Speaker, and first of all I want to say I did read reports in today's media about statements alleged to have been made by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I hope he was misquoted, because certainly the things he said were nasty, to say the least. I'm sure he wouldn't have said those things he was insinuating.

Mr. Speaker, the location, co-ordination, financing, and administration of health care facilities in the province are the responsibility of the government, through the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care. I did meet with the board and go through their facility. Within the department we then made an assessment of population trends, location of staff members and doctors, and patient clientele and, on that basis, decided to put the hospital, in its reconstructed situation, in the larger community of Grimshaw.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that there are several situations akin to that, in pairs of communities throughout the province. This was the only one where there was a constituency boundary between the two communities. But I want to assure the hon. member, in this House, that no political or constituency boundary factor was taken into consideration. We looked at the regional health needs of the communities involved and put the hospital where we think it will serve the most people in the best manner.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll save any observations on the minister's answer until tomorrow or the next day. But I would ask the supplementary question of the minister: can the minister advise the Assembly if, during the discussions the minister held with the board last year, the minister gave the undertaking or made the statement that any decision with respect to location would have to be a board decision?

MR. RUSSELL: No, I don't recall that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister, Can the minister advise the Assembly if, in the process of making a decision, either the Hospitals and Medical Care Policy Advisory Committee, chaired by the hon. Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park, or the Health and Social Services caucus committee, chaired by the hon. Member for Calgary North West, were in fact asked to give an opinion on either the Berwyn hospital relocation or any other aspect of the ministerial announcement yesterday?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly if it will be the intention of the government to table this recommendation from either committees? And was the decision with respect to the changing of site primarily a consequence of departmental review, or were there in fact specific recommendations from either committee?

MR. RUSSELL: I think several questions were embodied in one. First of all I can say that there is no written report to table. Even if there were, following standard policy in this House caucus reports would not be tabled. The departmental review was certainly part of the decision-making insofar as the size of the facility, whether it should be built, and where it ought to be located were concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I really want to deflect what the hon. member has been insinuating. If you look at the list of projects, going back to the nice new facility recently built in Fairview, the two new hospitals going into the constituency of the Leader of the Opposition, and the other facilities located around the province, without doubt you'll find that they're located on the premise of serving the health care needs of Albertans.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care relates to his first answer concerning the location of staff members at the Berwyn hospital. Had the minister had an opportunity to review the figures which show that 17 staff members live in Berwyn and only nine in Grimshaw, before the minister made his statement today in the House and public statements alleged by the minister outside the House?

MR. RUSSELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, there's the last person who should be talking about people making statements outside the House.

MR. NOTLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think it's fair game if the minister wants to invite challenges from the opposition . . .

MR. SPEAKER: What's the point of order?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is this: if we are not to ask insulting questions then, on the other hand, the minister should not give insulting answers. What's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. I know the members don't like that sort of situation. They like to have the huge control of 74 members to complete-

ly dominate this House, backed up by rules that give them unfair advantage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. NOTLEY: But if we are not to solicit that kind of response in asking a question, then by the same token when the ministers answer they must answer with a gentlemanly, diplomatic, and straightforward approach.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order. When the hon. member's gentlemanly and diplomatic questions contain barbs, it would seem less than fair to allow a minister an opportunity to deflect those barbs. Occasionally it is difficult for me to draw a line between a barb and an insult.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, returning to the matter of staff members, we looked at that. I don't have the exact numbers the hon. member has, but they approximate the information I have. Certainly all the doctors involved live and practice in the town of Grimshaw. The population is roughly on a 4 to 1 basis. Looking at the convenience to citizens, by all standards of measurement the hospital should logically be placed in Grimshaw, and that's where it's going.

MRS. FYFE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Referring to the location of hospitals in larger communities, I wonder if the minister could advise what criteria his department uses in determining the location of hospitals, seeing that there were such a large number of submissions made by boards in this province over the last year?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, that's a very difficult issue to deal with. We did spend some time in pairs of communities throughout Alberta — for example, Olds-Didsbury, Raymond-Magrath, Trochu-Three Hills — examining with those boards whether they would accept some form of rationalization with respect to combining facilities and looking at larger, more centralized facilities. In all cases the response was negative. So we've attempted to design a program that, to the degree possible, maintains health care facilities in local communities.

When you get into the larger metropolitan centres, it's the responsibility of the urban government to provide the site; then all other costs are borne by the province. In that case, we leave it up to the municipal council to provide the site, but we like the opportunity at least to review with them transportation and utility facilities available to the site and, again, the convenience to the public.

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the hon. minister . . . A hospital in my constituency in Calgary North Hill made application for considerable enlargement. Apparently that was refused, and it's going to go into a new hospital in some other's constituency. I wonder if the minister could say if that is political favoritism?

DR. BUCK: You don't speak up loud enough.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care regarding the significant announcement yesterday, talked about again today, of expanded hospitals. I wonder if the minister would clarify to the House the expandable core hospital he mentioned in the announcement yesterday.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, that follows the remarks I made in my last answer concerning regionalization. We recognize that if we were to try to maintain hospitals where they exist in most communities throughout Alberta, we would probably have to go away from the traditional pattern that's been followed. The department is currently developing what I think is a pretty exciting concept, the 10-bed expandable core hospital. This will provide on a standardized basis in many locations throughout Alberta the basic core of services that are needed for an active treatment hospital, plus an initial wing of 10 active treatment beds. The buildings will be standardized and designed so that, as the community grows or requirements change, we can plug into the core additional kinds of different nursing bed wings, as they are required.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I am certainly very pleased to hear that, because it recognizes the local community health care for small communities.

DR. BUCK: Just like Berwyn and Grimshaw.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would indicate whether these small core hospitals he described could be used for outpatient care?

MR. RUSSELL: I would think they would get a heavy use in outpatient care, Mr. Speaker.

DR. PAPROSKI: A further clarification to the House, Mr. Speaker, and a supplementary. I wonder if the minister would indicate whether this outpatient care would house or dispense multidisciplinary health services for the community, co-ordinated with the public health units that we have in the communities.

MR. RUSSELL: I couldn't answer that question today, Mr. Speaker. I think the facilities will respond to the local needs in each case. If the hon. member is referring to the community health care centres for which he has campaigned so vigorously in the past, I don't know if this would be a beginning to that or not.

DR. PAPROSKI: I'm pleased to hear that remark, Mr. Speaker. The final supplementary: does the minister recognize that the hospital boards and/or the minister have the authority and the possibility of also having such public health services in core hospitals?

DR. BUCK: They don't have the money, Ken.

MR. RUSSELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, the possibility always exists. An interjection from the other side made reference to financing, and of course that's a very important factor to consider, especially in these . . .

DR. BUCK: Tell it to the nurses, Dave.

MR. RUSSELL: Well, now that the hibernation season is over, look what crept out of its lair; for heaven's sake. [laughter]

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to see that the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care has responded to pressure from the opposition and the people of this province . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. [interjections] Order please.

Child Care

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney General. I would like to ask whether any decision has been made with regard to prosecution of staff members at the northern rehabilitation training centre?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to complete any review of that situation quickly in light of the great amount of publicity it's received. It is also important to make clear that what was being done was that a report prepared by Dr. Thompson was being considered, and the question asked whether or not from that report there appeared to be circumstances that would call for any further action with respect to the laying of charges. That review is being completed, and the decision is that it would not be appropriate to consider any further action in the circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, if I might indicate the reasoning behind that decision, I should say to hon. members that the laying of any charge is considered a matter of some importance and consequence, not lightly undertaken or proceeded with in any circumstances. It was the view of the law officers of the Crown — it clearly not being their duty to determine the appropriateness of specific treatment modes and so on, but only to determine whether a charge, if laid, might succeed — that any charge laid in the circumstances would probably fail, and that it would be an excessive use of law enforcement machinery to lay charges in that case.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Attorney General. In the case of the children who were affected and are also wards of the Crown, is there any civil recourse through the courts these children have with regard to their case? Or would the staff of the department be taking any recourse with regard to their situation?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is asking me to provide something more distinctly in the nature of a legal opinion than what his last question was. I should say that the legislative framework examined in order to see whether any further action in this case with respect to charges or the like included the criminal law and the provisions of The Child Welfare Act of Alberta. In both cases it was thought that no steps should be taken.

75th Anniversary

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Government Services in his capacity as a member of the cabinet committee on the 75th Anniversary. There appears to be some confusion, and I would like the minister to clarify . . .

DR. BUCK: You're right, John.

MR. GOGO: . . . with regard to the medallion program anticipated this year for certain Albertans. In view of the fact that many of our senior citizens around Alberta listen to CKUA and this question period, I wonder if the minister could advise the House what the qualifications

are for Albertans to receive the gold and silver medallion, in this our 75th Anniversary year?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. member is asking on behalf of a group of people and not himself, but I can assure him that he does not qualify. I will have to search my mind very quickly for the qualifications. In brief they are: for a gold medallion you must be 75 years or more, you must have been born here in Alberta — or what is now Alberta but might formerly have been a part of the Northwest Territories — and you must now be living here as a permanent resident. I believe those are all the qualifications for a gold medallion.

If you are resident in Alberta for three years, 75 years of age or more, and a Canadian citizen you would be entitled to a silver medallion.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, that in attempting to honor all the pioneers who were in Alberta over these past 75 years, or even those who have come more recently but have established permanent residence here, we also want to honor senior citizens 65 years of age and over. Each of them will be given a scroll that will recognize their contribution to the tremendous 75th Anniversary year we're having, this Diamond Jubilee year.

MR. GOGO: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I also believe there is special recognition for certain new-borns in the province. In view of the unknown quantity of senior citizens in Alberta who may qualify, I wonder if the minister could assure the House that these medallions will indeed be available in terms of the materials necessary — that is, the gold and silver — to present to these senior citizens during 1980.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, we have in fact purchased a supply of gold and silver to allow us to mint the medallions when the time comes and we know how many are required.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the newborn, I should say that I hope the comments of the [member] will not encourage any competition to qualify for newborn medallions.

MR. GOGO: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the time of year, I would anticipate it would be somewhat of a miracle to achieve that this year.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I should say they will be ready about September 1.

MR. SPEAKER: We have used the time for the question period, but I've already recognized the hon. Member for Vegreville. If the Assembly agrees, perhaps we could have his question.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Education, who is charged with the proposals made to the 75th Anniversary Commission. Would the minister advise the Assembly whether applications for funding of the 75th Anniversary celebrations have been reviewed and whether a decision for approval has been completed?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, approximately 180 projects submitted from around the province are going to be funded by the 75th Anniversary Commission. Those proj-

ects are separate and apart from the probably thousands of projects that will originate locally and be funded locally from the \$20 per capita grant that has been given to each municipality in the province. So I want to separate the programs funded by the 75th Anniversary Commission from the thousands of additional programs that are going to be funded locally.

With respect to those that are funded by the 75th Anniversary Commission, all have been advised of approval in principle for financial support of their projects. We are now going through a second evaluation of these, not on the merits of the proposal but rather on its operational feasibility and budget. As we approve that second evaluation step, we are sending further confirmation to the sponsors of the project to advise what kind of support they will be receiving from us, whether it is money or support in kind, and the extent of that support.

From among all those projects, while every one approved by the 75th Anniversary Commission has been advised of approval in principle, we are moving on the second stage in order of a critical date. In other words, if the project is going to be operated this spring, we're reviewing those first in order to ensure that before the critical date they know how much support they are going to have and what kind it is going to be. Projects that are scheduled to be held during the summer or fall may not have received a second letter yet from the 75th Anniversary Commission, but it's our expectation that they will all have been evaluated, will all have received a second letter of notification by April 20. If the hon. member has any particular information about a project that suggests the system is not operating properly, I would be pleased to hear about it.

MR. BATIUK: A short supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise whether the others who have not been given approval have been notified that their application would be rejected.

MR. KING: To the best of our knowledge, yes. Approximately 2,500 proposals have been submitted to the 75th Anniversary Commission by groups around the province. To the best of our knowledge all of those have been acknowledged by the 75th Anniversary Commission. If they were not eligible in principle for support by the commission, they have been advised of that fact and the proposal has been referred to the municipality or the suggestion has been made that they look for alternate sources of funding. But as I say, when you are dealing with 2,500 applications you may be aware of a proposal which has not received an acknowledgement. If that's the case, I'd be interested in hearing the details from you, perhaps privately, and would be very pleased to pursue it.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for the question period, as I mentioned, has elapsed. I regret that five members who had intended to ask questions were not reached. It has now happened three days in a row that a number of members were not reached for their first question. There's no way the Chair could say that their questions would be less important or concerning less important subjects than those which were in fact asked, and it's going to be necessary to restrict supplementaries somewhat further than has been done in the last three days.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. To the Government House Leader: has the government considered lengthening the question period?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, no consideration has been given to that.

MR. SPEAKER: Without wishing to enter into a debate on the subject, I believe in the House of Commons there is a 40-minute question period, for a considerably larger number of members.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we saw a rather, I'm afraid to say, momentary — but I hope it would be permanent — change of view by this government on Friday when we had the release of the poll in question, it is not necessary to move Motion for a Return No. 101. In not moving it, I would simply express the hope that the disclosure on Friday will herald a new day of open government, and that in the future all polls will automatically be tabled by the minister after they are completed.

DR. BUCK: Only the ones that don't hurt them.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is withdrawn.

head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

201. Moved by Mr. L. Clark:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to consider bringing about a review of rentals under surface leases and orders dated before January 1, 1972, that have not been reviewed voluntarily, by introducing legislation to amend The Surface Rights Act to provide for a review of such rentals on the application of the land owner or operator.

MR. L. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me pleasure today to move Motion 201. The purpose of this Motion is very simple. It urges the government to amend The Surface Rights Act to treat all landowners equally. I realize that in many ways this is a rather controversial motion, in that it asks the government to force a reopening of contracts that have been in force for many years. In fact all of them have been in force longer than this government has been in power. I realize also that in many cases the oil companies have voluntarily brought their old contracts into line with the new contract prices. But there is still a small minority who have either not moved at all or else made only very token payments.

Mr. Speaker, I had a pre-session meeting in my constituency, and it was very well attended by surface rights groups in the area. Even though the meeting was called to discuss the amendments to the new assessment Act, the one and only motion that came out of that meeting was: that all leases prior to 1972 be included in the Act for purposes of renegotiation.

At that meeting there was representation from two surface rights groups; one had 175 members, the other 68. Very few of these people are actually affected, because the greatest majority of wells in our area had been drilled long after 1972. I suppose that must speak well for our present energy policies under this government. In spite of

that fact that most of the wells were drilled after 1972 the people attending the meeting still felt that a small [minority] left out there were being treated unfairly because they could not renegotiate their lease every five years, the same as people who had wells drilled on their farms after 1972. Their argument was that it would have little effect on the oil companies. As I said before, most all of the oil companies have already renegotiated their leases, as they have been urged to do by this government. But there is still that minority, and it is that small minority that this motion is concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, within the boundaries of my constituency I have two surface rights groups, both of which spent many hours reviewing The Surface Rights Act and coming up with some recommendations for changes within that Act. One point both groups made very clear to me that day was that they would like all leases signed before 1972 to be included in the Act for renegotiation. I realize there are those here who would argue that the government should not interfere in contracts made between two private parties. That might well be true in many cases, but we must remember that in this case the farmers involved had no choice on the price, as it was set by a government board. Even though all the farmers didn't go to arbitration to set that price, the price they received was based on what was established by the board at that time. Any farmers I have ever seen in our area would have certainly taken more if they could have gotten it.

We also must remember, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers involved not only could not negotiate the price; they could not refuse to sign the agreement. Because of the forced entry clause in the Act, they were forced to enter into the agreement whether they wished to or not. I believe this puts them into a little different category from the average person who willingly signs a contract believing he has a good deal, but also has the privilege and the right to refuse to sign that contract if he doesn't like what is offered. This is certainly not the case as far as the farmers were concerned. They were not able to negotiate a higher price or to refuse to sign the agreement.

Keeping this in mind, Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at what has happened over the years to some of these contracts that took place before 1972. I would like to use as an example one in our area that I know very well. In 1958 a large Canadian company drilled a well on a man's property. At that time the land was native grass which he used for hay land. You can only get one crop every three years out of native grass. At that time it wasn't too bad a deal, but let's look at what has happened to that oil company and that farm over the past 22 years.

The land has changed from native grass to farmland. Why? Because it was uneconomical to accept one crop every three years. It was no longer economical to keep it in native grass, so it was broken up and turned into farmland. The oil well has changed hands, not once but three times. It is now on its third owner, a private individual from the United States. The ownership of the land has gone from one generation to the next. Taxes on this piece of property have gone up 10 times, not just because of inflation but because of the change in the use of the land from native grass to farmland.

The only thing that has not changed, Mr. Speaker, is the contract signed by the present owner's father and a large Canadian oil company 22 years ago, in 1958. Over the years the land has changed use, the oil companies have changed, and the land has gone from one generation to another. The contract has never really changed. It was a contract that was really never negotiable in the first

place, because the price was set by a government board and the contract could not be turned down because of the forced entry clause in the Act.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to hearing the debate on this motion, because this government has taken great pride over the years, and rightly so, in treating all Albertans fairly. It has shown this many times over during its time in office. We have a minority of landowners who are being treated differently from the majority of landowners in our province, not through any fault of their own but because they just happen to own land the oil companies decided to drill on before 1972. As a result they have no way of upgrading their contracts as farmers have after 1972, and in most cases the ones from 1972 on have a much better deal to start with than those prior to 1972.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to hearing the debate on this motion and ask members for their support.

Thank you.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, as I rise to join in the debate on Motion 201, I wish to thank the Member for Drumheller for bringing the motion forth. It is almost identical to a motion I had on the Order Paper last year, only I wasn't quite so fortunate as to be on the top of the list to get it debated as a first motion in the present session of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, as the member previously said, we are dealing with a small number of well lease sites in Alberta, but to farmers they are a very big item. They are very important when you have a well site that has been drilled many years ago and you do not receive any reassessment of the price on that well site.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that 95 per cent and up of the well sites previous to 1972 have been renegotiated. Most figures settle around 97 per cent, so that leaves 3 per cent that have not been renegotiated voluntarily. I stress the word "voluntarily" because, as has been said, there is no legislation forcing the companies to increase their compensation to the farmers. But most have, and I feel that IPAC, the Independent Petroleum Association, and the Canadian Petroleum Association should be commended for urging their members, and putting pressure on the majority of their members, to upgrade their leases voluntarily. Also I believe the office of the Farmers' Advocate should be commended for the pressure and work it has done to encourage oil companies to renegotiate voluntarily the increase in the well sites that have been upgraded.

Mr. Speaker, some of the companies argue that they cannot afford to increase the price paid on a well site. But I submit that the amount of money paid on a well site would be a small percentage of the operation of that well. Many of those wells have increased their income many-fold from the time the contract with the farmer was originally signed, with the price of gas or oil in those days compared to the price they receive for gas and oil on the market today. There is no reason why the farmer or landowner should not share a portion of that profit, as he has to put up with the inconvenience of the well site.

Mr. Speaker, sanctity of contract is fine, and it should be maintained. But in fairness I believe it is up to the companies to renegotiate these contracts in good faith, a meaningful negotiation with both sides participating — not just saying, well, we'll give you a dollar increase and that's it; we've renegotiated; we've changed the totals. But a negotiation that's fair and equitable. And if the amount can't be arrived at by the groups, take it to the Surface Rights Board to assess the amount that could be paid on

this land.

Just to indicate the problem with some of the leases that are outstanding, I quote from *Hansard*, March 13, 1978. As part of his speech, the then Member for Drumheller referred to the very problem that the present Member for Drumheller has in the form of a motion today, and it reads in part:

Our offer was never intended to be negotiable ...

we would assume from your letter that you do not wish to accept an increase in surface rentals.

Mr. Speaker, that is not meaningful negotiation; that is one part. And the wording reminds us very much of what was happening prior to The Surface Rights Act of 1972 being introduced. The company was saying, you are going to get this, a one-sided deal; if you don't like it, that's tough. In those days expropriation was pretty easy. So we'll expropriate. That has been turned around. Today expropriation is a time-consuming and expensive legal step, so we have to turn to negotiations. And, as we see, the majority have: all the wells drilled since 1972, as well as 97 per cent or thereabouts of the wells drilled previously. But there is still that small number outstanding that will not negotiate meaningfully and are clinging to the old ideas the companies had then. I am sure they are an embarrassment to the other companies in the business that are negotiating meaningfully.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Drumheller gave some figures related to the taxation of those lands, the productivity of those lands, and the losses thereof, from the dates of those wells to nowadays. From 1961 to 1976, I have figures that farms have almost doubled in size, on the average from 345 acres to 508. Now if those acreages are the average in the areas where many of these wells are, in the dryland areas, the size of the machinery has more than doubled. So you are, in effect, working with large machinery around some of these wells, requiring more time to work around these obstructions.

Probably the starting of surface rights groups is the result of some of the feelings the landowner has towards the oil companies, that they are in effect trampling over them. Now, Mr. Speaker, I know in my area many of the wells drilled — the oil companies have very good working relationships with the farmers. Most of the land men have good working relationships with the farmers. But this 3 per cent is hanging out there, and these groups are out to stand up for what they think is right, to see that they get a fair share of the exploration moneys that are spent in Alberta.

Again, Mr. Speaker, in closing I would urge those to support the motion to have meaningful negotiations go on to upgrade those well sites prior to 1972, and also to commend those companies who have built up good relations before 1972 and since 1972. I am sure this 3 per cent is an embarrassment to them. I have talked to these groups, and it appears to me that they have done everything they can to encourage them to upgrade and they have not been able to. Mr. Speaker, maybe it's time that we do something to force them to upgrade.

Thank you.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Sitting here and listening to the debate on Motion 201, Mr. Speaker, I just felt that I've got to get up and go on record as supporting this motion, because I think it is a good motion. I can recall in 1972 when The Surface Rights Act came in, and the hon. Member for Drayton Valley at that time, brought a resolution before the floor. I can always remember Dr. Horner, the minister responsible at that time, saying that

if they don't renew these leases voluntarily, we're apt to bring in legislation. As a result, I have to agree that the majority of the oil companies have renewed and updated their leases that were prior to 1972.

As I see it, the problem with a lot of these leases — and I agree with farmers that didn't have legal advice and contracts. We had no uniformity of contracts at that time. Sometimes a farmer would be busy in the field, and an oil company representative or someone expropriating or buying land would come out and sign an agreement with the farmer, and they wouldn't really know what they were signing. As far as some of these oil companies breaking contracts, I think they were contracts that were not well understood by the farmers of the day. We now have some uniformity of contracts, and it is much easier for a farmer to get involved in contracts with oil companies.

Mr. Speaker, in my constituency I have a few oil companies that haven't updated their leases. I come from an area where there's a lot of irrigation. These oil sites cause a real problem, especially where they want to put in sprinkler systems or pivots. It certainly causes a problem in irrigation.

We did have a surface rights association set up. They call it EID Surface Rights Association, and I've got to give them a lot of credit because they've certainly ironed out a lot of problems as far as oil leases are concerned. One of the requests they had to oil companies down in the area: any oil company that puts in an oil head or drills a well, has to drill it in the northeast corner of a quarter section. That certainly has helped down in my constituency.

As I say, there are oil companies down there that haven't upgraded these leases, and I certainly think there should be some fair method, because most of the major oil companies have brought their leases up to a reasonable standard. I have one suggestion from the EID Surface Rights Association that we tie remuneration of leases to royalties. If the royalties go up and the revenue from oil and gas goes up, the rent from these leases should go up. I might say, some of these contracts haven't been upgraded since 1972. Oil was \$3 a barrel when these contracts were signed, and gas was as low as 15 cents. I just wanted to go on record, Mr. Speaker, as supporting this resolution and congratulate the member for bringing it before the House.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I take a great deal of pleasure in participating in this debate today, and would like first of all to congratulate the Member for Drumheller for sponsoring the resolution that was previously on the Order Paper by the Member for Cypress, who also made a very significant contribution to the debate today.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose one might almost think that my participation in the discussion would be somewhat suspect. I have been an urban man all my life, have worked in the oil industry for some 18 years, and have represented the other side of the equation. I confess to some mixed feelings about the debate.

I remember sitting at the other end of this row five years back when I first came here. The then Member for Innisfail at that time had sponsored a resolution urging the government to consider reviewing by legislation all the oil royalties provided in the various freehold mineral leases. I recall at that time getting up and making a speech in opposition to the motion as an invasion of the private sector and an intrusion into voluntary agreements, and feeling quite strongly about it. I still share

those kinds of concerns, but I have a great deal of sympathy for the position put forward today by the hon. members. The sympathy relates to experience here, to a better knowledge of the industry, to a recognition of what I think are the responsibilities of the industry, as well as to a recognition of the increase in energy prices and so on, which would make it so much easier for the energy companies at this time to respond in a more generous fashion to the landowners who have not had their leases reviewed.

I would also say, Mr. Speaker, that I was very pleased to see the Member for Bow Valley in the debate today. I wouldn't want to suggest the opposition might have solved this problem years ago, but frankly, they might have. This government came to govern in 1971, and at that time the situation was just as described by the first speakers. The energy companies, the oil and gas companies, could get access, and still can, to property to drill or produce their oil and gas wells. In the legislation at that time there was a degree of expropriation, or at least expropriation threat so that if the oil company and the landowner were not able to agree to the terms and conditions by which the energy company might be admitted to the farmer's lands, the right of entry board or the Surface Rights Board — whatever it may be called — would then give the company access. So there was a degree of compulsion or threat of expropriation to the company.

Our government came to power in 1971, and in 1972 recognized the unfairness of the situation and legislated, not retroactively but prospectively, that any future voluntary agreements or compensation orders — that is, compulsory takings — would be subject to five-year review. I think that was a very forward step. Had the prior government been perhaps a bit more alert and considered legislation of that nature many, many years before, we wouldn't be in the conundrum we are right now with the 3 per cent of the companies that have not reviewed their legislation. So I think there's a degree of culpability on the prior administration in leaving the situation as it is right now.

With respect to whether or not anyone supports retroactive legislation, I think we all have to do a good deal of soul-searching on that before we get into it. I know that in 1972 — not being here, and being actively engaged in the oil industry — when the present government passed that legislation, a lot of us in the oil industry in southern Alberta thought it was an unfair involvement in private sector areas, where two mature adult citizens, be they corporations or individuals, could and would agree on a price. It seemed unfair at that time I thought for a government to be saying, your leases will be subject to later review. That was my opinion in 1972, although not a strong one. Right now I think the 1972 legislation which is now with us was very forward and deserves the continuing support of all members here.

I've had a number of representations from constituents and others who right now are in the dilemma of having a 1950 or 1960 order or surface lease and still having to live with it. I think of one in particular. It's a very unusual situation. Land in the Calgary area was taken by voluntary agreement in about 1952. I may have the numbers wrong, but not badly in error. The amount agreed on in the early 1950s for annual rental was about \$35. The land has since been annexed to the city of Calgary. It is a part of the sour gas field on the northeast extremity of the city of Calgary. There are three or four, maybe a half dozen wells on the property. The land is housing development land and has a value somewhere between \$50,000 an acre

and perhaps a maximum of \$125,000, but going up. The man's lease is not one of those by legislation subject to review. He tells me his father agreed to the lease with the energy company because — and I won't vouch for the facts; I'll simply tell them to you as he told them to me. The land agent told his father that if he didn't agree to sign a lease, they would simply go through expropriation. He would have to go through the hearing process, perhaps hire a lawyer and, in any event not arrive at any greater advantage than by signing at what was then the current rate of \$35 or \$50 an acre. Here we are 25 or 27 years later, and according to the man's story he's still being paid the \$35 or \$50 an acre and has no legal redress.

Frankly I don't know what the solution to his problem would be. Even if we were to change the legislation, I don't know whether the board that now has authority in that area would give him anywhere towards what he thinks is a fair market value for that property. In fact during the life of that field, which I believe is another 12 to 18 years, he will be deprived of the opportunity of developing that land as housing and reaping the million-dollar profits he might from it. I don't know how the Surface Rights Board would or could respond to that situation. There are some very serious problems out there, and I think they deserve the sympathy of this Assembly. Certainly the oil companies should show corporate responsibility and address themselves to that problem. We have heard, and I'm sure the facts are correct, that 97 per cent have already and are continuing to review their agreements.

Mr. Speaker, I take a personal satisfaction in that because the company I was formerly associated with I think was one of the first to recognize their responsibility. The reason I take a personal satisfaction from it is that part of the responsibility for the reviews fell under my jurisdiction. I guess, because of my close connection with many of the members up here, I was sympathetic towards the landowner or farmer concerned, and encouraged our company, and through membership on the legal and land committees of the Canadian Petroleum Association and the Independent Petroleum Association, helped urge their membership to take a responsible corporate attitude and review their leases. They have done that, Mr. Speaker. My understanding right now is that about 3 per cent have not responded in a positive fashion.

I had the opportunity over lunch today to speak to the Farmers' Advocate. I've forgotten the date of his appointment; it goes back 6 or 7 years. His appointment caused some concern in the industry. I shared some of that concern about how he would be out there involving himself in private contracts. I have since come to respect the job he does. I think his impact on both the landowners or the farmers and the energy companies, in the area of reviewing surface rentals, has been a very positive one in ameliorating their differences, in bringing them together, and in trying to get a better understanding from both sides as to what a realistic pricing mechanism might be.

Could I just interject here, if I heard him correctly, the opposition member suggested that surface rentals might be tied to royalties or to pricing of the product, be it oil or gas. I don't think that is the right approach, Mr. Speaker. In my view, the landowner either does or doesn't have an interest in the royalty or the mines and minerals. If he does, he automatically gets his per centum share of any increase in the price of the product, and that's fair enough. If he doesn't have an interest in the mines and minerals, he should not be expecting any

compensation for that. That isn't to say that the annual compensation for his surface rights or his surface lands shouldn't go upward as inflation takes place, as land values go up. But it shouldn't be tied directly to the price of a barrel of oil or an MCF or a gigajoule of gas. In other words, it shouldn't be dependent on negotiations undertaken between the provincial government and the federal government and whatever arrangements might be made there. Surely the landowner's rental should be determined on a much more stable and predictable basis.

Anyway, coming back to the Farmers' Advocate and communication with the industry and the land owners, when the 1972 legislation was passed, it's my understanding that he sent out several thousand letters to companies that had not at that date indicated any intention to review their surface royalties or rentals. He had a very good response and is continuing to work with them. I understand there is something like 135,000 acres of Alberta agricultural land subject to surface rights with the energy companies, and if 97 per cent of that amount has been renegotiated, it is a very small minority who are still being penalized or unfairly dealt with. I am told that the companies not responding to the urgings of the Legislature, the Canadian Petroleum Association, and responsible industry leaders, are the companies that have low-producer wells or shut-in wells or whatever.

In suggesting they have a responsibility to review this, Mr. Speaker, I would remind them that our government has seen fit to reduce the royalties on low-producer wells to assure that those wells are not prematurely shut-in and that those companies would have adequate revenues to pay the operating costs of their wells. Rental to the landowner is surely one of the operating costs of those wells, and our reduction of oil royalties should make it much easier for even the smaller companies to respond more positively to the needs of the landowner.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Calgary Millican was saying last night — and he took a great deal of pride in it — that 85 per cent of the oil company head offices were in downtown Calgary Millican or downtown Calgary Elbow. If we're not able to resolve this matter in the House, perhaps he may do some urging through his special connections that would bring a measure of responsibility to those companies that have not yet reviewed their leases.

Mr. Speaker, I see the time is about out. I look forward to the contributions of others. I have other remarks I would like to make, so could I now beg leave to adjourn debate?

MR. NOTLEY: It goes all day today, Stu. Read the rules.

DR. BUCK: His time's run out.

MR. NOTLEY: Keep going, Stu.

MR. McCRAE: I believe there are other matters coming up on the Order Paper.

MR. NOTLEY: The minister is confusing Tuesday with Thursday.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, if I have the unanimous support of the House to continue — not only the support but the urgings of the House ... [interjection]

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, did I hear that it was unanimous? Did he make it that way, or did he pull back his

consent?

Anyway, just a few more remarks, then I look forward to comments of others. The industry is an important one; it's a vital one at this time in our history. It is an industry that from the time of Turner Valley and even before has given Alberta its place in Confederation right now, and that is one of leadership. We have a full treasury, a surplus: We have a heritage trust fund. We have high employment. We have opportunities for people from all across Canada who come here to work in the industry. The industry has profited mightily. I remember that when I first came here in the latter part of '73, things were very difficult on the street. The industry was at a very, very low ebb. Things have changed. Things are very advantageous for the energy companies at this time, and I think it is incumbent on the industry that have not yet responded positively to the wishes of their lessors, that they do so.

Mr. Speaker, I have some concern about what would be retroactive legislation. I wouldn't at this time say I would support retroactive legislation. I'm concerned about it. But, as I have said, I have considerable sympathy with the intent and purpose of this motion. I think the way to go is through the channels of industry, through the Canadian Petroleum Association, through the Independent Petroleum Association, through individual members here urging the companies they are familiar with — be it through the Member for Calgary Millican, the Member for Calgary Elbow, or each one of us, contacting individuals in those companies and asking them to review their surface rentals.

We often condemn these energy companies as being foreign oriented or foreign based and so on. The facts of the matter are that the people working in those companies and making the day-to-day decisions are you and I, the people of Alberta who are employed there. When I worked with a major company, very few decisions came from head office. They came from the day-to-day management of the company, you and I sitting there making decisions.

So for the 3 per cent of the companies that have not yet agreed to review their annual rentals, I think that if you and I individually, collectively, through the Canadian Petroleum Association, through the offices of the Farmers' Advocate, and the other organizations, persist in urging them on, there is a very distinct possibility that not only 97 per cent, but all the surface rights leases will be reviewed.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. minister for adjournment of debate, would all those in favor please say aye?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those opposed, please say no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is carried.

202. Moved by Mr. Sindlinger:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to establish a scholarship fund for students playing a sport for any university or college intercollegiate team, in order to encourage highly skilled young athletes to remain in Alberta, to develop a high level of recrea-

tional competence and expertise, and to provide a rich resource of skills and leadership for Alberta's recreation and leisure industry.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to bring this motion before the Assembly for debate today. This resolution asks the Legislature to urge the government to establish what are commonly known as athletic scholarships. Some people might say the need for athletic scholarships stems from the fact that sports and physical education build strong character, alert minds, and a great nation. That's not true. Other people say that athletes are red-blooded, clean-living, honest, great guys. It may surprise you, sir, but that's not true either.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there's a need for athletic scholarships in Alberta for two reasons. First, we do have a great deal of raw athletic expertise in the province, but this expertise is being attracted to the United States because there are more facilities and opportunities for athletes in that country.

I'd like to refer to an article that was in *Maclean's* just last summer. It talked about Canadian athletes who had excelled in the Olympic Games, the Pan American Games, and the Commonwealth Games. It cites a few, such as Nancy Garapick, one of Canada's Olympic medal winners, gold medal winners, and says that besides her, 13 of Canada's best swimmers are in the United States. Joining Miss Garapick at Arizona State University were five other Canadian swimmers, with Alberta's Graham Smith, star of the 1978 Commonwealth Games, swimming for the University of California at Berkeley, and Steve Pickell for the University of Southern California.

More than 100 track and field athletes have followed this path of least discomfort, and the list runs on to hockey players [so numerous that quotas are being slapped on Canadian recruits], football and basketball players . . . rowers, and scores of others.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion there is a second reason for providing athletic scholarships to keep Alberta athletes in Alberta. I believe our society has reached such a high standard of living today that recreation and leisure time activities are going to become of prime importance to Albertans. It wasn't long ago that people were working seven-day weeks. Today most people are working five-day weeks, but many others work only four-day weeks. It won't be long before we'll be looking at working two days and having five days for leisure and recreational activities. I believe we have to have the expertise and the competence to manage and develop that type of recreational and leisure activity for us.

Mr. Speaker, there is enabling legislation within the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union for such sports awards. It had been thought before that such sports awards couldn't be awarded because of eligibility rules. However, the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union does allow awards for third party representation. Their regulation C-3 says:

A student shall not be eligible to compete in any Union contest who is receiving an athletic scholarship or subsidy from the member he represents or from any other organization under the jurisdiction of the said member . . .

Students competing in activities leading to C.I.A.U. competition are eligible to receive third party scholarships established by provincial and/or federal governments and those awards by any other agency approved by the Board of Directors of the Union.

These "third party scholarships" or grants-in-aid must not specify a university of attendance.

Mr. Speaker, other provinces have taken action in this regard; most notably British Columbia, which just last year introduced a system of sports awards for its athletes attending universities and colleges. The government of British Columbia has recognized that there is

a need to encourage and reward excellence in this field and to get good athletes to stay in the province. . . . [They also have] given increased attention to recognizing gifted children and promoting excellence among their young people . . . [They've] recognized that the promotion of physical fitness is an integral part of public policy.

In that regard, they have set up an athletic scholarship fund, and awards have already been made for the last semester in their universities. They are providing for 550 scholarships of \$1,000 each. To be eligible for one of these scholarships, a student must be in full-time attendance and must be maintaining passing grades at one of the three B.C. universities. Furthermore, recipients must be Canadian citizens or landed immigrants and must have been residents of British Columbia for at least one year. The final condition is that the awards be made from the university to the student.

Mr. Speaker, I've gone through the calendars of the University of Alberta, the University of Calgary, the University of Lethbridge, and the colleges. As you go through these calendars, you can find listed in the backs of the calendars numerous scholarships for various disciplines: engineering, nursing, law, economics, zoology, biology, chemistry, what have you. But under the category of physical education, there are very few awards. There are some at the University of Alberta and absolutely none at the University of Calgary or the University of Lethbridge.

In terms of cost to the province of Alberta, I think a resolution such as this, if implemented, would cost somewhere in the neighborhood of \$500,000 per year. I don't think it's a great, onerous expenditure on the part of the province. It's a small investment. In terms of the rewards from the participation of the athletes in sports in the province, the incentive they provide for other youngsters to remain here, and the contribution they make to athletics after they graduate in coaching, administration, organization, and things of that nature, I think it's well worth the investment.

I wanted to make my comments on this subject brief today. I'm looking forward to hearing the comments of other members of the Legislature. I encourage them to debate the motion in regard to its own merit, and not on the pros and cons of other possible programs. After having heard their comments, I would like to expand on the comments I made today and theirs.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to rise and participate in this debate. I will ignore the hon. member's request that I zero in on just the proposal, because I think the proposal has ramifications wider than he's suggesting.

I agree with the hon. member's idea that we should use a scholarship approach. However, I think it's a rather restricted attitude. In Canada right now we have 800,000 people out of work. This is a tremendously rich resource that has been poorly used. It's obvious that we need more education. The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo first brought this suggestion to the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee, where I had an opportunity to speak

with regard to it. I think the member should be applauded for bringing it up again, but it gives me the opportunity once again to disagree slightly with him.

I would like to give a little personal background on this. I was fortunate to go to university. I went there for nothing. I was paid for when I was there. The only thing I had to do each year was pass my courses prescribed by the university. I also got an allowance for my wife, because at the time I was married. I was a veteran student. A lot of people say, well, the country owed it to you. I don't agree. Many of us spent many years in the service, some of us anywhere from one to six years, but we were convinced that we were doing the right thing. All we wanted was the opportunity to have a better future for our children. Those who lived through the dirty '30s knew what poor education meant. We wanted the chance to develop skills and create wealth that we could all share.

Way back in '45 the Liberals, God bless them — we're not blessing them today — came up with a massive program to educate all the veterans who returned from the wars and wanted an education: for every month of service, you got a month of education. Some people received Ph.D.s and some travelled worldwide, but a tremendous resource was developed in our country.

I would suggest that from an economic point of view our country is much richer for it. The taxes I am paying now as a university graduate are much higher than they would have been if I would have never entered a university. I'm sure that when you look at the carpenters, plumbers, and electricians that were retrained, and at the money they've been making and the taxes that were paid, the country of Canada has been well repaid.

Right now we have a large university plant in Canada. Unfortunately we have an aging university staff throughout the nation. Compared to the facilities I enjoyed, we have excellent facilities, and they are getting better. But we still need more educated people, particularly in science, engineering, and the people professions such as medicine, dentistry, and law. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the only qualification should be the ability to achieve passing grades, and that's all. Everything else will follow. I don't agree with a sports elite, a scientific elite, or an arts elite. I think you should rise there by excellence, but not by any financial help.

In some of this material that was provided for me I notice that they talk about, we don't want academic brilliance, we want athletic brilliance. I think to myself, my God, I'm sure glad we had academic brilliance that brought us through the war, because I'm sure if I'd have been a highly-trained athlete I wouldn't have come up with radar. I think that was one of the most important inventions that saved us. Likewise, today we live in the age of the jet, and again it's a result of a man's work in the lab, not from what he was doing on the field of sports.

Unfortunately, in North America in particular, sports is highly distorted. I recall Professor Goodwin, who used to be a head of the sports department at the University of Calgary, saying how wasteful we were in Calgary in particular in developing large baseball fields. He said, you have 18 players playing, a few hundred people watching, and look at the hundreds of acres you are using throughout the community. In the baseball leagues in the United States right now they are even having difficulty keeping up their fans.

I would suggest that much of the arguments presented by the hon. member are not for sport but for entertainment, and let's not forget that. It's good entertainment.

But if you want to set up a system of developing entertainers, why don't you do it through a sports foundation or something of that nature? Don't tie it to our universities. Only 2 or 3 per cent of our community goes to university. What about the other 97 per cent? I don't know this figure, Mr. Speaker; I would like to know how many Montreal Canadiens have university degrees. But I bet we would all agree that they are pretty damn good hockey players.

Mr. Speaker, one of the difficulties I have with this is that quite often they make comparisons with the United States and talk about the great opportunities there. They forget the great weather there too. It allows you to train 10, 11 and, in some parts of the United States, 12 months of the year. I like the Americans as well as anybody, and I appreciate their hustle, drive, and energy. But we forget that there are many problems and difficulties facing the Americans. They have ways of solving their difficulties that are a lot different from ours. Many countries in the world think of the Americans as being militaristic. I remember when General Eisenhower left the post of President. He said that one of the difficulties facing the United States was the great lobby that had been built up by the defence establishment. I would suggest that much of this team spirit that's developed — you see the military type bands from the school colleges stepping around the streets. The Calgary Stampede is a good example. Unfortunately it reminds me of the goose-stepping activities of the Nazis back in the late '30s.

So this is another reason I can't support the glorification of sports superstars. But I would like to suggest that we concern ourselves with the universities. I have an article written by the President of the University of Alberta. Here's what he says about our university. We have a decline in enrolment in some of our programs; [we have] the difficulty of reallocating limited resources . . . [We have the] vocational and professional preparation to the disadvantage of the university's other responsibilities . . . the limited number of jobs for our graduate students because of minimal hiring in universities and research institutes; the need to replace aging research equipment purchased in the 1950s and 1960s . . . the age distribution of our staff, which has most of us in the middle range . . . the negative image of the university held by important elements in society, including government . . . [that has to be changed.]

He mentions in the conclusion:

We serve society well when many of our undergraduates are prepared for the demands of graduate study and our graduate students are students in professional programs are perceived by government, by business and labor groups, by professional associations, and generally by employers and by fellow employees as extremely well-prepared experts in agriculture and forestry, teachers, lawyers, physicians, engineers . . . not just master technicians, but also thinking and feeling and committed people.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that if we really want to do something about the competence of Canadians in the area of recreation, perhaps we should start at the elementary level and work on it through high school. But I believe we should be emphasizing more as participation has done. We should be emphasizing such things as cross-country skiing, downhill skiing and, in the summer, golf, tennis, hiking; the kinds of activities you can do throughout your life, to a lesser degree as you get older, but still you can maintain them. We all hear stories about people

skiing at 60 and 70 and so on. I suggest that the concept of the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo is excellent. It's small in scope. It lacks the broad approach.

Why can't we educate every person in the province of Alberta who wants to go to university? To me this would be the best investment of the heritage fund. I don't agree with people who say we will have a lot of freeloaders. The easy way is: if you don't pass, you get thrown out. Believe me, they threw the veterans out. I remember the first day in my class in commerce; he said, look around because a lot of you won't be here. There were about 60 of us, and four years later I think 18 of us graduated. I suggest those are the kinds of standards we should maintain in our universities today, not clutter them up with all these extra frills.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, it's a real pleasure this afternoon to rise and speak in favor of the motion from the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo. It's a difficult topic to approach because sports policy has so many competing interests and values that come to mind. Many of us think of sports as simply an opportunity to have good fun and enjoyment. Kicking around a soccer ball, skating on an ice rink bring back a lot of memories from childhood. As the minister for health and hospitals will indicate, it is also important from a fitness point of view. We're looking at trying to correct the attitudes of some of the people in the community, trying to get them off their rear ends and to walk around the block, as participation would suggest. It brings to mind notions of personal development: the Greek approach to philosophy, building a whole man, developing mind, body, and spirit.

Some will think of sport as a prestige resource that could be developed by a country or community for Olympic athletes or glorification of a community. The Edmonton Eskimos do exceptionally well against the Calgary Stampeders, for example, and are a great source of pride and inspiration for Edmontonians and Albertans, I'm sure, much to the chagrin of our country cousins to the south in Calgary. They are also a source of profit to some. There are people who make a good deal of money organizing and managing teams. So sport has all those interests and competing values. It's hard to get a focus or direction in sports policy. Perhaps it's particularly difficult in Canada, Mr. Speaker, because we're a federal country and have two levels of jurisdiction. As a result it's difficult to overlay the provincial programming on top of federal programming and also co-ordinate the activities of universities and private groups.

As I mentioned in the throne speech debate last night, Alberta, though, is a land of opportunity. It's wonderful to be able to recite the many accomplishments and achievements. In Alberta sports, too, is enjoying a good deal of attention, and we can point with pride to the many athletic facilities being constructed. In my own constituency, Mr. Speaker, I can boast of two fine swimming complexes, ice rinks, ball parks: lots of opportunity for youngsters to participate and develop their sports abilities. Another focus the Department of Recreation and Parks is developing is coaching and providing leadership for young athletes.

I think the hon. member's motion would go a long way toward developing the attitude we want to develop in the community; that is, that recreation is important, that we be active, involved in sport, not purely competitive sport, not purely for team competition but simply to stay fit and active. I think we'd all agree in this Chamber, Mr.

Speaker, that if we were to take that attitude we'd find a lot less instance of stress, heart attacks, and a number of other physical problems that plague us in our health care system. People would be able to cope with the rigors of daily living and also enjoy themselves.

I'd like to take just one case in point of a young athlete who would benefit from a program like this. Ian Newhouse is a world class athlete based here in Edmonton, a hurdler on the Canadian national track and field team. Ian Newhouse had to go down to Boise State University in Idaho in order to get his first couple of years of education. He was supported by the good people of Idaho at the time — one of our own going away. It seems a little incongruous, but the Americans seem to take better care of our athletes than we do. Ian came back to Alberta and is registered in the phys ed program at the University of Alberta, where he is developing into a fine athlete. On graduation he is going to be able to contribute to the leadership of our community in sports programs. He will be a recreation administrator, and as such, because of the Americans and the University of Alberta he will be able to help us develop our sports programming. He is in effect becoming a leader in the community; that's what he's being trained for.

It's ironic, though, that Ian can only do that, though, in these two years because his father helps him by supporting him during the summer. The reason is that a young athlete finds it very difficult to get summer employment when a good part of the day, in the afternoon for example, may be spent training, going into meets for a week's duration. Employers aren't very considerate or understanding of that kind of schedule.

We are really developing a leisure class in the most perverse sense of the word, because leisure can only be afforded by people who can afford to be in the leisure class that sociologists so often refer to. In effect we're discriminating against people who don't have the financial wherewithal to support their children. That seems a little unfair in a province like Alberta.

I'd like to refer for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to the federal government's white paper, *Partners in Pursuit of Excellence*, that was put out a couple of years ago. It makes particular reference to the universities as a resource for sports policy and notes that

Canadian universities can play a decisive part in the pursuit of academic and athletic excellence in our country. They have the capacity to relate advanced [education] to sports . . .

and they can combine academics with research. The point being that in a university like the University of Alberta we can develop academic staff members who can coach athletes in the finer techniques of improving their performances, and also relate that to the community as a whole for the benefit of the whole community in their development of coaching.

We should be looking at the financing of sport not so much as a problem but rather as an opportunity. I think we have an opportunity to help the recreation industry. It's a growing industry, Mr. Speaker, that provides a great opportunity for jobs in the secondary and tertiary area of the economy. We can provide leadership here by combining academic excellence with athletic excellence. It need not, as the previous speaker from Calgary suggested, slacken the academic standards at a university but rather, if I can put words into the mouth of the mover of the motion, combine the very best of both by attracting those young athletes who do have academic ability. That would be the focus of this program.

I think we have to recognize that as a government we have a responsibility to provide some leadership. Secondly we have to encourage industry to get involved and participate. If government shows some leadership in this area, we can put more moral suasion to bear on them. We should also encourage our volunteers. There shouldn't be any suggestion at all that we'd be replacing the volunteer community. We're developing models or sources of inspiration for young Albertans to become whole people in the Greek tradition, whole people, people who have developed their minds and bodies to their fullest potential. And that's important.

I think the hon. member's proposal is a worthy one; it's not narrow in scope, as the previous speaker suggested. It would not detract from academic standards at university. Rather, it would enhance those young athletes who have academic ability as well — they have several gifts — so that they can focus their energy on both areas and not simply on the day-to-day pursuit of financial support to keep them going. I think we should be developing an attitude in our community that emphasizes fitness and preventative medicine, and this is exactly the kind of proposal that would accomplish that. It would provide us with young leaders who, at the conclusion of their academic training, could administer and develop programs in the sports and recreation industry.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by wholeheartedly supporting the resolution proposed by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, and urge members of the Assembly to support it as well.

MR. KNAACK: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to participate on the motion presented by the Member for Calgary Buffalo. I'm rising in support of the motion. I think it's timely and should be supported by this Assembly. I think our society as a whole has really misplaced some of its energies and emphasis in not emphasizing athletics enough as a component of everyday life. Unlike the member, I think a healthy routine of exercise and athletics can facilitate an individual's reaching his potential more easily and completely.

One of the problems many of us have is really not ever having the opportunity to learn the skills of a sport. Most of us find that once we understand the skills of a sport it becomes much more enjoyable and much more useful as well, in terms of an exercise routine. One of the real shortages is both in terms of the attitude and of competent instructors in various areas of sport. To the extent that it does that I think this program should be supported, and I think it will.

The only question I have is whether or not 500 scholarships at \$1,000 would accomplish the goal as effectively as, say, 100 scholarships at \$5,000. The point there is: is \$1,000 a sufficient inducement to retain the athlete in Canada and then pass his expertise on to the rest of the community? So my suggestion for consideration would be that we change the proposal: instead of having so many scholarships, have fewer per year and increase the amounts.

The other point I wish to make — and I guess it's coming out that way — I don't think this scholarship should be used simply to train professional athletes. That's not the intent of my speaking in favor of the motion, and I don't think it's the intention of the mover of the motion either. Some who take advantage of the scholarship may become professional athletes; some may become professional athletes for a very short period of time and then return to their community as trainers and

teachers.

The only other suggestion I have is to combine this scholarship program with the general 75th Anniversary scholarship program and make it broader. One of my own proposals, which I suggested during the Heritage Savings Trust Fund debate, was to develop a scholarship program for our graduate students in combination with this proposal; fairly large scholarships but very limited in number, which would facilitate very competent Albertans to gain expertise from the best universities of their choice in the world for the purpose of developing and using it in Alberta. I would suggest a comprehensive scholarship program be designed to include the two proposals, the one from the Member of Calgary Buffalo and hopefully my own. I urge members to support this particular motion.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to rise and speak to the motion proposed by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo. Listening very carefully to the debate that has preceded my rising, I found I had to look back at the motion and read it:

Be it resolved that, the Legislative Assembly urge the Government to establish a scholarship fund for students playing a sport for any university or college intercollegiate team, in order to encourage highly skilled young athletes to remain in Alberta, to develop a high level of recreational competence and expertise, and to provide a rich resource of skills and leadership for Alberta's recreation and leisure industry.

Mr. Speaker, before what I might call personalizing my remarks in speaking to the motion, I think it's worth while breaking the motion down into two parts. When you establish a scholarship fund for students playing a sport for any university or college intercollegiate team, that gives me an image of doing all the things that we would all agree to in providing that resource base, an expertise for passing on sports skills to both young and old Albertans. When you start encouraging the highly skilled young athletes, however, I think that puts another connotation on it. I guess that's where I have a bit of a problem rationalizing the two points together. I would urge the mover perhaps to think in those terms when he sums up the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I said I would personalize my speaking to the motion, and I would say to members of the Assembly that I speak from some personal experience. In order to establish my credentials in that sense: some 15 years and 30 pounds ago I was an amateur boxer. I competed at provincial, national, and international levels. Other than the remark, it is said that as long as you don't ring any bells around me, I don't think I've been hurt by the experience.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's a matter of opinion.

MR. PAHL: In fact, the only time I was ever rendered unconscious during my athletic career was while playing high school football. So, as in many things, I think there are some preconceived notions within sports.

Mr. Speaker, my experience that relates to Motion 202 dates back to 1964, when I was training for the 1964 Olympics held in Tokyo. Because the University of Alberta had dropped boxing as an eligible intercollegiate sport in the previous years, not only were funds not available to me, because of an absence of university support, I was really unable to continue my academic career and

meaningfully participate in the Olympic trials at the same time. The effect was that I had to drop out for a year to compete in the Olympic trials.

My point is that if there is an economic interest in promising young athletes by an academic institution, there will probably be a positive climate towards enabling that athlete to maintain his academic presence at the university and his standing there. So from the point of view of the athlete who has a desire to compete or even participate in a significant way and continue his or her academic training, the motion has considerable merit indeed. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that had they spent some money on me, they would have wasted it, because a tough sailor from Vancouver convinced me that my career lay elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I would also say that I see in the motion some positive benefits for the rest of the student body in raising the profile of sports and fitness on our university and college campuses. There are also, in my view, some very positive benefits in providing additional resources to our campuses which, speaking from the experience of a student, really are big — they're growing; they change from year to year — and to provide some *esprit de corps* to a school. Having higher profile in sports has a positive benefit, I think.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, with our burgeoning populations and ever increasing economic development, the ongoing problems our universities have in shifting their priorities to what I will call bread-and-butter faculties such as Business Administration and Commerce, may be enhanced by or [inaudible] by providing more funds and wanting them to apply them to sports endeavors.

It may also be difficult to justify to some Albertans providing funds for sporting scholarships, when other Albertans may have a very high priority in simply getting into university and completing it. I think I would also have some difficulty supporting, or trying to decide which athlete — and I see by the note, I should include either male or female athletes — would be fairly dealt with.

On the positive side — some of my remarks were prefaced before having a clear understanding of the financial amount that is suggested. I think there is a positive benefit in providing what might be called seed money in the form of half a million dollars. Five hundred scholarships at \$1,000 each would, in my view, satisfy my concern that the intent of the scholarships is not only to provide financial assistance to sports endeavors, but also to raise that profile so there is some understanding on the campus that people are participating in sports. Perhaps that might go a little way toward getting the odd break on the academic side.

I also think the purpose of the seed money would be to encourage people — I think it was mentioned by a previous speaker — who would perhaps benefit most from increased expertise in sport in our province. I'm thinking of hockey, football, and based on my own background, perhaps even the silly, "do you wanna fight" tournaments, although I rather doubt that.

My suggestion would be to limit the seed money presentations to those faculties such as Physical Education, that will provide a residual benefit for the province in their encouragement of people who have athletic ability as well as academic capability. Those would be sports that would contribute to the participation of more of our citizens in athletic endeavors. It helps our fitness and sense of community and participation by more citizens.

In summary, although the motion has merit, I think it would do well for the mover perhaps to make some

distinctions for the benefit of this House in terms of whether the focus is on a more broadly based expertise in sports or whether it's for the highly skilled young athletes. There's quite a difference between the level that can contribute meaningfully to our province and its overall level of sports competence, and the level that would go to Olympic competitions, which I suppose is another area we tend to think of.

So in general I support the motion with respect to providing that seed money, but I hope that we would allow our universities to continue with the main thrust on academic excellence, and also use the scholarships as seed money to encourage other people who would benefit more directly by having increased athletic scholarship levels in our educational institutions.

Thank you.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, it's with pleasure that I enter this debate this afternoon. I'm going to make some comments, I'm going to ask a few questions, and then I hope to outline some of the programs we're involved in.

As I read Motion 202, I have some difficulty with clarification. Maybe we can get this later. It says to "fund for students playing a sport for any university or college". I wonder if that's meant just for Albertans, or is it meant for any athlete that's here? Because I can see where in some cases, a university could have a number of students from outside the province who would take up the opportunities and might exclude some of ours. It goes on: "to encourage highly skilled young athletes to remain in Alberta". That's fine. I think we're all working towards that end.

But in saying that, Mr. Speaker, why do we restrict it just to universities and colleges? Should we not involve all athletes, all ages, all schools? As I ask these questions and make some comments, it might be food for thought for some of the other members who want to take part. What gives us the assurance that after they reach a certain level they would stay in Alberta? If an athlete had the skills and ability, would he not move on to other challenges? I'm sure they would. We've all participated in sports one way or another, and as you played one level of sport and you got a little better, you moved on. And some of us have moved on and got as far as here. Others have gotten further.

But is that the answer, Mr. Speaker, or are there other questions we should pose? It's fine to have a scholarship, and I support that, but is there a need for better coaching? Is there a need for better promotions? How do we get those young people to the university level? I think that's a question we should ask ourselves, because when they get there, they should have some skills. I don't think you can start training them and have them perform the way we'd like at that level. So that brings me, and all of us, to where do we start?

I look at the British Columbia program as outlined by the member, and it says a number of things. Students must be full time, and they must make the team. That program excludes a number of people that I think the members here would like to help. I think we have a challenge, as the member outlined in his opening comments. I think the challenge is for us to make it worth while for all athletes to stay in Alberta. The challenge for us is to make it a challenge for them.

You know, what's more challenging than what I saw this year in Lake Placid, on the Olympic hockey team, where dedicated athletes take time out from education and play on an Olympic team. That's the kind of chal-

lenge we have to put to them and instill in their minds and bodies the desire and the will to work. We must promote programs that get that out. A program that will give you a desire and a will to perform is something that we just don't have.

I've looked at a number of programs within my department, and we have to improve them. We have to have them get involved, and we have to make it easier for them to get involved. I think we have to start with development at the grass roots level, when they're 4 and 5 years old. I think we have to start with the family. We're excluding the very basics of what makes an individual. I think it starts the first day you go to school. It starts before that, but it continues and you develop and by the time you hit university or college, you're a pretty finely developed athlete.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we talked about chances and how we go about it, and there's been some talk about the old days. I remember those days, probably not as far back as some, but I go back to where you had a desire, where the pond in the back yard was shovelled by yourself and you went and had some fun. I remember the days when you packed up your old skates. You might even have to weld the blade back on or straighten it out. You made a hockey stick out of a willow tree, and the puck was something you might find in the barnyard. That's the desire and the will that I mentioned before. You've got to have that to want to proceed.

You talk about the good old days. I remember so well when Gordie Howe made it to the big top. He had the desire because he skated on that pond. He used the Eaton's catalogue for shin pads and all that. I'm not so sure he got to college, but he's a fine athlete, and he's there. Another gentleman we can speak about is young Wayne Gretzky, a fine athlete at a young age. I understand his brothers are performing on the same pond in the same area that he did.

When we talk about programs, let's really think. I'm not objecting to what's proposed; I just want to toss out the other side of it. We're talking now that we should be ready for the 1988 Olympics in Alberta, and I hope they come. But if we are to perform at our best, we can't take the university athletes who are available today, because they are gone. That means we have but eight years to put in place the kind of programs — the grass roots development — to be ready for that day.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move on to touch briefly on what we are doing within my department. As I said before, it's not nearly enough, but I'm sure I'll get the necessary support as we go along, because I think it's necessary to do the things that I and other members have outlined today. We fund Alberta Games Council, and this year we had the winter games in Grande Prairie. It was quite a setting. I toured a number of venues and watched the participation. It's great. It's that level that'll get us into the Olympics, the Pan American games, and what have you. We fund them, somewhere around half million dollars and more, and it's well worth it when you have 3,000 athletes performing in one city at one time. It's a marvel to see.

We should continue to provide more funds for the Schools' Athletic Association. I think we're not doing the kind of job we should within our schools and our programs within those schools. Where else do you have the kind of periods, the free time where you could develop your abilities, than right in our classrooms? I think we have a duty to talk to our school boards. I don't think we are doing it as well as we can. Let's get that

message to them, that they should be more involved with their teachers and students. Sport Alberta is set up to provide information across the province, and we fund it. We're involved in the coaching program, but again it doesn't touch enough parts of Alberta to make it as efficient as some of us would hope. We fund over \$300,000 to the coaching program at the national level, leadership development, and a number of others. I think we have to press on and ask, and push, and demand that we get better coaching throughout the province.

Mr. Speaker, we fund some 98 associations. The funding is broken down for administration, leadership, and programming. The 98 associations receive well over a million dollars, and they range anywhere from soccer to football to bowling, wrestling, skiing — just about every sport you can imagine. The top association gets \$30,000. Five thousand of that is for administration, \$5,000 is for leadership, and \$20,000 is for programs which they have to match. We might want to look at that. I don't know if we should add one more thing: we have leadership; do we need coaching?

I make these comments, Mr. Speaker, so that I might get some feedback in the days ahead when the members can discuss this with their recreation boards or their local town council or village council or what have you. I think we have to make some changes, and I'd like some direc-

tion. This year we provide funding to some 560 athletes. These athletes are broken down for the summer Olympic games, winter games, the Pan American games, and a number of others. As I've said, we have 560 athletes whom we fund \$330, per athlete. In the calendar year of 1980 there will be \$660 available to them. I think that program has to be enriched. That program touches probably the best athletes we have in the province. They are the athletes that will compete in the Olympics. They don't all get a chance to go, but it doesn't exclude the little boy from Grande Prairie or somebody from Breton or anyplace else.

I have a number of other comments I'd like to make, Mr. Speaker, but as the time is close to adjournment, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly wish to agree with the hon. minister's motion to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is proposed that the House not sit this evening.

[At 5:27 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Wednesday at 2:30 p.m.]