

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**Title: **Thursday, April 14, 1983 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce to the members of the Assembly, through you, a very distinguished visitor who is seated in your gallery. Our visitor today is His Excellency Rodney Vandergert, the High Commissioner to Canada from our sister Commonwealth nation of Sri Lanka. I ask that His Excellency rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 226****An Act to Provide for Equal Pay  
for Work of Equal Value**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 226, An Act to Provide for Equal Pay for Work of Equal Value.

The Act amends the Individual's Rights Protection Act in that section in which the Act currently attempts to ensure equal pay for equal work. The Bill would specify equal pay for jobs involving work of equal value to the employer, with value being determined on the basis of such criteria as the skill, effort, and responsibility required in the performance of the work, and the conditions under which the work is performed.

[Leave granted; Bill 226 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to certain statutes, today I wish to table an Alberta regulation dealing with the natural gas-burning appliances and equipment installation regulation; secondly, an Alberta regulation dealing with the propane-burning appliances and equipment installation regulation; thirdly, an Alberta regulation dealing with gas permit and inspection fee amendments; and fourthly, gas fitters' certification amendment regulations.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual report of Recreation and Parks for the year ended March 31, 1982.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 27 grade 7 students from the Delburne junior high school, accompanied by Mrs. Lillie Clutton and Mr.

Randy Tuff. They are seated in the members gallery, and I ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the House.

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague from Edmonton Glengarry, I would like to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 80 grade 8 students from St. Cecilia school. Seated in the public gallery, they are accompanied by teachers Les Wasylycia, Rennalto Del Fabbro, Julieanne O'Loughlin, and their principal Ron Zapisocki. Would members welcome these students.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Natural Gas Exports**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It relates to the ministerial announcement on April 11. With respect to the decision of the government of Alberta to offer, given certain conditions, an incentive price that is fully one third less than the \$4.91 price, can the minister advise the Assembly what objective studies the department commissioned to evaluate the impact such a drastic cut in price would have on expanding markets in the United States?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, in arriving at this very important determination as the Alberta position, the process engaged in involved more than merely studies by experts. It involved working very closely with the natural gas industry and, as has been outlined to members of the Assembly on previous occasions, the decisions arose from at least a dual process.

First, an intergovernmental task force of federal, British Columbia, and Alberta officials addressed this very important question of natural gas export pricing. Contemporaneous with that task force was a series of meetings of the energy committee, chaired by the Premier, with industry representatives: producers, transmission companies, and other private-sector participants in the natural gas industry. Those meetings involving the energy committee of cabinet and industry representatives were preceded, and in some instances succeeded, by a series of meetings of industry representatives working with the best information they had available.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that arriving at a specific number was a very difficult task, given the fact that the present gas market in the United States is an exceedingly complex one and given its highly regulated nature, with some 28 different categories of natural gas. So the initial determination was that we had to go with a single price. Having come to that conclusion, the specific figure of \$3.30 U.S. per million BTUs was arrived at in consultation with industry, and I believe the hon. member will discover, in conversation with industry, that it has the widespread support of the industry.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. What criteria did the government take into account, both as a government and in consultation with industry, in arriving at the figure of \$3.30 U.S.? Undoubtedly there must have been some assessment of the impact of this figure on markets. Is the minister in a position to assure the House that there will in fact be an increase in the volume of gas sales to the United States,

or is this incentive price essentially just going to bolster existing markets?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has this predilection for guarantees in a number of different instances. Of course, I would not provide any guarantee, as the members of the Assembly would well recognize. When you are involved in a market-place situation, it's a matter of making the very best determination that can be made as to the effective price that will in fact produce the desired result.

That desired result is twofold. Firstly, in combination with the adjustment on the Duncan-Lalonde formula to a base price of \$4.40 per million BTUs, along with the incentive price, that package will enable the Canadian gas industry to maintain existing market share, which is absolutely crucial, to ensure that in the mid 1980s when we anticipate significantly increasing demand in the U.S., we will be well positioned to take advantage of that increasing demand; as well, provide opportunity for incremental sales. It is our belief that that package, if instituted, does hold that opportunity. If the hon. member is asking for more specific assurances, obviously those cannot be given.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Given this government's commitment to the sanctity of contract, what assessment has the government given to what is in fact an incentive price based on a violation of the take-or-pay agreements, which provide for 75 per cent of the volume, and we are now providing an incentive price based on 50 per cent? What assessment has been made of the precedent that is set by providing a bonus price, if you like, for importers that are violating their take-or-pay agreements?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is quite mistaken in suggesting that the pricing package in some fashion violates existing contractual arrangements. Nothing could be further from the case. Prior to the federal announcement on April 11, existing contracts were operating on the basis of the then prevailing U.S. border price of \$4.94 per million BTUs. Subsequent to the announcement, they are operating at the adjusted price based on the Duncan-Lalonde formula. That is consistent with all existing contracts that are in place.

The hon. member's references to take-or-pay provisions, in relating them to the price — in fact, the take-or-pay relates to volumes. It's made quite clear in item 6 in our document that was tabled in the Assembly:

The pricing provisions are not intended to affect existing take-or-pay provisions.

There is the acknowledgment, however, that there may be some particular circumstances where between the parties there is some need to take a look or review those considerations. There certainly has to be a recognition by government of those extreme circumstances, while standing very strongly to the view and holding to the view that the pricing provisions ought not to affect existing take-or-pay provisions.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. I'm referring to paragraph 4 on page 4, with respect to the base price on which the new incentive price is going to be provided. My question is not whether the government of Alberta is breaking its contract. No one is alleging that. It is the question of whether or not importers in the United States that have

signed take-or-pay agreements are not living up to their commitment to take the volume which is based on 75 per cent of the approved amount. By allowing an incentive price, what precedent are we setting in terms of our exports to the United States, when we allow them to violate contracts? It's not us violating contracts; importers violating contracts . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. leader is just so clearly debating the thing without asking a question. When a rhetorical question asking what precedent we are creating is put, that is certainly not looking for information; that's a statement.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps on a point of order, then. I think we're dealing with a very complex question. When one gets into take-or-pay arrangements, an incentive price based on base volumes, et cetera, with great respect, one has to have some latitude in putting the questions, and I would expect some latitude on the minister's part in being able to answer the questions. We're dealing with highly complex issues.

Let me put to the minister: what legal advice was sought with respect to the take-or-pay provisions, not as it applies to the government of Alberta but as it applies to American importers?

MR. SPEAKER: Surely the hon. member is not really extricating himself in that fashion, asking what advice. It's abundantly clear that neither the government nor any hon. member is required to answer in the House what kind of legal advice he got.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order again. The question I would like to put to the hon. minister is not whether he wants to share the legal advice but whether the government has in fact sought legal advice on this particular matter. I want to make it clear — and with your indulgence, sir, I would like to make it clear again — that we're not dealing with a violation by the province of Alberta or the government of Canada but the precedent with respect to the importers in the United States and the commitments they have signed.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I suggest the hon. member is heading off in the wrong direction by suggesting that by offering a realistic pricing package, somehow that is going to engender or facilitate breach of contract. Quite the contrary, we are strongly of the view that the pricing proposal put forward by the province of Alberta is going to provide some greater likelihood that there will not be breach of contract, because we feel the pricing provisions are very realistic in terms of today's market.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, to the extent that any specific contractual difficulties exist at the present time — and the Pan-Alberta situation is a case in point — that is a matter as between the parties to that contract. For example, it's my understanding that legal action has been undertaken with respect to the declaration of force majeure. That's clearly a matter as between the parties to a private contract, with which we would not purport to interfere.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. NOTLEY: . . . to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. What representation has been made to the government of Canada with respect to the take-or-pay provisions American importers have signed and whether it would be in the interests of the government of Canada to insist that those importers follow specifically the commitments they have made, and that representation be made by the Department of External Affairs to Washington that it's the position of Alberta that we recommend to the government of Canada that as a condition of the sale of export, importers . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I really regret intervening again. The hon. member is making a speech and saying, why don't you make representations to Washington about these people south of the border who are breaking their contracts? If the hon. member wants to stay with the question he asked before he made the speech, then we are back to where he's asking whether the federal government has taken a position in this regard.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order again. We're dealing with a highly complex question. In fairness, I'm putting to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs whether he's made representation to the government of Canada, which would have the jurisdictional right to make representation to Congress. With great respect, sir, I think one has to have some latitude in asking questions. I'm not accusing the minister of not doing his job; I'm simply putting the question, which I do right now.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, on several occasions now, my colleague the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources has pointed out to the Assembly that there has indeed been an intergovernmental task force, which has included representatives of the government of Canada and the governments of Alberta and British Columbia, relative to the development of a position with respect to the export of Albertan and Canadian natural gas into the United States market. That being the case, it has not been my responsibility as minister to make additional representations to the government of Canada. Such representations as have been proper and appropriate have been made through the vehicle already described by my colleague, not just today but on previous occasions in this Assembly.

#### **Municipal Financing**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of further questions on this — and no doubt we'll have an opportunity to debate it before long — I'd like to direct the second question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. It's with regard to that minister's ministerial announcement cancelling the municipal debt interest rebate program. Have any contingency plans been prepared to cover the effects the loss of this program will have on Alberta municipalities, since interest rates before the 1973 program came in were 8.4 per cent and are now 12.8 per cent?

MR. KOZIAK: Well, the interest rates vary, Mr. Speaker. They're 11.75 per cent for five-year debentures. There's an expectation that there's a likelihood that that will fall, having regard to the remarks of Mr. Volcker the other day and the unexpected pleasure at the lower estimates of the federal deficit in Canada than were

previously budgeted for and projected. One must take a look at that question relative to the circumstances as they exist from time to time. I gave the five-year rate. I believe the 25-year rate is about 13.25 per cent.

In any event, it's not the relationship of the interest rate that determines the program. At the time we entered into the program, circumstances were completely different. We were in a situation where municipalities had many challenges facing them from what might be termed abnormal growth. To respond to those challenges, they had to put in services which required borrowed funds at a time when interest rates were rising. Today we face a completely different set of circumstances. Those circumstances include the fact that the province is no longer a lender of funds but a borrower of funds, that interest rates are in fact falling, and that the population growths that existed when the program was announced aren't there and the pressures on municipalities for services aren't the same as existed at the time of the announcement of the program.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer. What action has the government taken with respect to the correspondence received by the government of Alberta from Mayor Klein in Calgary — this relates to the question of interest shielding — specifically outlining that in that city where 50,000 people are out of work, Calgary has on its shelf capital works which could proceed that would provide almost 10,000 jobs. What assessment has the government given Mayor Klein's communication? And will the government review its interest shielding program to allow the city of Calgary to proceed with that major capital expansion, which they are ready to start?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, that is definitely a supplementary that is directed my way. I can respond to that by saying that in the course of my announcement and subsequent discussions on this issue, I indicated that the outstanding liability of \$1.4 billion until the year 2008 does not include a further liability for debenture shielding on those borrowings that have already been approved by the Local Authorities Board but have not been called upon by the municipalities. As a matter of fact, I don't have the exact figures at hand, but the city of Calgary has hundreds of millions of dollars of approvals for borrowings that would be subject to interest shielding when and if they decide to borrow that money, because we will honor those approvals. So there are significant dollars available if the city makes the decision to proceed with the projects.

The decision to proceed with the projects has to be based on need, however, and that need must be assessed in terms of today's reality. It's senseless to build subdivisions for people who won't be occupying those subdivisions, just to provide jobs. But if, in the wisdom of city council, it's necessary to provide services for future growth that they have reassessed in light of today's circumstances, then they should definitely proceed with that. And those borrowings that have been approved by the Local Authorities Board are protected for shielding by the announcement I made.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I'm not talking about the borrowings protected by the shielding program, which members of the city council in Calgary are well aware of. I'm talking about the communication sent by Mayor Klein with respect to additional capital programs the city of Calgary

has planned, engineered, and ready to go, which will directly and indirectly provide almost 10,000 jobs. I'm talking about those capital projects which unfortunately do not meet the criteria the minister has set.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps they should begin with those that have been approved. When I say hundreds of millions of dollars, that's what it is: hundreds of millions of dollars. Those should of course be their first priority. They set it themselves; I didn't set it.

#### **Sewage Flooding — Spruce Grove**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question was to the Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications, but I'll ask one of the Minister of the Environment. Could the minister indicate what action has been taken with regard to a resident of Spruce Grove who has had his land flooded by sewage out of Atim Creek? I wonder if the minister has taken action on that matter and spoken to the town of Stony Plain to prevent their continuing that practice?

MR. SPEAKER: It may be that the minister is able to answer this. Just briefly, and with respect to the hon. leader of the Independents, the reason I've intervened is that I think it's clear that the question period is not really intended for matters which, although they may be of extreme importance to individuals involved, are really of a local nature, especially one with this kind of specific. It seems to me that the ordinary rules ...

MR. NOTLEY: They've all been notified of it.

MR. SPEAKER: It's a matter of a local nature, involving a specific situation. Now, I'm not suggesting that the minister should not answer; the question has been asked. But generally speaking, the question period is intended for matters which are of a more general or provincial nature. The same applies, I might say, in the House of Commons, where you also don't ask questions of that kind. They're more national in scope.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. First of all, I would like the section and citation, the rule that states that. I am not aware of it and would appreciate that very much.

I can indicate precedent in this Assembly, where local constituency questions have been asked for the member's own purpose, to get some publicity. I think of Mr. Gordon Taylor, who used to sit in this Legislature and ask about things in Drumheller so that he could notify his constituents. I can think of other members of this Legislature doing exactly the same thing. And I wouldn't want to excuse myself from that practice, under certain circumstances, because I'm sure it has happened over the years.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the question I directed to the hon. minister, the question is universal in this Legislature, because the notification went to all MLAs. It was raised with every member of this Legislature, and action hasn't taken place. The incident has occurred over several years, and the government hasn't acted on the matter. The people concerned said, why isn't raised it in the Legislature? I am following through on that request, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I think we can manage to solve this one fairly easily and perhaps save time, which is going on. I was not aware; that has not yet reached my attention. I'm sure it will, if the other MLAs received it. As far as the hon. member's question about the citation, it was 171 in the old *Beauchesne*. I'm not sure which one it is in the new one, but I'll look it up. In any event, under the circumstances we should proceed with the question.

MR. BRADLEY: I might note that the hon. Member for Stony Plain previously raised this matter with me. There certainly is a concern by the individual with regards to flooding of land in the Atim Creek area. The department currently has the matter under investigation. An arrangement was provided that prior to discharging any effluent from their ponds, the communities involved would notify landowners who would be affected downstream and any debris or restrictions in the stream channel would be removed. As I've stated, the matter is currently under investigation, and I expect a full report from the department on the matter in the near future.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister table that report in the Legislature, as it is a matter of concern and representation to all members of this Legislature?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd be prepared to respond when I have the investigation report of the department.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the minister said that in the interim, while the investigation is proceeding, notification has gone to the town of Stony Plain not to discharge any further sewage and to do something else with it? I'm not sure what they are going to do.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that the matter is under investigation.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. I wonder if the minister could also confirm for this House if his regional people have been investigating the complaints along Atim Creek and if they've been taking any corrective actions?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, I can advise the hon. member that my department is looking into at least part of the report that was mentioned by my colleague.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Calgary McCall followed by the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health, who wishes to supplement some information previously requested.

#### **Bulk Food Retailing**

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Is there a specific regulation in the Public Health Act to stop the sale of bulk foods in retail outlets?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I've been advised that the operation of bulk food outlets is illegal. But having said that, I think it's important to note that the particular bulk food dealers have been working with people in our de-

partment and the Provincial Board of Health to try to devise a set of regulations that could see the operation of these facilities and, at the same time, take care of any health concerns the health inspectors might have.

MR. NELSON: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Is it a fact that the Act may be silent on the issue of the sale of bulk foods?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, he is for the second time asking what's contained in the law. Perhaps there is some other way of discovering that.

#### **Health Study — Pincher Creek Area**

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the other day the hon. Leader of the Opposition indicated that the Snider study was commissioned in April 1982 and that funding was not made available until December, therefore delaying the study. That information is in error. A contract was commissioned in the spring of '82, and payments were made on the following dates: \$36,000 in April '82, \$24,000 in June '82, and \$15,000 in August '82, for a total of \$75,000.

Dr. Snider concluded that it would be worth while to further analyse the data collected under that particular contract, and therefore in November signed an application for a grant to do further work. A grant for \$34,000 was approved on November 24 and paid to Dr. Snider in December of '82. As you can see from the foregoing, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Snider's work was not delayed as outlined by the hon. Leader of the Opposition yesterday.

#### **Urea Formaldehyde Foam Insulation**

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs concerns the urea formaldehyde foam insulation problem that we are all aware of. Could the minister give us an update on what aid is available from either the federal or provincial people for the problem that exists?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, this particular problem is being handled by the federal government. If I am correct, a provincial environmental health services program has been made available to citizens to have their homes tested. Earlier this winter, because of the number of inquiries we have had on the urea formaldehyde problem, my department officials had a meeting with the federal people. We were told that their program required registration. Around June 30 of this year was the deadline, I believe, and they committed to us an undertaking that they would advertise in a much broader way across the province to alert citizens to this. Certainly citizens who have called my department have been told of this particular deadline.

MR. OMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In the United States this week, I believe there was a court case which refused to recognize the ban on urea formaldehyde, indicating that there wasn't enough evidence to indicate it should be done. Does the minister know if that has any effect on the Canadian scene at this point?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is really asking for an opinion. He is of course entitled to his own, as are other hon. members.

MR. OMAN: Fair enough, Mr. Speaker. Let me go at another one. Because of the effect on appraised values of homes in which this has been installed — and I believe if you sell a house or apply for a mortgage you have to indicate that it so exists. Is there a mortgage available from any firms she knows of, for people who own such houses?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that question, but one of my hon. colleagues who has responsibility in this area may be able to answer it.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I am unable to respond with respect to any mortgage companies other than those related to the government. The Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation does not provide mortgages for homes that are known to have urea formaldehyde foam insulation, either under our new home program, which is the family home ownership program, or on the resale program.

MR. OMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I gather there aren't any people who would supply mortgages, but would the Minister of Housing investigate further as to whether the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation might consider this as a possibility for those who need it?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, we will watch with care the controversy as it goes on with respect to the use of urea formaldehyde foam insulation. If we are certain that there is no concern with its use, then the board of the corporation will again consider financing homes that used this type of insulation.

MR. OMAN: One further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I don't know which minister this should be directed to, but I believe the province of Ontario allows municipalities to reassess property that is so insulated, to give it a lower assessment for tax purposes. Perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs could indicate whether that's possible in Alberta or whether it might be looked into.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of actual cases where, due to this circumstance, home-owners have appealed the assessment to the court of revision or the Assessment Appeal Board. But if there is an adverse effect on value — after all, that's what the assessment process is all about — under the wide provisions of economic obsolescence, they could probably argue a reduction in value and therefore a reduction in assessment before the Assessment Appeal Board or courts of revision throughout the province, and I think would probably be successful.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Housing or the Minister of Labour, with regard to the question put by the Member for Calgary North Hill. Has it been, or is it presently, a policy of the minister's department that Albertans use urea formaldehyde to insulate their homes?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, there is no policy of government that the Department of Labour, under the regulations it has any responsibility for, would require, urge, or even suggest the use of urea formaldehyde for home insulation.

MR. GOGO: A final supplementary to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Mr. Speaker. In view

of the answer by the Minister of Labour, does the minister's department have any responsibility with regard to compensation for those that do?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, surely we're not going to be asking in the question period what ministers' responsibilities are.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is it presently the policy of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs or her department that her department feels there is a responsibility for compensating those people? [interjections]

#### **Labor Negotiations — Teachers**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Education. Is the minister in a position to confirm that at this late date, only four school boards in the province have concluded contract negotiations with their teachers?

MR. KING: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Then does the minister know how many school boards have concluded successful negotiations with their teachers?

MR. KING: We have no direct involvement with the negotiations that occur at the school board level. Of my own knowledge, I am aware that two school boards in the province have signed contracts with their teachers.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Has the minister asked his officials for any assessment of why negotiations are going so slowly? If he has, can he tell the Assembly what the holdup is?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, we deal with the Alberta Teachers' Association in terms of its professional responsibilities, not its economic responsibilities. We deal with it and with school boards on questions of education, not on matters of labor relations. I'd invite him to direct questions about labor relations or the economic activities of the ATA to the Minister of Labour.

MR. MARTIN: I will so direct to the Minister of Labour.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I am on the alert for the direction, but I've not yet seen anything come flying past.

MR. MARTIN: I'm sorry to wake you up. I asked the Minister of Education and I'll ask you: has the minister asked his officials for any assessment of why negotiations with school boards and teachers are progressing so slowly? If his officials have, can he outline to the Assembly what the holdup is?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I have had a consultation with the chief negotiator for the Alberta Teachers' Association, and my understanding is that lack of progress is uniquely centred on failure to agree on what ought to be a reasonable settlement.

MR. MARTIN: That's good, Les; you're right on top of it.

A supplementary question. Does the minister have any

information which substantiates the view that some school boards are not settling because they are strapped for cash due to the Minister of Education's 5 per cent solution and could be taking advantage of delays to collect interest on their bank accounts?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is really not an inquiry; that's argument.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should indicate that I have also had some communication with certain school boards. It would be fair to say that those school boards believe that in a year in which farmers are anticipating a lower net return than in previous years, in a year when there is a high level of unemployment, in a year when there have been many people working at fewer than normal working hours, the teaching association should take that into account. Accordingly, we're back to the failure to agree on what is a reasonable adjustment for 1983.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. MARTIN: Has the minister been given any warnings by his officials that strikes or walkouts may be imminent in Alberta schools?

MR. YOUNG: No.

#### **Energy Pricing**

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Has the minister had an opportunity to review the speech apparently given in Toronto today by his national counterpart? If so, can he indicate if the contents of that address will in any way affect Alberta policy in the energy area?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, based upon my understanding of the remarks made by Mr. Chretien in Toronto today, from the Alberta perspective I would say that Mr. Chretien made a very important statement in terms of the fact that the world circumstances have changed dramatically since the September 1981 Ottawa-Alberta energy agreement. I was pleased with Mr. Chrétien's acknowledgement that one of the options that must be given consideration in the weeks and months ahead, in terms of the Canadian energy scene, is an immediate move to market pricing.

Mr. Speaker, I should add that I believe it was suggested that the Alberta position is in favor of a straightforward freeze of energy prices at their present level, Canadian old oil prices. In fact, Mr. Speaker, for a number of years the Alberta position has consistently been one of advocating market pricing. That has been our position and continues to be the case.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. As a result of the speech today, can the minister indicate if he plans any immediate conversations with his counterpart in Ottawa to clarify what he means by market pricing and if we are in fact moving in that direction on a national scale?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Chretien was outlining what he perceives as a range of options which ought to be considered. I wouldn't venture a comment beyond that, in terms of a final federal position. In terms of the timing, our expectation continues to be that in the early part of May, there will first be meetings of the respective officials of the Alberta and federal governments on the energy side, followed by meetings involving Mr. Chretien and myself.

**Health Study — Pincher Creek Area**  
(continued)

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, and it flows from the answer he gave today. Could the minister reconcile for the Assembly the publicly stated position of the government of Alberta that a comprehensive study recommended by the Canadian Public Health Association was too expensive — and therefore the Snider study was considered appropriate — with the minister's decision to add another \$34,000 to a study that will now come to \$109,000, in my reckoning from the minister's statistics? What was the reason for that about-face between a public statement last spring and a decision made by the minister in November?

DR. WEBBER: As I recall, Mr. Speaker, the study the hon. member is referring to had a cost estimate of some \$200,000, whereas this particular Snider study had a cost of \$75,000 associated with it. The decision to make the additional \$34,000 grant was made later in the year. So those are the numbers that are associated.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Did the minister make the decision to expand the scope or cost of the study? And if the minister did in fact make the decision, can he reconcile why the decision was made, given the publicly stated position of the government in the spring?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the decision to proceed with further funds for the Snider study was based on the input from Dr. Snider, in that he considered it worth while to further analyse the data he had collected under the previous contract. The department considered that it would be worth while to do so as well.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister telling the House that it was only in November that a decision was made that additional studies were required to analyse the data? On what basis did the government decide to commission the Snider study, as opposed to a more comprehensive study, when we now find that we had to supplement the Snider study? Surely the terms of reference should have been clearly drawn out when the study was commissioned in the first place.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I would be repeating myself by saying that in the initial phase of the Snider study, it was concluded that further research would be worth while; therefore the department made the decision to proceed with further analysis. That's the reason for the grant.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Given that answer, is the Assembly then to understand that should Dr. Snider request even further

research, we're going to have a never-ending story here, and that more funds will be made available? I raise that question, relating it back to the reason the government denied the Canadian Public Health Association proposal a year and a half ago.

MR. SPEAKER: That's clearly a hypothetical question, the hypothesis being whether Dr. Snider is going to ask for more money for further research.

MR. NOTLEY: Then will the minister give the House the assurance that we will in fact have the Snider study tabled in this spring session of the Legislature and that there will be no further instalments?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I can only table the study if I receive it in time for the end of the spring session. In terms of any further studies, I think it would be wrong to say that we wouldn't be open to looking at further studies if they are considered necessary.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I'm not talking about further studies on the issue; I am talking about a continuation of the Snider study. Will the minister give a commitment to the House that with the receipt of the Snider study, that will in fact complete this particular contract?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition is confusing two things: the completion of this contract, as well as possible further contracts. When we get the results of this particular study, then we'll be in a position to make further decisions if necessary.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary. The time for the question period has run out.

MR. NOTLEY: Given that answer, will the minister now review the option of the comprehensive study recommended by the Canadian Public Health Association?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, after we have a look at the results and if any further studies are considered necessary, I'm sure we'd be looking at a number of alternatives.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for the question period has run out.

MR. R. SPEAKER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Before we leave this item of business, I'd like to raise the question with regard to the type of question that can be asked, and refer to the section 171 you indicated. I would appreciate your review of that section. If we go with the ruling as it is, it's precedent in the Legislature. As I understand it, it would sort of be the property of the House as a precedent and could be cited in other decisions you would have to make in question periods after today.

I have reviewed section 171, and I am unable to find a section that clearly demonstrates or supports the decision made. I would like to ask the Speaker to take the matter under consideration and possibly report back to the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll do that. I might have had the wrong number.

MR. MARTIN: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I rise to state the following. Yesterday it was brought to my attention that there may be some possible doubt as to the appropriateness of my receiving payments available to Albertans under the Alberta heritage fund mortgage interest reduction program while serving as a member of this Assembly. This question having been brought to my attention, I immediately set about attempting to obtain a definite answer. Thus far, I have been unable to obtain a definite answer.

Nevertheless I wish to advise you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the other hon. members of this Assembly, that pending the receipt by me of a definite answer, I've decided (a) to immediately refuse further payments under the program and (b) to reimburse those payments I have received since November 1, 1982.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

167. Mr. Notley moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing the government's best estimate of:
- (a) the number of cases (without identifying the specific company or companies involved) in which a company engaged in selling some of its assets for the purpose of qualifying for more than one payment under the royalty tax credit program,
  - (b) the number of additional payments deriving from the cases detailed in (a) and their total value, over the life of the royalty tax credit program from 1974 to date.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment to this motion for a return. I've delivered copies of the amendment to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Your Honour, and the Clerk.

I move that Motion for Return No. 167 be amended by deleting that part of the motion after the words "best estimate of and replacing it with the following:

- (a) the number of corporations (without identification of the specific company or companies involved) which have claimed entitlement for the total value of such credits paid under the Alberta Corporate Income Tax Act in 1982-83.
- (b) the number of royalty tax credit claims withheld and under review because it appears that:
  - (i) the claiming corporations may have entered into transactions which lack any substantial business purpose other than increasing royalty tax credit or may have intended to increase total credit claims artificially, or
  - (ii) one of the main reasons for the separate existence of two or more corporations may have been to increase total credit claims;
- (c) the total value of the 1982-83 claims under review relating to the corporations cited in (b).

Mr. Speaker, the reasons for the amendment can be briefly stated. Firstly, the revised wording reflects the provisions of section 26 of the Corporate Income Tax Act of this Legislature, which is the Act administered by the corporate tax members of the government. Secondly, the reason the time line is changed to 1982-83 rather than the

original motion, which went right back to 1974, is that the decision-making over corporate tax with respect to the province of Alberta only began on January 1, 1982. Records and initiatives taken prior to that date, back to 1974, are within the files of the Department of National Revenue in Ottawa.

If the hon. Leader of the Opposition wishes to consider a further motion requesting the government to request the Minister of National Revenue to provide further information — I don't know at this stage the way their files are set up or how long that would take; it might well take months — I'd certainly be prepared to consider it.

In any event, the amendment enables information to be provided as to the information which the government of Alberta has on those two subjects, and it can be available within a matter of days.

[Motion as amended carried]

### head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

#### 206. Moved by Mr. Musgreave:

Be it resolved that the Assembly urge the government to consider establishing a task force composed of representative citizens concerned with the role of women in Alberta's society. Part of the task force's mandate would be a review of the achievements of the Alberta Women's Bureau. They would also examine and evaluate the progress of women toward full and equal participation in social, educational, and economic activities, and to identify those areas which are most in need of more attention with specific suggestions for improvements if required.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, for the past few weeks, I've thought and worried about this motion. Some of my reasons for this are the concerns that have resulted from my research into this fascinating subject. In my findings, I have determined that there certainly is discrimination against women in our society. Secondly, women are still denied credit, jobs, or promotion, because they are women. This happens in the business world, in schools, and in government. There are some political parties in Canada that are archaic enough to even have women's auxiliaries. I have also found that women disagree amongst themselves as to what and how they should advance their cause. Men, too, are concerned. The struggle for jobs, power, position, and glory is tough enough without having tough-minded, experienced, hard-working women joining the fray.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I want to help my colleagues gain a better perspective of half of our society. Those of us from the business world know the strength of women, their thoroughness, pragmatism, and ability — and I had here: to work hard at dull tasks, including typing speeches like this. My secretary said that it's not hard work if they're interesting. We'll see about that as we proceed.

How did I get started on this? Well, I'm an equal opportunity parent. My daughter had every opportunity that my sons had, both educational and financial. Being a father, of course I was convinced that there was no man in the world good enough for her. But she, her husband, and their two children are what would be today's average family, trying to make their way in the world: a two-income family with a large mortgage.

But why my interest in women's affairs? About two



years ago I had a call from a constituent of mine who had a daughter who could not secure a mortgage from Alberta Housing Corporation, even though she was financially independent, born and raised in Alberta. Many women working in this very building have experienced the same problem. She could have circumvented the law at that time by living common-law and then breaking the relationship. However, the rules were later changed. That meant only families with children could get mortgages.

Another strange quirk: a constituent of mine, a young lady from Hong Kong raising a family of brothers and sisters, could not get a mortgage, and only after careful persuasion by her M.L.A. did the corporation accommodate this person and approve her mortgage. Hopefully my colleagues in the House will learn that today a family can be a mother and dad with 2.4 children; a couple with two children — his, hers, or theirs; a 26-year-old secretary and her adopted daughter; a couple that are sharing everything in life except a marriage licence; a divorced woman and her stepdaughter; retired grandparents raising a grandson; or any combination of the above.

In raising this matter by way of a motion some two years ago, I was surprised by the amount of material accumulated by my colleague from the constituency of Calgary North West, Mrs. Sheila Embury. This lady has a very extensive file and, in her chosen profession, has struggled valiantly for the cause of women as equal partners, with the same desires and aspirations for themselves as any thinking male member of our society possesses. It is incredible to me that one of the toughest battles women have to fight is the lack of support of their cause by other women or the raising of issues that quite frequently are not the main issue.

Today I would like to deal with some important issues that may be introduced into our debate, but which are not the main issue. For me, the main issue is to evaluate the role of women in Alberta society: how we as a government could strengthen the Alberta Women's Bureau and the work of dedicated people — such as Mrs. Ellis — who have struggled valiantly for the concerns of women in our province. We are living in changing times and, to help us steer a clear course, we need more help from the Women's Bureau. We especially need help in restoring confidence in ourselves, our people, and our nation. I can think of no better way than working with the women of Alberta. Our economy is in trouble, yet some of the best advice on what we could do about it is available from women economists, financial analysts, and business people.

If any of you have the good fortune to watch *Wall Street Week* on the PBS network, you cannot help but be amazed by the tremendous number of women participants who are well informed and active in the business world of the most business-directed country in the world, the United States of America. In this province too, they are willing and able to make their contributions as professionals, as small business people, and as executives in large corporations. Unfortunately their numbers in our province are small.

But first to deal with issues that I think are used by some strident groups — and obviously these are groups that feel threatened in these changing times. The traditional family unit as we knew it in my generation has fallen to the point where less than one-third of the women can stay home and raise their families, as many of our wives were able to do.

First, I would like to deal with the abortion issue. My view is that a woman should decide when she should have

a family. I know some groups such as Campaign Life, or the Alberta Federation of Women United for the Family, are against the formation of an Alberta women's advisory council, because such an agency may support Planned Parenthood which believes in sex education for teenagers who, whether or not we like it, are sexually active. For the information of members, I should mention here that the presidents of Campaign Life and Women United are related. Their memberships and goals are intertwined, so that while they are vociferous, they do not represent the majority opinion of women in Alberta or in Canada.

I would like to quote from a letter of April 8, 1982, from the Hon. David Russell, Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, to Mrs. Kathleen Toth, president of Campaign Life, Edmonton.

Under the Medical Care Act of Canada, section 4(1)(b) stipulates that a provincial plan must provide "insured services" and defines insured services as "all services rendered by medical practitioners that are medically required". This section means that all medically required services, including legal abortions, are automatically "insured services", and covered by Alberta Health Care and there is no need for the federal minister to specifically designate them. The specific designation is only required in instances where a service is an insured service, and has not previously been recognized as medically required. In the case of abortions, once the requirements of the Criminal Code with respect to the approval of an abortion have been satisfied (the approval of an abortion is based on health considerations) the abortion is medically required and therefore covered under the plan.

The minister goes on:

I have indicated on many occasions that I do not believe the solution to the abortion problem lies in changes which would deny abortions or withhold funding. As well as being a problem in themselves, the higher number of abortions is a symptom of a problem that, depending on your perspective and philosophy, must be attacked through better education to prevent unwanted pregnancy or a strengthened moral outlook and philosophy.

Secondly, on feminist issues which apply primarily to my female colleagues, or any women who ever think about women's concerns, many women will say: I'm not a feminist, but . . . I don't know what a feminist is, Mr. Speaker, and I feel I'm in good company. Dame Rebecca West, a famous British author of over 200 books, who among other things covered the Nuremberg trials, died recently at the age of 90. She said of feminism that she was never able to find out precisely what it meant. She said:

I only know that people call me a feminist whenever I express sentiments that differentiate me from a doormat or a prostitute.

Let us just think of a few questions that should concern any woman who says she has no sympathy for or cannot be called a feminist. Do you think women should be able to vote in municipal, provincial, or federal elections? Do you feel your daughter should have educational opportunities equal to your son's? If your daughter were the best student in her graduating class but could not be the valedictorian because that was a role for boys only, would you be angry? Would you be even angrier if, after having got out of high school, your daughter was refused admission to university in the faculties of law, engineering, or medicine because these professions were reserved

for boys? Not too long ago, Mr. Speaker, these were questions that women could not answer with a yes. These are all avenues of achievement that not too many years ago were denied to women.

There are still other areas of concern that imply that women are not persons but property. For example: is the house you live in yours, your wife's, or ours? If a woman misbehaves, some husbands feel they have the right to beat her. As working wives, with incomes of their own, do you feel they should be granted credit?

Mr. Speaker, some examples of what I call discrimination from my own city. The education system in Calgary, the public school system: we have one high school teacher, by the name of Moira Hagerty, who is the only principal of a high school in the city of Calgary. She happens to be the principal of John G. Diefenbaker high school in the constituency of Calgary McKnight. The public system in Calgary has three female junior high school principals. Out of five schools, the separate school system in Calgary has no female high school principals and one female vice-principal. Out of 22 junior highs, there is one female vice-principal. In the Catholic system, such questions as how female principals would cope with a spouse and a family and how many girls at St. Mary's have had abortions, are asked of women teachers, questions that would never be asked of male applicants. In the view of some Catholic teachers in the city of Calgary, their system downgrades women, so their only role is to be a mother and be at home. Times are changing, but slowly.

Recently a constituent asked me to lunch so she could inform me of her position on the optometry Act proposed for this session. In a profession dominated by men, it turned out that my constituent is a professional person running her own practice, is also the registrar of her profession in Alberta, the mother of two children with a working husband. By the way, she paid for the lunch.

Many women — and I would count among them my wife and the wives of my colleagues — are running the farm in your absence or looking after your business. Some are filling in for you in your medical clinics. I know some of the female members here also have their marriage partners looking after the farm or working in the oil industry or in the field of education. Many of these women would be the first to say that they do not wish to be associated with the feminist movement. They want women to be treated as equal to men in the search for jobs or to work in the professions or engage in politics; or, put another way, to be treated as persons — not chattels, not lumped with children or the mentally incompetent — equal in every way to men.

But first a little history. Prior to April 1916, women in Alberta could not vote. Quoting from the Dominion Elections Act: no idiot, lunatic, criminal, or woman shall vote. The law was changed because of the determination of five women in the province of Alberta who did enough research to know that any five people could take an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada for clarification of any part of the BNA Act.

These five women — Emily Murphy; Nellie McClung, who served in this Legislature some 60 years ago; Henrietta Edwards, who was an early legal pioneer in such areas as vocational training for girls, prison reform, organization of public libraries, and mothers' allowances; Irene Parlby, who was the second woman in the British Empire to serve as a cabinet minister and president of the United Farm Women of Alberta; and Louise McKinney, first elected to a legislature in Canada and in the British

Empire — were active in such matters as minimum wages, law, nursing services in rural areas where no doctors were available, child clinics, better liquor laws, housing and recreational facilities, to name a few. Their battle had to be taken to the Privy Council, where in 1929 the Lord Chancellor announced that women could become members of the Senate of Canada. But ironically the first woman senator came from eastern Canada. I'm sure we are all aware of what happened recently when the constitution was finally determined in eastern Canada. It was the work of an unorganized group of volunteer women all across Canada that got women's rights integrated into our constitution.

Now I'd like to give you some recent history of Alberta. When I came here in 1975, there were two women members; there are now six. There was one cabinet minister; there are now two. There were no senior officials at the deputy minister or assistant level; I understand there are now two. We are making some progress, but it's slow. That is why I think my motion has merit. There is vast room for involvement of women for positions in Alberta society. At the professional level, there are more women in training for the ministry, engineering, optometry, accounting, law, and medicine, and there are more changes ahead.

In the vocational field, though, progress is not as good. Perhaps we men are to blame because some of us, frankly, are worried. For example, in the last election campaign we mentioned that female apprentices in Alberta had increased 47 per cent from 399 to 588, as of February 26, 1982. What we did not say was that in the same period, there were 28,408 apprentices in the program. To put it in another way, just over 2 per cent were women.

When I mentioned this motion to some of my colleagues, they said, why shouldn't we have bureaus for boys, girls, and men? I say, look around you; it's still a male kingdom in all aspects of life. I know that women are the only ones who can have babies, and this is very important to our society. The sanctity of the family unit is most important, but that does not mean women have to be prisoners of custom or dependent on men for financial survival. Our widows' pension that will be debated tomorrow is a recognition of this, but there are still women who never marry, who are poor, and who are in need of help.

Now I'd like to return to today's woman. The University of Alberta has a new vice-president of research by the name of Dr. Gordin Kaplan, who is chairman of women in scholarship, engineering and science. He has formed a task force whose primary job is to try to understand why women are underrepresented in the hard sciences, in engineering, and then do something about it.

Women scientists are more numerous in Europe; more women engineers are in Russia. Why, asks Dr. Kaplan. This is an area the task force could probe, in my view. Perhaps Albertans should encourage students in elementary, junior, and high schools to pursue courses in math and science, as they do in the province of Quebec. To quote an article by Helene Loiselle, a senior civil engineer with Bechtel Quebec Ltd.

A recent survey of women members of the Order of Engineers of Quebec shows that most believe we have to be better than our male colleagues to achieve the same professional recognition. Some men are ready to accept us based on our engineering competence, but there are the traditionalists with a "what's a nice girl like you doing here?" attitude.

Gladys Stott graduated in 1952 as an industrial che-

mist. She found out that refineries in those days didn't hire women. She could do routine work in a hospital medical lab or, if she was lucky, she could get a job testing blood for the Red Cross. But she had graduated as an industrial chemist. The only job she could get was a junior one at the Research Council, which she took to get a toe in the door. Today she's a section head in the chemical and materials engineering department of the Research Council.

Dr. Nancy Cyr, an associate research officer in the chemistry department for four years, says that she enjoys equality with her male co-workers in many areas, except management decisions. In areas of science, she says, there's no problem. But management is a man's world in the view of some at the Research Council.

Dr. Marianne English, who is a section manager of cloud physics and evaluation in the atmospheric science department, has been with ARC for nine years. In her case, marriage and career did not work. She has a PhD from McGill, but her husband never got his Bachelor of Science degree. She is sympathetic to women who try to pursue careers while raising families, particularly professionals with young children who have great difficulty attending technical conferences away from their home city.

Another PhD at ARC is Dr. Irina Shetsen in the geological survey department. She brings concerns, which I also found in my research, that reflect her background in science. She is a graduate in science from the U.S.S.R. She cited *The Cinderella Complex* by Colette Dowling:

Women are afraid to succeed because success brings new work. You have to take the risks and dare to do things you didn't do before. You might alienate people and women are afraid to do that. They want everyone to think they are nice. Men usually don't think that way.

Born and educated in Russia, she estimates that women and men graduate in equal numbers in the sciences, but women in science in Russia move slowly through the ranks, and there are none in government in the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few examples of women in science in Alberta. You can appreciate some are able to raise a family and pursue a career in science, yet they meet the same obstacles as do other women who try to break out of traditional roles. Because of the poor enrolment in science overall in Canada, in 1980 the Science Council of Canada held a workshop to determine why this was so. In 1976 the number of women doctoral candidates in engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences was too small to be measured. As a result of this, the number of women teachers doing research in universities and industry was naturally small.

If girls continue to opt out of science courses, it will have profound economic and political consequences in a world where the impact of science and technology is becoming more important every day. Women must be able to participate in directing technological innovation and determining the speed and manner in which new developments are introduced into society. Women will have to be well informed and represented in the professional scientific community.

There are other important reasons for women to increase their scientific skills. One way or another, technology will continue to affect the labor market at many levels. Girls who do not acquire the basic elements of mathematics and physics will not be eligible for admission to science and technology programs in secondary education. These are the programs that provide skilled

personnel. Unless women have basic science education, they cannot enter training programs to qualify them for new job opportunities. As the office procedures change, that's going to be their only out.

One of the speakers at the workshop was Dr. Rose Sheinin: *Women in Science and Why Not/Naught*. She asked: what is the cultural, social, ethical and economic imprint that Canadian society lays upon its young people so that the two sexes go their separate ways as adults? In her view, it can be described as a German concept. I'm glad the hon. Minister of International Trade is not here, because I cannot pronounce this German very well. It's *kinder, kuche, kirche*, or in English, children, kitchen, church. In Canada, we're more crude: women should be barefoot, pregnant, and in the kitchen. The North American concept is more honest as it spells out the cultural and economic sexism of our society, or to put it in the vernacular: male chauvinism.

According to Dr. Sheinin, classical art often reveals a view of woman as a madonna: a loving, caring mother figure. Sometimes she is shown as a creative vital force of mankind. Rarely do we see the effects of poverty on women, on mothers, and on children. Woman in the work place is shown shopping or washing. Rarely is she shown as a scientist, an engineer, or an authority figure, unless she's a monarch or a goddess. Women are shown as teachers, but never as principals. Even the Soviet Union shows women in non-traditional roles as tractor drivers or engineers, but rarely as authority figures.

This is a quick overview of women's place in our society. In my view, it is important that we strengthen the Women's Bureau to evaluate the role of women. There is much to be done. Society is changing, and we as legislators should be more aware of the changing situation. Outspoken views quite frequently are not based on fact. Many women are hurting. To quote Betty Friedan, who wrote the book called *The Feminine Mystique*, which was a kind of catalyst to the women's movement 10 years ago — I thought it was a rather interesting comment on our situation here. When I went to our library they didn't have it, but he said they had the latest book of Betty Friedan. I'd like to quote from *The Second Stage*.

The challenge of the second stage is to tap our own wellspring of generative human power, accepting the political responsibility to restructure the system as it dehumanizes both work and home — using the capitalist system to meet the new needs of individual growth and family, with a real choice to have children, and to engage the evolving human urgencies of both men and women for meaning and purpose in life. The mode of the second stage transforms the very problems into solutions, liberating those frustrated life energies from the passive service of demagogue and profiteer, pornographic escape or deadly violence. For above all, it frees us for new kinds of political participation: human politics.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote two women in our province, one from a wealthy Calgary neighborhood represented by the Member for Calgary Northwest, in a letter to the Member for Calgary West:

Incidentally, the Women's Bureau does a good job with the resources it has. If its budget and its mandate could be strengthened, and if a minister who understood and cared about women's issues were in place for a full four years — like every other minister — then we'd be getting somewhere. Women's groups who write and say we don't need a special department for women's affairs in Alberta

have seen only one aspect of life. I don't want to add to the division that's already going on in this province, but it is nearsighted and selfish to say that everything is okay as it is. It's not. It may be okay if a woman has a good caring responsible husband who in turn has a good bank account. But it is not okay if she happens to be unlucky in the draw.

The second letter will appeal to my rural colleagues. It's from a lady living in northeast Alberta in the Fairview area. This lady has a limited education and doesn't even know how to write a letter, but this letter should interest you. She says:

1. I started work on the farm at 10 years old — milking, hauling water, care of horses and cattle, cutting wood with a buck saw at age 10 — father was ill and I had to do this to age 15 and also walk 7 miles a day (to school and home).
2. Married at 16. Eight children — and I was kept busy looking after them.
3. ... in 1967 .. got a job at a local hospital.
4. Worked until I was injured and was off work for 5 years because of the injury. Much pain and illness too. Some of the time I was unable to walk across a room.
5. I got Workers' Compensation benefit at the clinic in Edmonton; they are the most wonderful caring people around.
6. In 1973 I got a small disability pension. The doctor told me I would get it for life.

She then proceeds to speak about employment in a local school and how she eventually lost her job.

Finally had to go down the welfare road. As of Nov. 82 I got \$328.00. Next month Dec. 29th I will get \$219.00. I was getting too much they said. Quite a comedown from 16,000.00 and over a year.

Now her husband who receives the old age pension feels it should be all for his needs. He doesn't want to share it. She says:

If two are pensioners it is better. The humiliation, shame and disgrace to sink to welfare is unreal. So called welfare bums. Should we starve or hang our heads in shame.

Her husband threatens he will leave if he cannot have his entire pension for himself. To quote her again, she says:

I don't blame him. He worked hard in his life and helped open the Worsley area up and feels he earned his pension and is tired of the pinching every penny. And after over 40 years of marriage. What about me! 55-60 does not exist to our fair province unless you are rich and famous ... Also there are likely more women 55-60 as I that are in financial trouble too. We are the forgotten ones. Hurray for the Alberta council on women's affairs.

Thank you.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to precede by remarks on Motion 206 by saying how pleased I am to note the amount of time being devoted to women's issues by this government in this sitting of the Legislature. I had the honor of giving first reading to the Widows' Pension Act which is now a government Bill. Its purpose is to provide assistance to Albertans between the ages of 55 and 64 who have lost their spouses and have limited income.

The Member for Edmonton Belmont introduced a motion dealing with the very serious problem of spouse battering. Today we are debating a motion dealing with the establishment of a task force to review the achieve-

ments of the Women's Bureau and consider the role of women in Alberta today. I sincerely trust that many, many colleagues in the Legislature will take the opportunity under this Bill to express their concerns and the feelings of their constituents.

I think this motion shows the genuine interest of this government with the special concerns of a large segment of the population; 49 per cent of the voting population are women. I especially want to congratulate my colleague for Calgary McKnight for his initiative in bringing forth this motion. On many occasions over the past few years, we have talked regarding issues that are primarily pertinent to women. I will admit that it was on his initiative, first of all. He came to me to discuss what he perceived as some very unique and specific problems for women in Alberta. This further expanded over the years, and contrary to some popular opinion and beliefs, particularly in Calgary, this issue did not die amongst us. How well we know that there are many other members of the Assembly, cabinet ministers, that have all been genuinely interested in looking at the concerns that face women today.

To put the situation of Alberta women in perspective, it is interesting to look at the plight of women in the rest of the world. The World Conference on the United Nations Decade for Women in Copenhagen in 1980 produced some information. The situation of women in the rest of the world is certainly not good and, very tragically, it is in fact getting worse. Comparatively speaking, women in Alberta are living in paradise. I know that I could well be taken to task for making that statement when we realize that there are very severe and tragic problems still facing us in Alberta. But as I said at the beginning of this paragraph, I'm trying to put Alberta in perspective with the rest of the world.

Some examples are worth noting. Most women now work far longer hours than men, in factory, shop, or office, as well as in the home as cook, cleaner, child rearer, shopper, and homemaker. The average woman who goes to work puts in an 80-hour working week, twice as much as a lot of men. Everywhere in the work place women's wages are lower than men's. In the United Kingdom women are paid an average of 25 per cent less. In the United States they are paid 40 per cent less. This is despite equal pay legislation in most industrialized countries.

Trade unions, which by the way are dominated by men, have done much to improve the pay, conditions, and benefits of work forces in the industrial world. In America's garment industry, 80 per cent of the union workers are women, but 21 of the 22 on the board of the union are men. In New Zealand only 15 of the country's 323 unions have any women executives, despite the fact that women carry over one-third of all union membership cards.

Women and girls are half the world's population. They do two-thirds of the world's work hours. They receive one-tenth of the world's income, and own less than a hundredth of the world's property. Two out of three women in the world are illiterate. Three-quarters of the health problems of the developing world could be prevented by better nutrition, water, sanitation, education, and immunization, all of which are usually the responsibility of women. Eighty per cent of the medical and health budgets are devoted to doctors and hospitals promoting curative medicine to a small proportion of the population.

In rural areas only about 15 per cent of the population

have access to modern health care. During pregnancy and childbirth, more than half of the world's women have no trained help; only a third have access to family planning. While this is not to say that Alberta women should somehow be content and maintain the status quo, it does help to show us that we are living in a privileged society.

The process for women to have involvement or input to the political system is the same as for all citizens in the province, and this is learning to use the political process. Of course this is done primarily by utilizing the Members of the Legislative Assembly, the cabinet ministers, and their departments. Many of these departments are responsible for issues that directly affect women: issues like day care, career development, education or employment opportunities. These are spread, fortunately or unfortunately depending on how it is perceived by people, through various departments in the government. It makes it very confusing for women to know how to have input to the system or to seek information they need. One of the roles, of course, of the Alberta Women's Bureau is to make information on these various issues available.

Women have access to the decision-making process through their elected members, the caucus members, as I've said, Executive Council members, and the government departments. They can also participate actively through the electoral process by voting. Further, in our government here in Alberta, the minister responsible for the status of women, the Hon. Dick Johnston, is accessible to individual women and groups representing women's interest. So women's affairs have wide representation in the province today.

As everyone in the Assembly is aware, this issue of looking at a more concrete or specific body to deal with women's affairs — whether it is called an advisory council on the status of women, or a council of women's affairs — has long been looked at, debated, and had questions asked about it in this Assembly. When the question was directed to him in 1977, the now hon. Provincial Treasurer stated that this government did not

endorse as appropriate any kind of special ministry of women, because that would clearly be discriminatory and would not suggest equality for women.

As I stated, each department deals with women's issues as they relate to the particular department. In the Department of Housing, the senior citizens' self-contained housing program and the senior citizens' lodges program probably impact more women today than men, in light of the fact that there are more elderly women than elderly men living alone. In 1971 the average life expectancy for women was 76; for men it was 69. In 1971, 55 per cent of those aged 65-plus were women and 45 per cent were men. The proportion of women rises in even older age categories. For the same reasons, in the Department of Municipal Affairs, the Alberta property tax reduction program benefits seniors. They also have the Alberta senior citizen renter assistance program. Again, both of these programs impact the lives of women. In Hospitals and Medical Care, men and women pay the same premiums for health care; however, women receive about 50 per cent more benefits from those programs than men.

In the Department of Education, the guidance and health curriculum involves teachers discussing self-awareness, career awareness, and personal development. Teachers are to help make students aware of all possible alternatives to fulfill themselves as people, not necessarily as males or females. As well, the department has a stringent policy for analysing teaching materials. This analysis includes an awareness that materials should not contain

sex stereotyping. For example, books show single-family parents with male or female heads, not necessarily just females. The analysis procedure that all provincial learning materials must go through is called EPI analysis, educational products information exchange. It is an objective and a rigorous procedure that Manitoba and B.C. use as well.

The Personnel Administration department has personal planning and career development with the commitment to help female employees of the Alberta public service achieve their career potential. There are three programs under this unit: secretarial professionalism, the senior secretary, and career development for women. A coordinator within the other government departments takes the initiative with respect to the specific types of programs, workshops, et cetera that are offered in that department. The personnel planning and career development unit works closely with these co-ordinators.

In 1980, a formal research project was initiated to identify any mobility barriers to women in the department. In Social Services and Community Health, there are seven areas which impact directly and positively on women. First of all, the parent resource unit is designed for all parents, but in fact there is more response from women, especially single-parent women. The parent support group program is a network of parents who share information on the care of young children. It is mainly aimed at women with children at home. One function it serves is to prevent child abuse. Secondly, the employment opportunities program is designed to help find employment for those persons receiving assistance from the department. About 60 per cent of those who use this service are women, many with dependent children. The program involves individual and group counselling. One such group session is the contemporary woman program that was run by the Calgary school board. The program is designed for women desiring employment who have never worked or who have not worked for some time.

In what used to be called our preventive social service program, now the family community service program, a number are predominantly but not exclusively used by women. I think they are worth mentioning because I must admit that I was quite surprised at the number of the programs that are available. One is family life education; mother's day out; parent/child development; after school care; family centres; family planning agencies; a single parents project which is unique to Calgary; the rape crisis centre in Calgary; N'GaWee Care an urban skills program here in the city of Edmonton; the Bissell child care centre; homemaker services; family aid programs; and the Elizabeth Fry court worker program in Calgary.

The income security branch publishes a guide to social allowance which has an indirect impact on women. A single parent in need of economic assistance may apply for social allowance. This would affect women since, unfortunately, most single parents today are female.

Women's shelters have previously received a great deal of funding by this government. This issue was well discussed when we were discussing the motion on battered women. There are privately run organizations also that receive local and provincial moneys if a request by the organization is approved. As I've mentioned before in this Assembly, another unique program which may be listed under the women's shelter, but is unique, is the Discovery House in Calgary. It goes one step further than the emergency women's shelters that are available. It allows women and families to remain in that setting for a much longer period than they can stay in the emergency

shelter and also receive some counselling. Day care of course is a very important contribution for ensuring that women have equal employment opportunities. Many of the programs of senior citizens under this department also will impact women just because of the number that are female.

Through the Solicitor General's department, the government encourages all municipal police departments and the RCMP to undertake a variety of crime prevention activities. I believe the members of the Legislature are well aware of the Lady Beware education program. In many instances family violence is related to alcoholism and drug abuse. The Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission provides important support services to spouses and children of people who abuse drugs or alcohol.

Lastly, as the initiator of this resolution mentioned, we have in place the Alberta Women's Bureau, a very important service in providing information to women in the province. It produces many information sheets and pamphlets which are distributed free of charge on request. The newest information sheets are personal financial management and single parents. Other pamphlets and fact sheets available range from Laws for Albertans to a guide to probate procedures. These publications are recognized and respected by many groups in Alberta. In particular, the guide to probate procedures has been noted by the legal profession as being the best in Canada. The document Laws for Albertans is used at the University of Alberta's law faculty as a reference tool.

The Women's Bureau has also undertaken a number of specific projects, including a speaker who travelled throughout Alberta in 1975 to speak to groups on the concerns of women. In 1976 the Women's Bureau initiated a pilot project seminar on career development for women in the Alberta government. In 1979 the Women's Bureau was responsible for publicizing the "persons case", which the Member for Calgary McKnight mentioned. Further, the Women's Bureau has sponsored \$20,000 in scholarships to men and women to pursue studies in social sciences.

It certainly isn't to say that that hasn't been a very valuable resource in the province of Alberta. The question is: in the changing times of today — or if you live in the city of Calgary, as I do, with the rapid growth we have undergone in most recent years, the terrific social pressures we have — is it just possibly time to look at what services we offer and any ways we can change them?

For some reason I had it in my mind, and probably others have had the same idea, that it was time to update the name. I'm not exactly sure why I felt this was such a radical change that should be made at this time. Two or three years ago, I wrote to some of my constituents to see how they felt about the issue and if they could suggest a different name for the Women's Bureau. I certainly think the services should be expanded; there's no doubt about it. As we've decentralized so many departments in our provinces and provided more specific services to the people in our other cities and our smaller towns, I think it's maybe time that we look at: are we really doing the best for the women, primarily in Alberta, by letting them know what information is available or how they can obtain this information?

So I would certainly at least like to see, if not a suboffice in Calgary — because I know there are some groups that operate that do have resource centres, and they offer a great many services within the city of Calgary. I felt that rather than duplicate an office, which

would be part of the Women's Bureau, why couldn't one of those agencies in Calgary that already has the structure in place — possibly they might need some more available space or staff — serve this link that is so vitally needed in the city of Calgary, and probably in many of the other major centres in Alberta?

I also felt that the concept would be acceptable regarding the philosophy of this government, where we believe that there are people out in the community, a lot of volunteer organizations, that are doing a great job and can carry on and do the job very well. With some financial assistance from us, I thought this would be an excellent, viable way of achieving the same type of goal without multiplying some of our government resources throughout the province.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

I think we're going to have to look particularly at alternate ways of funding today in view of our budget and the restraints that we have. But I believe very strongly and sincerely that it doesn't mean to say we should curtail the services that have been identified as being well used and needed throughout this province.

Further to having the information available, if people know how to contact the Women's Bureau, I think that we need to go into — and I understand this is already under consideration by the Women's Bureau — having television programs throughout the province so that women, be it in the urban or rural setting, know specifically what type of help is available to them. I think that there are still far too many individual cases where women do not know where to go for help and do not have any access to what we perceive as a normal route through the political system.

I think this motion is very appropriate, because all it is saying is, let us review the achievements of the Women's Bureau. Hopefully other members have different ideas on how to make it more accessible to people or to provide and expand the services. I am sure all my colleagues in the Legislature do receive the magazine that is relatively new, called *Alberta Women*, published by the Women's Bureau. I am always pleased to see the articles in there, particularly those that pertain to Alberta issues. I feel it's important that the many exciting programs, items of interest, and things that are happening in this province alone, should be communicated through this vehicle to all Alberta women.

The second objective of this task force would be to examine and evaluate the progress of women toward full and equal opportunity. Again, Mr. Speaker, I really want my colleagues to speak on this one, because we know that there are problems out there. I feel a terrible frustration for all the years that I have been involved in this issue, of trying to help in any way that I possibly could — through my nursing background or now in my role as an M.L.A. — women that have specific problems. One concern that has been brought to my attention on many occasions is the idea that we need more research; we have really got to find out. That may be. I am certain that we've got to be willing to look at changes as they occur. But I have a pile of studies on my desk here. There are so many of them. I'm sure these barely touch what is already available out there: A Review of Women's Participation in the Non-Traditional Occupations, July 1981; Women in the Public Service, October 1980; Occupational Segregation and Its Effects, A Study of Women in the Alberta Public Service, 1979; the Calgary YWCA brief to the Parliamentary Task

Force on Employment Opportunities in the '80s; another brief, Micro-electronics and Employment; a brief to the Social Service Committee by the Alberta Status of Women Action Committee, February 1980. On and on it goes.

So to my mind, there must be enough information available that surely the task force could take what is there, identify the issues, and look at some solutions, if we're missing some of the areas that really need to be directed. I feel that everybody is now ready to move on those issues. One of the problems that I've encountered so often when I have been speaking with women who have a genuine concern for what is happening to many women, is the fact that the issues are very, very broad. They talk about equal pay for equal opportunity. When you try to look at specific cases or ask them if they have gone to the Human Rights Commission, if they're aware of our Bill of Rights in this province or the Individuals Rights Protection Act — there are many solutions already in place. Unfortunately, again I think it's a question that people do not know how to access what is there.

Lastly, I would like to comment briefly on one of the latest inputs that I know has reached the minister, the Hon. Dick Johnston, and I believe was presented primarily to members in Calgary. Through a lot of study, a group has been organized in the city of Calgary that decided it was time once again to assess where the women are in Alberta and what the major concerns are that can be brought to our attention. So an informal group was invited to sit down, and they became members of a steering committee for an Alberta council on women's affairs.

This group met in Calgary and eventually have developed a position paper. At the present time I believe they state that they represent 45 organizations. Further to this number — because this was when the brief was printed in June 1982 — they have probably added a lot more organizations that give support to their concerns. They have developed terms of reference, of course, and what they are mainly interested in. First of all, they would like a more formal structure than currently exists. It is obvious that they feel there should be more than the Women's Bureau, or they feel that there should be more than a rotating minister that is responsible for the status of women's affairs. They also want a body that is to be recognized by the provincial government. They want it to be accountable to the women in Alberta. They also want a forum for positive, constructive, concerned input to issues which really would affect the various roles of women.

They've taken quite a large mandate, because they really would like to consider local, regional, provincial, federal, and international issues. I think this will raise some questions and concerns, although in the presentation of their information package, they are saying primarily that they hope this will be a tool to initiate dialogue and facilitate discussion with government on the establishment of an Alberta council on women's affairs.

As I said, I know the Calgary members have received this brief. If other members have not had a copy and would like to see what is being proposed, the women in Calgary have also contacted various organizations throughout the whole province, so that hopefully it will become a provincial concern. While I did mention they had 45 organizations listed that supported their endeavors, I've received a couple of presentations — so I'm sure other MLAs have — from organizations that really feel this is not the way to go at this time.

I would like to commend the group in Calgary for their hard work on this issue and on bringing it to our attention. At this time, I urge the members in the Legislature not only to please consider supporting this resolution, but hopefully each and every one of you will debate and present your points of view regarding the concerns of women in your constituencies.

In view of the hour, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the hon. member have agreement to adjourn debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

**Bill 206  
Code of Ethics and Conduct Act**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to preface just a few remarks on the Bill. I believe the Bill is self-explanatory as people go through it. But I'd preface my remarks in saying that unfortunately in our society — it's not just true of Alberta; it's true in Canada, North America, throughout the western world, I expect, and what we know of the world behind the Iron Curtain, although they probably don't talk about it very much — there seems to be a cynicism developing about politicians and the political process. I think this cynicism is unfair and most often unfounded, but it affects all of us in public life. It affects people not only in the legislature or parliament and municipal governments but even at the local level. That feeling is that politicians are in it for what they can get out of it, that they're not there to provide public service.

I suggest that that is not the case with most hon. members I know. We may disagree a lot on philosophy and tactics and what's right or wrong, but I'd certainly say that most of the people I have met in public life are there because they want to provide a public service to the people, whether it be in Alberta or Canada. But we have to recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the cynicism is there.

Unfortunately, in my job as high school counsellor, I saw that feeling developing at a younger and younger age. If you look at the voting turnouts of young people, they're not turning out in the same proportions as, say, senior citizens. Many of them have given up on the system. I'm not suggesting that this Code of Ethics and Conduct Act can change all that, but I think we as politicians have an image problem, if you like. All of you perhaps have seen polls of people you would trust and respect. Usually hockey players or sports figures are at the top and politicians come last, and just ahead of them are used car salesmen. I think this is unfair. We're all in this position, and I think we feel it's unfair.

But we have to look at the problem, and I think we need a code of ethics and conduct Act for our own protection, as well as for anybody else or for people who are contemplating going into the political arena. Surely all of us in this Legislature agree that politics should be the most honorable position, the most honorable occupation around and that all of us, regardless of our political philosophy, want the best possible people running for political office, be it at the local level, the provincial level,

or the federal level.

I remind you of the recent problems of the House of Commons, where the Conservative opposition led the way in the problems Mr. Gillespie had. They were right to go after Mr. Gillespie, because in many ways it was clear that he was breaking their code of ethics. Unfortunately we do not have a code in Alberta. Mr. Gillespie would not have been guilty of anything in Alberta at this particular time.

I hope this is just an oversight and that members opposite have not had time to put thought into this oversight, if you like, but I do believe it's time. I know it's not going to happen with an opposition member and a private member's Bill. I know that's not going to become law. But hopefully by starting the debate — and I would say to hon. members that there are many different types of code of ethics and conduct Acts. If there are things in here that members do not like, that's fine. There may be better ways to do it. There's always a better way. But I think there are some good ideas in this Bill. I think it's worth thinking about. I say to you honestly that all our reputations are involved here. If people perceive, and perhaps wrongfully so — most often wrongfully so — that people in public business seem to be getting a lot more out of it than they're putting into it, it's not just that person who suffers. It's all of us and all the people who are thinking of going into public life.

I'm sure hon. members opposite have talked to other people about being candidates in their party and have got the reaction, well, I wouldn't put up with it all; I don't want to get involved in it; it's a dirty business. How many of us have knocked door-to-door and got the reaction — I'm sure we all have — well, they're all a bunch of crooks anyhow. I think this is a dangerous precedent we're starting. This would be one step, admittedly small, in an image problem we all have. I think it would be a reasonable first step to bring in a code of ethics and conduct Act. I would say to hon. members, take a look at it. If there are things that you don't think are good or practical, fine. But I hope the members would go back to their caucus and discuss bringing in their own Bill.

Let me just look at parts of it. I'm not going to go through it point by point, because everybody here can read and I wouldn't want to bore you. Maybe some hon. members have read it already. Part one deals with MLAs, ministers, executive assistants, and heads of Crown corporations during the time they are in government service. In this case, it would affect all of us here, plus people in offices who are working for us in a political sense, and heads of Crown corporations. So that part deals basically with what happens while you're in government.

The second part, if you want to break it into different parts, deals with public disclosure of assets and companies a person has been a director of. I know some members here have personally done this, because I've talked to them and they think it's a good idea. If it's a good idea for individual members, then it might be a good thing for all of us as members of the Legislature. If we're talking about blind trust and things like this, it would enable us to concentrate on our business as legislators representing our constituents.

If you would look at part three, it deals with what happens after we're through with public life. In the most recent example of what happened in the federal Parliament, this is where this particular person ran into trouble. If this is laid out clearly and people know what is right and wrong — I think that often we get into problems because there are all sorts of shades of gray. I'm suggest-

ing that if what is right and what is wrong was laid out after very clearly, that would save a fair amount of problems. I would say to this government that, honestly, it would have saved the government embarrassment over the recent appointments of Mr. McMillan, Mr. deRapard, and Mr. Leitch. Nobody is going to say . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Who's embarrassed?

MR. MARTIN: If you're not embarrassed, you should be, because it's been plain. That's not to say that these gentlemen aren't very capable. I know all of them. I worked very closely with a couple of them when I was a secretary. But the fact remains that people wonder how they got the job. Did they get it because they were a member of the Conservative Party high up, or did they get it because they were the best possible people?

I'm suggesting to the hon. members not to get excited about it. I'm not maligning these people. They're very good people. I've said that. But what we're trying to say, even for their protection, and the cynicism people have, is that it would have been better if there had been a process for them to go through. That's all we're saying. If they were the best possible people, I'm sure they would have got the jobs. But it would have been a process. People would accept that. So the third part of the Bill deals basically with length of time and correct or incorrect things people can do when they're through with government service, be it an MLA, a minister, a Crown corporation head, or people in political positions as executive assistants.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would ask hon. members to take a serious look at the Bill. If hon. members really feel that politicians have no image problems, and everybody thinks it is an honorable position and there is no need for a code at all, then I have to accept that. But I do not believe that's the case. I think hon. members would agree that there is an image problem out there.

The other point I would make is that if there's a better way to do it, fine. We're open to suggestions on this, because this should be a non-partisan issue. We're not dealing with ideologies or economics here; we're dealing with image problems for all of us, be it NDP, Conservative, Independent or, I might even say, Liberal. I suppose even that's possible in Alberta at some point.

MR. NOTLEY: Not too many liberal minds in this House.

MR. MARTIN: I would ask hon. members to take an objective look at the Bill. I say again that politics should be the most honorable occupation there is. Unfortunately — and I say this sincerely — most people do not look at it that way. I would say that if we adopted a Bill, this would be one small step towards some respect for politicians. I conclude by saying that if members do not like this code of ethics, if they think it's too stringent or not stringent enough, then take it back to caucus, look at it, and come back with another Bill. We'd be glad to support it.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I must rise this afternoon to discuss Bill 206, brought forward by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood. In quickly looking at the Bill — I've seen similar attempts at Bills — I would think that the only people who could probably qualify under this and remain reasonably straightforward about it would be



preachers, prostitutes, or professors. I think that what we need in this Legislature are people who want to get into politics, get involved, and don't want an awful lot of stringent rules hanging over their heads, particularly as a back-bench MLA such as the Member for Edmonton Norwood is.

Just looking at the very first section of the Act the hon. member has proposed,

... "asset" means any property of value, including land or interest in land, personal or intellectual property, shares in a company ...

and on it goes. Then there are the exceptions. Further on in the Act we go into where we must report any change in any of this, other than the exceptions, within 30 days.

When he talks about intellectual property — that's patents, copyrights, and things like that — who is to know when there is a change in the value of a piece of work, a photograph, if you happen to be a licenced photographer, or any number of other things? I would suggest that just there in the first section the Act is in trouble.

One of the other exceptions is your home or any part of your farm or business if you're resident on it. It would mean that because I don't live on it, I would have to list everything I've got on my little farm, which maybe isn't that much, but it's enough to make it reasonable under the Act that I register all this stuff. And if there's any change of value of any kind, then I have to register it within 30 days. I can just imagine all the members here in the Legislature racing down to the Clerk's office within a 30-day time period, and there are 79 of us ...

AN HON. MEMBER: How many chickens have you got?

MR. LYSONS: Yes. If the eggs hatched ... How many people would it take in the Clerk's office to register all this stuff?

We know that the hon. member loves bureaucracy, the building of it, and so on. But really what we're looking at in this Act is not what the Act says — because it's poorly written and hasn't been thought out too well, as he's admitted — it's what's implied. I have read it very carefully. I don't understand a lot of it, but I do know that there are enough things in here that would pretty well cook your Christmas goose if you became an MLA and made a mistake.

There's a little section here for hon. members to consider. Conflict of interest (conflicting outside activities):

3 No member of the Legislative Assembly may take supplementary employment other than as authorized by or pursuant to any Act,

(a) which is performed in such a way as to appear to be an official act, or to directly represent the Government of Alberta; or

(b) which unduly interferes with his responsibilities as a member.

I'm not a lawyer, and I don't think the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood is. But there are a number of lawyers in here. I can just see our lawyer pals having a real heyday with "which unduly interferes".

I can see myself someday helping the farmer who farms my land take off the crop, and we may be in session. That may be considered unduly interfering. There are all kinds of things like that. That's just where I personally — how about some people who may have a law practice or teach school or whatever?

No Minister may carry on business other than as a

Minister, except ... a family farm.

Of course he's left out the Swiss bank account. That's legal, hon. members. We can still have our Swiss bank accounts.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shameful. He should bank in Canada.

MR. LYSONS: I checked that out very carefully, because I wanted to make sure that was no problem.

Then we go on to public disclosure. Well, in this little Constitution Act, 1982 — this little red book is reminiscent of the people who printed it and had it made up — there are certain rights and freedoms that are part of our constitution. I'm not so sure we wouldn't be violating our own federal constitution, that this province is a signatory to, by this Act. I hope the hon. member would clarify that in third reading. Then on "disclosure by officials", who determines, and what constitutes, full disclosure? We're going to need another set of bookkeepers for that.

The one I would really like to draw your attention to is sort of personal. I was a chairman of the container refund committee, and our task was to look at how much we might be able to pay people for bringing back bottles and tin cans. Now with section 7,

Where the value or income from any asset owned by a member of the Legislative Assembly will be or is likely to be affected by a resolution before the Legislative Assembly, the member shall disclose the nature of the asset to the Legislative Assembly and shall not vote on the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that would automatically eliminate almost everyone in this Legislature from sitting on the bottle refund committee, because almost every one of us has a pop bottle sitting around the house.

AN HON. MEMBER: I never thought about that one. That's very good.

MR. LYSONS: Oh, there's a whole bunch. But the hon. member must realize that it's not what he has in here that's so dangerous; it's what's implied. Mr. Speaker, there are 79 members elected to this Legislature. Hopefully they're elected on the basis of the voters' sincere desire to put the best candidate in the Legislature to direct their affairs. I don't think our voters in Alberta would be expecting anything more or anything less than our doing an honest job within the rules, which are set down very carefully. Perhaps they require some changes. But I really believe that the best people in Alberta are here, and we don't need a little document like this to make anyone ever consider that they couldn't become a member of this Legislature because of a possible conflict. I pointed out to you the idea of a bottle or a juice can around the house that, taken to the final judge, could actually exclude a sitting member from being a member of the Legislature.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DROBOT: Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation about speaking against Bill 206, the Code of Ethics and Conduct Act. There's little doubt that all of us as members of this Assembly can agree that a high standard of moral conduct is essential on the part of members. It's essential on the part of all public officials. I'm against Bill 206 because it's unnecessary, ambiguous, and certainly ineffective. It's unnecessary because Alberta already has specific provisions that have proven to be very effective in the past. These provisions clearly spell out and outline what

standard of conduct is expected of a public official. You have heard these provisions many times in the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, so I will quickly outline them.

The Legislative Assembly Act enables this Assembly to assume the powers of a court in determining whether a member is in conflict of interest. Section 43(1) of the Act outlines the behavior for a member, including accepting bribes or charging fees or compensation or rewards for promoting a view in the Legislature. The Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act of 1977 includes stringent guidelines on campaign fund disclosures. Standing Order 31(1) and (2) of this Assembly forbids any member from voting on an issue in which he has a direct pecuniary interest. The Criminal Code of Canada precisely outlines bribery and fraud.

The code of ethics for the public service of Alberta proposes guidelines that encourage deputy ministers to act efficiently, impartially, and with integrity. It's interesting to note that this code also recognizes that even for departmental administrators and employees, it is impossible to derive guidelines that would permit uniform application. As elected representatives, Mr. Speaker, an effective uniform code of ethics is even harder to create.

I'm sure the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood is aware of Premier Lougheed's 1973 ministerial statement, which required the legal description of all land holdings, mineral rights, shares in private companies doing business in Alberta, and other interests held by all ministers of this government.

All these provisions I've described, plus others, like referring to the electorate and holding public inquiries, are tried and proven. Whenever there has been a general public concern about a member's activities, this government has an excellent record of clearing the air in public. I honestly believe, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation, policy statements, and guidelines we already have in Alberta are adequate.

Bill 206 is well intended as a piece of legislation. But instead of encouraging better government, it could hurt the quality of people recruited to the public service. This code of ethics and conduct restricts employment and business activities as well as paid public duties to members. It restricts post public-office employment opportunities for members, and it requires full disclosure of assets and financial interests of all members. In effect, we already have most of these provisions and guidelines in other legislation and policy statements. The difference is that Bill 206 is simple-mindedly asserting that these provisions [apply] in broad terms to every case. The current guidelines more precisely address the specific situations, and have grown over the years into a tried and true system.

Already there are many men and women who are unwilling to make a career sacrifice in order to enter public office. Their expertise is needed in the public sector. A Bill such as this would be a great deterrent to their considering a career in public service.

Dealing with the Bill in a more specific way, I have great difficulty interpreting some of the language used. Section 3(b) disallows to members supplementary employment which "unduly interferes" with their responsibilities as members. Where do we draw the line for unduly interfering with responsibilities? There's a lot of room for disagreement there.

Section 8(1)(a) and (b) requires executive staff members and heads of Crown corporations and ministers to disclose

all serious offers of positions outside government

service which would put [them] in a position of conflict of interest.

Who's to say what constitutes a serious offer? Judges would hate us if we passed this legislation. It's too vague to be effective, and it's reduced to a general motherhood statement.

Mr. Speaker, I can look back on 21 years of continuous county, school board, and municipal service. During that time, I met hundreds of municipal, county, school board, and hospital board members, elected and appointed, whose devotion to public service and integrity were beyond question. We need to attract these types of people, and people from the private sector, to public positions and should not curtail their business activities.

Bill 206, the Code of Ethics and Conduct Act, would cause more problems than it would solve, and wouldn't help deter potential abuse of public office. The concept of published codes of ethics is relatively new, and as yet has not been proven to be effective. The Assembly has operated, and will continue to operate, ethically. I urge members not to support this well-intentioned but rationally unsound Bill.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to Bill 206, I'd like to start out by acknowledging that we periodically have to look at the rules and regulations under which we operate as politicians. I think we live in a very much changing society. Certainly the role of government is continually being adjusted and changed. That's in fact what we're here for now. Those changes range from the wording on bottle caps, I suppose, to the nature of some of our biggest financial institutions and how we regulate them.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think such a Bill has to be considered in terms of what it may detract from, in terms of representation, as well as what it might prevent. The goal of legislation should be to make possible the participation in this Legislature of as wide as possible a spectrum of representation from our society. Should the electorate choose a particular individual — whether they be employees, self-employed professionals, businessmen, or any other segment of our society — it will be up to the electorate to choose who they feel can best represent them. I feel that the thrust of any legislation in this field should be to enhance opportunities as much as to control and restrict.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the problem of attracting people into government. There are many acclamations in elections at both the local and provincial level. Occasionally there's even one in the contest for the nomination of the government party. That of course is not apathy; that is recognition of good service. In many cases, I think there is a lack of interest in our government operations. Yes, there is cynicism. But I think the greater problem is the fact that in our bickering over various privileges and so on in this House, we tend to create an image that there is something wrong, and that there are things that need to be corrected and restricted in a detailed host of ways that really are not there.

As I will say a little bit later in my remarks, I think the emphasis has to be on the positive, and many things have to be done to enhance as well as to restrict. I'm sure we want the transition in and out of office left to the electorate and to individual choice rather than be caused by particular legislation, if that is at all avoidable.

Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of people come to the Legislature to try to provide good government for the people of this province and to serve their own constituen-

cies. They're not here to make a profit. I suppose you will always have the occasional bad apple. I suppose that in the long history of an honorable institution such as government, there will always be somebody who gets his hand into the public till and discredits the rest of those who are sincerely trying to do their job. But I feel that this is not a crisis situation at this time in the province of Alberta.

The hon. Member for St. Paul has well outlined the whole host of provisions that currently exist in Alberta to protect against possible wrongdoing should it ever arise. Perhaps there is room in the future, when the business of this Assembly may allow it, to look at consolidating and reviewing the legislation and guidelines that currently exist. Perhaps it could be put more succinctly so that it might be more easily dealt with by this Assembly, as well as looked at and understood by the people of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to go on to talk a bit more generally about what is involved in this particular Bill. In looking back over some previous *Hansards* that have referred to this particular topic, we've had many, many Bills and resolutions put forward. They've come from opposition members and government members.

The factor that I find alarming in this particular set of proposals is that the pattern seems to be in one direction; that is, it is always aiming toward creating more rules, more detailed restrictions. Perhaps we have to back up and have a look at the whole area of how one functions in this House in terms of their previous, current, or future occupation, business, or other investment contact.

It seems there are two philosophies involved in terms of the occupation of being a representative in this House. One would have the following features: first of all, you divest yourself of all economic and employment attachments before you even consider running for the nomination. You plan to be a full-time professional M.L.A. You commit yourself to having no personal involvement or contact with a job or business during your term of office.

It might even be advocated by some that you should have certain training — perhaps in economics, politics, or philosophy — before you aspire to these offices. This would be somewhat like Plato's program for philosopher kings. Although as I remember his writing, he did not plan that they would be selected for those offices by election. The result would be a person well grounded in theoretical knowledge, and certainly a person who would have a professional commitment to do the best possible job in the role of government. When you were through this particular career, I don't know what you would do. Perhaps you would intend to carry on for a long time, which I think is one of the dangers when you commit yourself to that particular role of representation as a system.

I can't help but reflect, in relationship to the Bill, that there is one thing you'd be qualified to do after you were finished as a representative, and that is to be a lobbyist. However, according to the Bill, you couldn't do that for four years. Perhaps you'd need to have a pension until you were sufficiently separated from that particular type of representation. But it does have its merits, and I think that's one side of the issue.

Certainly there would still have to be a code of ethics and a code of conduct that would be related to a person even in that particular style of representation. I think that code of conduct would be an extremely difficult one to devise, however, because it would have to do with preventing people from possibly mixing in the administra-

tion of government. It would have to be a code of conduct that would perhaps put a limit on the number of terms you could serve, because certainly the problem there would be that some people, albeit a minority, would come to the point where they would do everything within their power to stay in office. They would forget about the electorate they were there to serve.

The second approach, Mr. Speaker — and I think this one is of the British and North American tradition — is that you run for election because you have ideas, you feel you can represent the people, and people want you to seek public office because they feel that because of your accomplishment in business or performance in a job or profession, you have the background, the practical experience, and the contact with the community to provide good representation. In summary, you have understanding and empathy for the constituency and the individuals you're going to serve.

This style of representation involves the representative remaining in business as much as possible, although it has long been recognized that members of Executive Council have a full-time commitment at the government level. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, we can devise legislation that will have provisions in it to allow this particular approach, because here the emphasis is on practical experience and on learning about government service to people through ongoing contact, not just in the constituency context in our role as M.L.As but also in working, living, and participating in the activities of the constituency. You're an elected person as long as the people so choose and as long as you feel you have a contribution to make and can expect to return to private life on reasonable terms. Certainly with this particular style of representation, there also has to be consideration of a code of ethics and conduct.

There are phrases in this particular Bill — but I remind the House that those same phrases are in our current regulations — that refer to topics that have to be dealt with. There has to be disclosure of certain types of interests. There has to be some way of addressing cases that come up where it is quite clear that a person is using his office for his own self-interest. But I think the thrust of our legislation has to be one of openness, Mr. Speaker, and providing a mechanism whereby people that are concerned can have the matter brought forward and redressed, not an approach where we add layer upon layer of detail until the person aspiring to office is discouraged.

Both approaches have their merits in the ideal sense. However, Mr. Speaker, the second philosophy is the one that I think is most favored in this province. Therefore I feel we have to look at legislation and a code of ethics and conduct in this context. Certainly the second approach can be taken to its extreme. I know that years ago in different elected Houses, there was the extreme of this where the House may have sat for three or four weeks a year. People had a place to hang their hat and a bench to sit on, and after duly considering the recommendations from the civil service on both administrative matters and policy, they went home again. Certainly we have to go beyond that, but I still think there is a need for that particular approach.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

I acknowledge that Bill 206 is trying to pursue a good ideal, in that there's an attempt to combat some of the cynicism which I've said exists, although I don't think that is the main problem. Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, I

think it is well and good that we review these matters. It is certainly part of our responsibility. The public wants to see us review these things from time to time. Perhaps a review of the Legislative Assembly Act may be possible down the road.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is my view that Albertans want their representatives to have some freedom to keep active conduct with the world of business and occupations, provided they are not shown to be using their elected position selfishly. Of course a process that allows the public to deal with this problem needs to be in place. Mr. Speaker, I'd support a review of the legislation when we have time to reflect upon this, although I do not regard this as any emergency. Perhaps we can look at a totally new approach to the particular issue dealt with in this Bill.

I personally look forward to tackling what I consider the greater issue when it comes to serving in this House, and that is putting into legislation a document which might have a preamble on it stating how important it is to get the best possible people into the Assembly; a Bill which has as its thrust provision to allow businessmen and professional people to serve here with as few encumbrances as possible so they can relax and do the job here and also work at their occupation, their profession, or their business if that is still necessary. Certainly there will also have to be protections.

That is my view on this particular Bill, Mr. Speaker. I have to conclude by saying that I do not support its specifics, although it is certainly a good and timely topic to debate.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words to the debate on Bill No. 206 this afternoon. It's been argued that Bill 206 could promote public confidence in the integrity of public officials. I suggest that this is not necessarily the case, because much scepticism exists generally. I believe that scepticism often is created by media reports, even by opposition members, and by people that like to make news out of events that don't necessarily have much basis or much data to back up anything that could be considered a wrongdoing. If a public official was charged under this Act, if it received passage, his or her reputation or credibility could be damaged even though that person were found to be innocent of a misdoing.

Thirdly, if a public official was in a conflict-of-interest situation, the existing guidelines and statutes allow for a quick dismissal rather than a long court battle. In the case of an elected person, there is also provision for dismissal. The major portions of the Bill are already contained in existing statutes such as the Legislative Assembly Act and the Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act, as well as in guidelines that have been set out in ministerial statements by the Premier of this province.

Looking at the Bill itself, with the three sections it includes, in my opinion conflict of interest is far more clearly set out in our existing legislation. I have little quarrel with the second section on public disclosure. Members of Executive Council already make public disclosures and update those disclosures. And as the work and the responsibilities of members of the Legislative Assembly have grown to become, for many constituencies at least, nearly a full-time job, and the amount of committee work and responsibilities we have in carrying out our duties have grown so significantly, I think it's reasonable and fair that the public of this province could

expect that we disclose our financial assets and that those be kept updated. I have no problem in supporting that aspect of the Bill.

It's the third section, the employment following public office, that gives me some difficulty. With that section, I find that I have the greatest amount of difficulty understanding how this type of legislation could apply in any possible, practical sense. If we look at the aspects of the Bill, section 9, for example,

No Minister, executive staff member or head of a Crown Corporation shall, for a period of four years following his employment in that capacity . . . accept a directorship of a company . . . act . . . on behalf of [a] person in connection with any specific proceeding . . . lobby on behalf . . .

Secondly, in section 10,

. . . accept employment with a person with whom he had significant direct official dealings during the last year of his employment.

This could, in effect, preclude the Minister of Education, if he happened to be a teacher, from seeking any employment in an educational facility in the province, because obviously that person would have had some dealings with persons that would be prospective employers; or the Minister of Advanced Education returning to any postsecondary institution, university, or public college anywhere in this province, because those responsibilities would have included a close relationship with those prospective employers. The intention may be to put individuals into a period of non-employment for two years, where there is little alternative but perhaps to set up a public pension that would look after the needs of those persons for a two-year period.

If the members think it is absurd to draw those types of parallels, I think we just have to look at the interpretation of what's happened in the Municipal Government Act, in the section that alludes to direct and indirect conflict of interest for municipal councillors. There was a case where a municipal councillor was removed from his office by the courts — an action taken by the resident of a community within Alberta — for having voted on an issue that came to council. That issue seemed to be an extremely insignificant decision at the time. The decision related to access to a shopping centre. The councillor happened to own a business, which was a dry-cleaning plant, within that shopping centre. And because he'd voted on improving the access from the roadway into the shopping centre, that individual was taken to court and removed from responsibilities as a municipal councillor. At the time, I'm sure that person did not conceive that he would be in any conflict-of-interest situation and, if he had thought so, would have declared his interest and not voted.

That of course exists within this Assembly. Each of us, no matter how much of a disclosure, in our own consciences have to decide when interests come up that relate to us or to the involvement of our families. We have to make the decision as to whether we have any particular interest. So it's not simply the disclosure of the value of the assets we own; it's also the memberships in an organization or the associations we have within those organizations that may have some benefit to us as individuals and are not just related to the assets we own. The mover of this Bill would have to agree that there could be such broad implications of any application of legislation that it would be absurd to even consider passage of such a Bill. For that reason, I would encourage all members of the Assembly not to support the Bill. But certainly that does

not mean we do not support the very deep concern all of us as members have about conflict, and the responsibilities we have as elected people within the province of Alberta.

MR. ALGER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the hour, I won't be very long. I have just a couple of words to add to the subject addressed. The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood said that politics should be the most honorable position there is, and I couldn't agree more — right from the community level to our federal system.

I couldn't help but think, though, that it's a difficult thing to get as many excellent people into this House as we require without some of us holding another job of some kind. The [restrictions] in this particular Bill are awfully difficult to live with, in my estimation. In short, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the salary of an MLA isn't commensurate with the times. And part-time MLAs, as we're known, unless retired and semiwealthy, are almost forced to run another business or hold down another job. Now he didn't indicate that we can't do that, but it does make it pretty awkward from some of the portions of the Bill.

Without re quoting or repeating any of the codes we've already heard, I'd like to suggest that our guidelines as members of the Legislative Assembly are already more than adequate. The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood indicated that Bill 206 may not be presented exactly the way he would have had us approve. I think that through the severity of the restrictions, I'd be inclined to research the question far more avidly, if indeed it is required at all. It seems to me that the present code of ethics related to Members of the Legislative Assembly is more than explicit without further regulations. Good common sense should dictate our attitudes toward these incredibly important positions. I urge my colleagues to vote against Bill No. 206.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, in view of the hour, I move to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, before moving to call it 5:30, I should advise members of the Assembly that this evening in Committee of Supply it is proposed to deal with the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, followed by Culture. In the event that the votes go by quickly, the next order might include Recreation and Parks, and Transportation. I advise as well that the business for tomorrow would be to consider government Bill No. 26, relating to widows' and widowers' pensions.

Mr. Speaker, I move that we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned until this evening at ... Are we going to be in Committee of Supply?

MR. HORSMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Apparently we are going to be in Committee of Supply this evening. Do members agree

that when they reassemble at eight o'clock, they will be in Committee of Supply?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned until the Committee of Supply rises and reports.

[The House recessed at 5:28 p.m.]

[The Committee of Supply met at 8 p.m.]

#### head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will the Committee of Supply please come to order.

#### Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has the minister any opening comments?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the fact that I think we have a few members who want to look at some event that I understand is on television tonight ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The score is 2 to 0.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Our House leader is being very generous.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that I'd like to make a few comments, being a new minister, not only with a department that was fairly foreign to the kind of experience I had but becoming a minister for the first time. I think it is important that those of us in that position make some observations.

The department estimates are very straightforward. If you look at the bottom line, I think you'll see a slight decrease in budget, thanks to a very capable staff throughout the province, from our headquarters in Edmonton to the six regional offices and two suboffices. I believe that staff has literally performed miracles in terms of offering a very excellent service, a service that's rendered to people right on the spot and offered in a way that has allowed some efficiencies and therefore a slight decrease in budget.

While the budget is very straightforward, the kind of philosophy and the types of things under the various regulatory aspects are not necessarily so, especially in a year when we have had some institutions with financial problems. Of course, when you have a regulatory department, you find yourself interfacing with those people, those unfortunate companies that might find themselves in that position.

It's important to note that while we have some very excellent legislation in place — there are some 34 or 35 pieces of legislation under the umbrella of this department — I think there are some areas that could be looked at very seriously. In terms of information that has crossed my desk and come to me personally by way of telephone

calls and written submissions, I have found what seems to be a mix-up in terminology in the investment community, whereby we have people who believe they are making deposits in certain institutions in this province when, under the type of legislation we have, they are actually making an investment.

Notwithstanding the fact we try very hard to communicate that difference through the various agencies we have and through the Securities Commission, unfortunately that message hasn't come through. It has probably been added to and embellished by the fact that there are other provinces and the federal government whose legislation differs from ours. In this province, we have financial institutions that are regulated in one fashion under the federal government, and what appears to be almost a similar financial institution only slightly regulated by us is doing business in a completely different manner; hence some of the problems in terms of the misunderstanding, if you will, by those people who believe that they are embarking on a deposit as opposed to an investment.

The market place is key to the kinds of things that are especially involved in our operation, something like the Unfair Trade Practices Act that is administered by the department. Mr. Chairman, I suppose it's important to note that our philosophy is that while we would like to protect the consumers to some degree, we don't want them to become cripples. Therefore our philosophy has been to provide information to people and, hopefully, put the consumers in a position where they can make a good, sound judgment about how they spend their money.

Two interesting new additions to the department this year are the responsibilities for lotteries and for Class A fairs. After the House is out, I'm very much looking forward to meeting with the Class A fairs across the province. By looking at the budget, you can see that they receive a very large number of dollars, particularly those who have pari-mutuels as part of their fair. You can see by the grants and operating capital that there are a lot of dollars flowing, particularly into the smaller communities in this province, as well as the two major centres of Edmonton and Calgary.

Lotteries have certainly generated a fair amount of interest. I think most people are aware that the overall contractual obligation we have with the different groups out there who have been receiving funding from lotteries will be up a year from now. I know that many of the MLAs in this Assembly have been receiving submissions from their constituents, in terms of suggesting that alternate programs should be considered for lottery funding.

Mr. Chairman, when the Legislature adjourns some time late in the spring or in early summer, with the assistance of my colleagues I will also undertake a review of the disbursement of those funds and the overall running of the lotteries. I hasten to add that certainly there has been no question in terms of the way the lotteries have been managed in this province by the Alberta lottery foundation. But I believe it is important to review arrangements from time to time, to make sure we have the very best arrangement possible. Because after all, when expending those dollars on various games in this province, the citizens believe that the moneys that are profit are being used for a good purpose. We should make sure that the profits are maximized to the greatest extent.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further overall comments. I'd be pleased to answer any questions.

MR. NOTLEY: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to congratulate the new minister in taking her estimates

through the committee in her first year as Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

There are several points I'd like to make during initial discussion, and pose some questions as well. I missed the first several minutes of the minister's initial comments, so I apologize if she covered this. But I'd like to raise the issue of the protection of people who invest in trust companies, particularly Fidelity Trust. It seems to me that what we have at the moment — and I caught just a few sentences of the minister's remarks. I realize it is a confusing area. We have federal jurisdiction, provincial jurisdiction, and different incorporation in different provinces. It seems to me that if there are any concerns at all about a major trust company, our concern as Alberta legislators must be that Albertans who have invested in good faith in any of these trust companies can be satisfied that their investments are safe. I think one has to be concerned about the shareholders; no question about that. But I am particularly interested in the protection of those people who have taken some of their savings and shifted them into trust company deposits of one kind or another. I would not want to get into the situation where we found that there was a collapse and that people, particularly some of the people who struggled all their lives to save a few dollars and invested in good faith, have those savings whisked away.

Mr. Chairman, as members of the Assembly between 1971 and 1975 will recall, this is not an academic question. Members in that particular Legislature will note the major debate that occurred in 1973 and 1974 over the affairs of the Cosmopolitan Life Insurance Company, the difficulties that company encountered, and the very substantial losses of individuals who had invested in good faith in Cosmopolitan. I remember raising that issue and having all kinds of members stand up, huffing and puffing, and say: what are you raising that issue for? We ended up having an inquiry. The consequence of the inquiry was that charges were laid and people actually went to prison as a result of it. I'm not suggesting that that's the situation in any of the examples which have been raised in the last few months. But I raise the issue because it seems to me that the protection between the two levels of government of people who have invested in good faith is one of the areas that we in this Legislature have to hold the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs responsible for answering on a continuing basis.

That being the case, in discussion of the estimates I'd like the minister to bring us up to date on what steps the department has taken to evaluate the question of the affairs of one of the major trust companies, Fidelity Trust in particular — where things are at in that matter, what consultation there has been with federal authorities, what consultation there has been with the provincial authorities in the province of Ontario, and what kind of protection the minister can advise at this stage for individuals who have invested money with that particular trust company.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that it's a little bit of a hot potato because of the internal competition that faces our friends across the way, at least as it relates to their federal interests. But we're not here to discuss federal political interests; we're here to discuss what steps this government is taking to assure the position of Albertans, not only on matters within provincial jurisdiction but on the position of Albertans who have invested in good faith. So I would like the minister to take a few moments to discuss that issue tonight.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, we have of course decided to

eliminate any form of rent control in this province. That's another issue. I could raise it tonight. I think there are probably other times in the Assembly when the debate of rent control would be appropriate. If members want to debate rent control tonight — I see some interest back there — we'll debate it tonight; that's fine. I am certainly interested and well prepared to debate rent control.

However, because we had all kinds of members calling for the question no sooner had the minister made her initial comments, assuming there is not a tremendous amount of underlying interest in a three- or four-hour debate on rent control, I would then put to the minister: what kind of monitoring of rentals is there going to be by the department, given the new shelter allowance program of the Department of Social Services and Community Health?

It seems to me that if you are going to modify the shelter allowance program, it's fine to stand up, as the minister has, and say: well, it's our view that the rental situation has changed; there is now a higher vacancy rate. We all admit that, but I think we as members of the House have to have the assurance as to whether or not that change in the vacancy rate is not just raw figures but is translated into some clear idea of the opportunities for people to be able to find alternative accommodations.

What kind of monitoring procedures do we as a province have? We all know that CMHC keeps statistics. But I'm asking if the position of the province at the moment is that we will rely on the periodic information made available by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. What provision do we have for independent evaluation of the market for rental accommodations in this province? As I travel the province, I realize that there are some areas where rents in fact are coming down. That would not be true of every community, as the minister would know. It would be true in some communities, but not in every community.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that before we get to the estimates of the Minister of Social Services and Community Health — which I have a sneaking suspicion will take a good deal longer than the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs'. Nevertheless, before we get to those estimates, which I must confess I'm looking forward to with some degree of anticipation, I would like the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to outline what the department is doing in this particular area to make sure that her hon. colleague has adequate information on which to make the decisions of that particular department.

Mr. Chairman, I note that several other changes have been made. The minister observed that the Class A fairs now come under the jurisdiction of the department. I think that's fine, but what we have to look at in this province is not just the major exhibitions but the way in which we are going to foster and encourage smaller fairs. I wonder just what the strategy is in terms of the realignment, if you like, of the Class A fairs to the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

There may be other questions I will have during the course of the evening. But I conclude my remarks by saying to the minister and members of the committee that at a time when we are asking people to exercise some restraint in their demands — we've got a provincial government which is proposing major changes to labor legislation and complaining bitterly about arbitration awards — it seems to me that at the very minimum, the trade-off must be that we are going to make sure, and not just make sure in a hands-off sense, assuming that every-

thing is going to be looked after by the market place, but through the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs we must be vigilant in protecting the rights of the consumer. And I note that "consumer" comes before "corporate".

I realize that some of the areas where I think there have been some obvious consumer abuses don't come under the purview of the hon. minister. For example, when we get to the Attorney General we'll be dealing with the role, function, and operation of the Public Utilities Board, because it seems to me that is one area where there is glaring inconsistency. I'm not asking that the minister to be held accountable for that tonight, but I am asking for a statement from the government of Alberta as to the role this government sees in protecting the rights of the consumer and being an arm of the consumer, if you like, at a time when we are asking working people to tighten their belts. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that that sort of trade-off is one of the things that is at least reasonable to expect. At a time of rising expectations, at a time when there are huge average increases in wages right across the province, it may well be that one could say: let the buyer beware; let the market place work.

But at a time when we as a province are considering legislation which will restrict the ability of local levels of government to provide increases — we now have school boards in this province saying across-the-board: zero increase is the offer. If that is the situation people who have to deal with their employees find themselves in as a result of decisions made by this Legislature, then it seems to me that we have a very high obligation indeed to ensure that there are no rip-offs in the market place. Where there is any evidence at all that the market place is not working properly or that boards which are set up to protect the consumer are perhaps a little lax in the way they are administering the rules at this time of restraint and belt tightening, then it seems to me we have a right to ask: in the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, do we have a champion of the consumer? I leave that with the minister and invite her response.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I too haven't had the opportunity to publicly congratulate the minister on her appointment, and I feel I should do so. The minister and I spent a number of years in very close quarters in room 512. We called each other cell mates for a while. It actually was a fairly intimate relationship [interjections] inasmuch as the walls in the office were so thin that we could share each others' telephone conversations immediately. The cell the minister is now occupying is somewhat enlarged from those days, and I congratulate her on the appointment.

I'd also like to say that over the years I've been very impressed with the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs' operations, specifically with respect to counselling. Many years ago, I produced a radio program which dedicated one of its shows to consumer affairs once every three weeks. We had excellent co-operation from the department then. I worked with them in the programs they dealt with and, since I've become a member of this Assembly, I've had an opportunity to continue to work with the office in Calgary. It has some excellent people and excellent operations, and I know the minister is continuing to enhance and improve those all the time.

I have two items tonight, though, that I'd like the minister to take a look at in her responsibilities. One of them I championed for a couple of years in the Assembly, when the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs was in the

portfolio we're now discussing, and that's the move of the Securities Commission to Calgary. I recognize that coming from Calgary, that sounds like a vested interest and has for a number of years, but I honestly and sincerely believe that that move makes a lot of sense. It's Calgary where the stock market is, and it's Calgary where I understand the majority of the work from the commission is actually done. I know a report recommended that move some years ago, and the report came from the person who was chairman of the commission at that time. So I'd like the minister to take another look at that possibility in the future.

The other item I'd like the minister to consider is some sort of investigation into retail food marketing in the province of Alberta. For some years, it's been a concern to me that one particular large chain has over 60 per cent of the market share in the province. I believe that figure is accurate. It's considerably larger than that in Edmonton and a little less in Calgary, but a very large market share

MR. NOTLEY: You've got the Co-op in Calgary, Dennis.

MR. ANDERSON: It isn't the Co-op I'm talking about.

The market share is the largest held anywhere in North America, according to my research. I'd like to find out whether or not that's affecting consumer choice, whether it's affecting prices and, indeed, whether it's affecting the long-term good of that particular industry.

I raise it a lot because when I was first elected to the Assembly, the company of which I'm speaking had been charged a bit earlier by the federal government. They'd attempted to curtail its activity and, as such, the company bought up land that it didn't utilize. One of those was in my constituency — that lease on land where there could not be a food store because it sat empty, and they hoped to have their consumers move on to another place. There was a great deal of difficulty for many citizens in the area, mostly senior citizens and low-income individuals, who had to go a long way to purchase their goods and who couldn't have a store located there, even though several were interested. It was only after some persistence on my part to the manager of that company, and perhaps some suggestions that I didn't necessarily have the power to follow through with, that they let the lease go. Another company did move in. There's now a food store there, and the citizens of the area are served well. But I'm worried about how often that happens in Alberta because of the large percentage of the market share, and what effect it has generally in this province, since it seems to be unparalleled in North America in that regard. So I'd like to see either the department itself or some body of this committee investigate it.

With those few remarks and those two issues in particular that I'd like to bring to the minister's attention, I would like to say again that especially in this time of economic difficulty, I think it's essential that the department continue its operations of assisting consumers, especially those who get into difficulty, who don't understand the credit system and have misused it, in operating their lives better for the good of not only those individuals but the taxpayer in general.

MR. R. SPEAKER: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to offer my best wishes to the minister and hope for success in her responsibilities in the two to four years ahead, even though in doing that and listening to the

remarks of the minister, possibly some advice is worth while at this point in time. I suggest to the minister that one of the very important things is possibly to clearly establish some of the objectives a person should have for a department, whichever it may be — and I believe that would certainly include the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs — not only short-term ones and meeting some of the immediate needs but some type of objective that hopefully can be developed and concluded over a two- to four-year period.

I have observed the growth of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs since its inception in 1974-75. As I observe what happens to any department of government — and I can show this same type of growth rate in any department of this government, but it's only re-emphasized in the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. For example, in 1974-75 we started out with a \$2.5 million budget whereas today, eight years later, we're up to an over \$25 million budget, an over 1,000 per cent increase in expenditures. We talk about the fact that expenditures have gone down .2 per cent. Well, that's insignificant. It really isn't doing anything. We've had such an increase of expenditure over the years in this department that I think it's on its way to another kind of bureaucratic system. I think the minister should, first of all, ask that question: are the people that have been hired by this department most necessary, and are there other departments that are doing the very same thing? I think the relationship to the Department of Tourism and Small Business is one that should be carefully examined.

I've raised in the House before the issue where I've had the staff from the Department of Tourism and Small Business and the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs both trying to help the same client but never talking to each other — didn't realize that either was down the hall from the other in their services. There is a bit of difference in function between the two employees, but certainly very similar. I think what the new minister should do — starting from a clean slate, open to ask all kinds of questions — is review the staff at that regional level and ask that question, and assure herself, number one, that that kind of thing doesn't happen and that maybe somebody else can do the job and you don't need some of the staff. Maybe they are supposedly there, and I think it's incumbent upon a new minister to try to sweep up and pull up the loose ends wherever they may exist. That's the first objective the minister should look at. Are the people doing the job? If we're free enterprisers, that's a very legitimate question to ask. We don't need a bureaucratic system out there intervening with the consumer, the corporate sector, or the private sector.

That leads to my second point with regard to consumers. Certainly there are people who get themselves into difficulties because they don't read the contract they get into. We could take the hard-line position: tough break; that's their own responsibility. But it seems that today we have got to a point where citizens expect some kind of intervention service with regard to their own matters in many affairs. They are not ready to take the consequences, so we've stepped in as government to do it.

I'd examine how far we really go with that kind of . . . We can't catch all those things; people have to take some responsibility as consumers in this province. That's going to be a tough objective to control as a minister, because it's always easy to leap in and say: as a government, we're going to try to compromise, negotiate, or intervene in some way. That's always the easy way. But where a consumer has been mistreated, or where there has been



some act by some person, some good advice can be given in terms of that type of protection.

With regard to the business sector of this province — one of my great concerns over the years — the third objective, as I note from the opening descriptive paragraph of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, is to:

... foster the orderly development of business activity in a marketplace assured of fair standards of commercial endeavour.

That's basically the objective.

I think one of the areas that should be examined very carefully by the minister at this time is the whole area of regulations and the effect of regulations by government on the private sector, and where we can deregulate. The former minister looked at this question, came in with some recommendations in 1981, and brought in eight licensing regulation changes which affected about 8,000 businesses — a good move. I thought that was a very positive step at that time. But that was the end of it. Since then, we've had no further attempts to deregulate or to deal with regulations. That's where it has stood. We look at the only comprehensive study done by this government, back in 1974. As well as I can examine the subject, I don't know of any concrete aggressive steps that were taken to implement or follow up some of the recommendations of that report in 1974. That's number one.

Secondly, as I read the report and look at it, it had a very narrow perspective on regulations and how they affected private industry. It was sort of the application and clarity of regulations — do they do what they're supposed to do? It was more by definition of regulations than looking at regulations in terms of their economic effect on the private sector of this province.

I think that's the bigger and more important dimension that the minister should put into her set of objectives: what regulations are deterrents to economic growth in this province? That might be a more positive move than trying to rush out and find counsellors for business, or whatever, to work out in the market place — to look at what kinds of things government is doing to intervene. Then the private market place will produce jobs, produce dollars, pay taxes, and take its responsibility in the community with the least amount of intervention by government.

Some good research studies have been done with regard to this matter. The economic council of Canada examined economic regulations that occurred since 1978. They found that economic regulation includes regulations intended to influence and modify economic behavior in some significant sense. The council discovered in 1978 that of 500 existing statutes of the Parliament of Canada, some 129 were judged to contain provisions permitting economic regulation. In other words, they were regulating the economic activity of this country. I don't think the government of Canada has acted on it. Unfortunately they've only added more since that time to make the situation even worse.

Our own Alberta Chamber of Commerce made some comments with regard to this when it made a submission to the government's caucus committee on economic affairs, and said: as men and women in government, you have an idea of the cost of carrying out different regulatory processes and of the myriad of bureaucratic empires that grow and grow. But the cost to business to comply with all this excess regulation is even more frightening. Estimates show that for every dollar governments spend regulating, the private sector pays \$20 to comply.

I think the minister should consider and look at that aspect. That's very expensive to the private sector.

This explains part of Canada's dismal economic condition today. Government regulations bring both direct and indirect cost. That's the Alberta Chamber of Commerce saying that.

A third study, or publication, from The Canadian Manufacturers' Association, entitled *Regulatory Reform*, 1980, says this about regulations: one of the major problems of regulation is that its major costs are not borne by the government. The government, through regulation, transfers costs from the public to the private sectors and, ultimately, to the consumer. In a study conducted by the centre for the study of American business, Weidenbaum estimated the private sector's cost in complying with U.S. regulations to be 20 times higher than the costs incurred by government.

Mr. Chairman, I think we in Alberta are no exception to this kind of rule. As a new minister, a person who supports the private sector, who believes that by the production of the private sector we can create greater job opportunity and economic growth — one of the ways is to get government out of the road and deregulate in some other areas. I would say that one project, if taken on with excitement, fervor, and aggressiveness in the next two to three years, would be a mark in the history of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. That takes away from administering the department or worrying about how this large staff that's being accumulated is working from day to day. But it's an objective they must be able to come to grips with. Maybe hiring some people to just pursue that concern of regulations could be a great asset to Albertans as a whole, a very positive one and not a negative one. At the present time, I would say that in terms of the staff, they pursue the negatives out there. Somebody is in trouble every time they come to see the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. This would be a positive objective that could be pursued by the minister, and I would certainly recommend it to her very highly. It's not an easy one, but one that could certainly make a mark in the history of this present session of the Legislature.

The other area I want to comment on is with regard to lottery proceeds. I understand there are going to be some public hearings. I would appreciate it if the minister would comment with regard to those public hearings and what seem to be some of the new objectives. I'm in the wrong department, am I, in that sense? [interjection] All right. But I understand from one of the newsclippings that public hearings are going to be held. So we'll accept that.

Mr. Chairman, one more topic is with regard to metric. This is not directly the responsibility of the minister, but I would think that as the representative in Alberta with regard to that subject and a person that protects the consumer, many Albertans would appreciate the minister taking a very strong stand with Ottawa and making the case well known. Certainly we can only use our influence. We haven't any legislative power with regard to that matter. Maybe the minister could comment on it in terms of her attitude as well.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, it appears we've heard from the so-called left that feels very strongly about consumer protection. We have now had the Chamber of Commerce presentation. I would like to comment under three areas, Mr. Chairman. The minister comes to a portfolio that, in my view, is a well-structured portfolio. All the way from

Mr. Barry Martin, the deputy, down to the people in the southern region, which is the constituency I'm in, I'm very impressed. Over the past number of years I — along with others, I'm sure — have had many occasions to make inquiries, and the response has always been very quick, very factual, and very helpful to me in resolving constituency problems. So I'd like to pass on to the minister my commendations, particularly to those in the southern region. Mr. Kaszuba, who is regional director there, is really helpful to constituents, which of course makes my life easier.

The Member for Calgary Currie mentioned the intimacy with which he viewed the minister in room 512. I think it should be pointed out, in all fairness, that the minister was the party Whip. She was maybe not an iron maiden, but she certainly had an iron hand. All the occasions when we were in 512 were not necessarily pleasant. We were there, let's say, with the relationship of the Whip advising us sometimes of our role in this Assembly. I remember many a time in that huge office of 62 square feet when one wasn't allowed to smoke.

Mr. Chairman, my comments really fall into five areas. First, I don't think we should forget for one moment that the role of the department is essentially consumer protection, although clearly, as mentioned by the Member for Little Bow, it seems to have an impeding effect on other areas. The question that comes to mind, for example, is that with the conservation programs in place in Canada, we're making almost airtight homes. In question period today points were raised about urea formaldehyde. For some reason, people are very concerned about the insulation. In my experience in asking questions, the furniture and cabinets today in those homes have three to four times as high the degree of urea formaldehyde in terms of content. I think that's an item for the province and not Ottawa to be concerned about for our citizens. I'd be interested in the minister's comments. Maybe the minister responsible for the building code is the person who should be involved. But in terms of consumer protection, who do they turn to? I think we trained them to turn to government for answers. Whether that's right or wrong — it would be at odds with the Member for Little Bow, I know, but I think people expect that.

Of the campaigns that Consumer Affairs has been running — and they've been running many — the one that comes to mind, Mr. Chairman, is Before You Go Under, one of the most successful consumer information programs in North America. Even the Leader of the Opposition agrees with me. It's a very positive program. I happen to think it's the fault of our school system that it's come about. I frankly don't care who does it, but if we cannot get the message to young Albertans to learn how to manage their affairs, particularly financially, early in life, we're going to end up with a Minister of Social Services and Community Health inheriting a problem. We continually get demands about our not doing enough for other people. Yet people gladly go to Sears, the Bay, and the rest of them, pay 29 per cent interest, and don't even blink an eye about it. The minister's program of Before You Go Under with regard to consumer counselling is, I think, very important and very welcome and helpful to young Albertans.

There is a concern, Mr. Chairman, touched on by the Member for Little Bow, and I think it's a valid one. I as a member continue to hear it. That's a duplication of services between Ottawa and Alberta. I think there is some degree of overlap. Frankly, I feel sorry for those who fall through the cracks, because as we know, there are people

who fall through the cracks. We get Americans coming into southern Alberta — which seems to be the movie-making capital of this province — running up horrendous bills, walking out and not paying their bills, and for some reason there is no protection. There's a licensing requirement, yet God help you if you are born in Lethbridge and want to sell — I don't want to say Amway — Fuller Brush. If you want to sell Fuller Brush, you get a peddler licence, you get this licence and that licence, you get another licence. I often wonder if we're really protecting Albertans to the degree we think we are if we rely on the federal and the provincial. We get cases of overlap and duplication. In other words, in my view there are big cracks. Perhaps I'm wrong.

Lotteries have been touched on, and I'm most encouraged by the minister's comments that she's prepared to look at the distribution of lottery proceeds. I think they are running around \$15 million a year. When you take the cream off the top, about \$11 million is left. I don't object to Edmonton and Calgary getting the lion's share. Heaven knows, they get the lion's share of everything else. [interjections]

MR. NOTLEY: You're right, John. Hang in there.

MR. GOGO: I think Culture getting 20 per cent is a good thing, and Recreation and Parks; there's no question. One only has to drive through this province or read the annual report tabled today as to the activity of Recreation and Parks for Albertans around this province. You simply look at the number of people using our parks; no question it's well spent.

But what about amateur sports? Clearly we have a choice to make as members of this Assembly. Do we want to pay \$88 a day in jails? That's a question we have to face, because I think that through a meaningful contribution to amateur sports we can avoid a lot of that. I'm very encouraged by the minister's response in question period that she's prepared to look at it. Mr. Chairman, I view that as a breakthrough. The Minister of Culture has gone a long way towards assisting in that area. However, there's much more to be done, and I don't think a little thin dime on the dollar or 10 per cent of those proceeds spread across Alberta on a per capita basis to our constituencies for amateur sports — I can't think of a better prevention device in terms of education to compliment the volunteer than that. I'm pleased to see the front bench of this government nodding in agreement right across.

MR. NOTLEY: Now let's see some action.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the new game 6/49, I think projected revenues after they pay for those machines is \$5 million to \$10 million to \$15 million a year. It may look insignificant when we look at the Attorney General's department and some \$200 million in gaming. It may look insignificant, but it's not. The difference between the Gaming Commission is that government doesn't receive those dollars; the agencies that run them receive them. But clearly, lottery proceeds should be reviewed with the view, as I say, to amateur sports.

Secondly, I appreciate the Member for Calgary Currie wanting the Securities Commission in Calgary. I understand that. You know, they've got an AGT tower and we've got to sort of balance ... I'd be happy in Lethbridge if we could get a land titles office down there, even a branch of one. I can understand that many years ago when things were manual you couldn't do it, but I really

don't think that in this day and age of technology we shouldn't have one. B.C. has eight; Saskatchewan has eight. I don't really want to embarrass the Attorney General — I know I've attempted it many times — but I'd be prepared to let Calgary have the Securities Commission if we can get just one branch of land titles.

Mr. Chairman, regarding the Securities Commission, I wonder if the minister would comment on the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation. There's been public comment, I think, that protection should go from \$20,000 to \$60,000. As members know, Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation is a premium paid by all depositories across Canada that are chartered to protect the depositor.

I think we should clearly delineate between the depositor and the investor. Reference was made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition with regard to Cosmopolitan Life. I frankly am comfortable that those that take the risk in terms of investment should bear their own responsibility. Heaven knows we spent, I think, almost \$2 million of this government investigating Abacus Cities, and they were for investors not depositors. I questioned at that time and I question now whether we as a government should be worrying about investors, particularly when those investments are made primarily for and for no other reason than income tax. I don't feel too badly for those people. But when we get to areas like we saw here with Security Trust of 10 or 12 years ago, depositors who for one reason or another changed deposits to purchase preferred shares and so on — members of this committee are familiar with that — I clearly delineate between depositor protection and investor protection.

In the area of automobile insurance and the Automobile Insurance Board, Mr. Chairman, committee members are aware there is a decision outstanding now — by order in council or regulation, which I assume requires an order in council — that has a self-destruct mechanism at New Year's Eve regarding the Human Rights Commission. Contrary to the Human Rights Commission, we've allowed the insurance companies to charge different premiums for male and female. That self destructs on New Year's Eve. I would like the minister to indicate if we are going to continue with that for a further period of time or if, in fact, we're going to abide by the Human Rights Commission. I'm not saying I agree with it. That's not the point. The point is, what are we going to do? I think the members of the committee would be interested to hear that, in case there's not another opportunity during the spring sittings.

Mr. Chairman, there is a practice in Alberta now — one I don't agree with — that when people get speeding tickets, particularly those under 25 realize a \$50, \$100, or \$200 increase in their premium. I have some trouble accepting that because they get a speeding ticket, which is a violation of a provincial law, people have their insurance premium go up. If the insurance industry is going to charge that fee, theoretically it's to protect the public, and I think it should go to government and not an insurance company. I think there's quite a high degree of that going on now in this province. If we're going to assess these people extra money for that, I think the state should have the money.

I want to be fair to the minister, Mr. Chairman. I'll pose these questions. I don't necessarily want answers now. If I don't raise them in committee, perhaps I won't have another opportunity. I can well understand if it's some time before there's a response.

The last two comments, Mr. Chairman. I think we've been fortunate in Alberta to have the Landlord and

Tenant Advisory Board throughout the province. I think of Edmonton in particular, which in my view has done so much — certainly in the constituency of Edmonton Centre — to assist people who have had difficulties over the past few years. It's interesting to note that the Member for Little Bow talks about the escalating budget. Yet if you look on page 69, the minister's budget is \$25 million; in '81-82, it was \$35 million. I was going to congratulate the minister for reducing the budget. There's the difference between the left and the right wings. The Member for Spirit River-Fairview thinks we should spend a lot more; the Member for Little Bow thinks we're spending too much. In actual fact, the minister has only been in the portfolio for three or four months and already it's down \$10 million. I think that's commendable.

Mr. Chairman, the minister's involvement with exhibitions and fairs: I don't know where the break line is; I don't know whether it's Edmonton, Calgary, Lethbridge, Red Deer, et cetera. Perhaps the minister in summing up could indicate the area of responsibility with regard to those. I think there's a division, if I'm not mistaken. The Minister of Agriculture has the responsibility for some and the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs for others.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I think that incorporations of businesses are still running at over 1,000 a month. I don't know what they are, but I do know that in the Lethbridge region alone, anybody who wants to incorporate a business can walk in there and within three or four minutes find out if the name is acceptable, i.e. is it already registered. I think that's tremendous service. You know, for other parts of Alberta — and we generally refer to anything except Calgary and Edmonton as other parts of Alberta — I think that's a remarkable service to provide for our citizens. Although those offices appear to be growing — and I agree in part with the Member for Little Bow; they seem to be increasing — I hope, Mr. Chairman, that they increase primarily to protect the consumer of this province and, secondly, to assist the growth of small business throughout the province.

So I congratulate the minister for assuming the portfolio. I just know she's going to do a good job, and I look forward to some of the responses. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: For the hockey fans of the committee, the score is now 2 to 1 for Edmonton.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I too would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the minister on her new portfolio. I'm extremely pleased to hear that the minister is reviewing the apportionment of the lotteries, because I've had a number of representations from communities in my constituency about this.

But the point I'd like to raise with the minister tonight is consumer education. As jobs become scarcer, and maybe not as lucrative as before, many young people find themselves not knowing how to budget or where to turn. Consumer protection is education. In our high schools, we're probably not teaching consumer education enough. I think that's the fault of our schools, because we tend not to bring in experts. We tend to use the people within the system, and often the use of outside experts would be of great assistance, I think, to the pupils in those high schools.

The Member for Lethbridge West raised the point on the cost of borrowing. I believe that when our students go out of the school system, they should know how to budget and what the cost of borrowing is. I hope the

minister will talk with her counterpart in Education and raise that point.

It would appear that more and more consumers today are bombarded in the grocery stores by highly-processed instant foods. I guess the reason I'm up here tonight is that I came out of a food store last weekend, and the lady ahead of me had \$14 worth of items. There wasn't a food item among them, other than one quart of milk. It was cigarettes, pet food, whatever else, and I'm not sure that the quart of milk wasn't also pet food. It just seems to me that we're talking about the cost of food and you buy everything under the sun in a grocery store, from soap and detergent to toothpaste and pet food.

But I think the real problem is in the cost of processing. It's built in, in the food stores today, and you see far more processed food than you do basics. I've had occasion to talk to people in the lower income levels. The unemployed and social service recipients phone me, and they say food costs are too high. But they're talking about processed food.

Food preparation is interesting and challenging. Having been a housewife for many years, I thoroughly enjoy cooking. But if you don't have the basics, it's pretty difficult to go out to a store and purchase the basics and cook. What I'm suggesting is that basic cooking is far less expensive and far more nutritious and delicious than prepared instant foods.

I believe there's an opportunity to provide consumer education, maybe through courses. We've got lots of home economists out there. Possibly the minister could work with the Department of Agriculture and encourage more courses. Senior citizens might be encouraged to participate and to share their skills. They certainly have learned how to stretch the pennies and, for the most part, any I've seen are excellent cooks. They have vast experience in using the less expensive cuts of meat and are experts in basic cooking. I'd like to encourage the minister to think about this and possibly look at developing consumer education courses.

I'm particularly interested in single-parent families. This might involve providing child care service in order to allow a mother to take a course. I hope the minister can look at this activity as being worth while and will investigate the possibility.

I guess I have the same concerns as the other members about expanding the portfolio. But I know she's resourceful enough to do it without bringing in new programs, and can re-evaluate the ones that are there and maybe provide a much needed service in consumer education.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. KOWALSKI: One of the advantages about being fourth, fifth, or sixth in the list of individuals who have attracted the attention of the chairman is that your other colleagues in the House have had an opportunity to raise some of the issues you wanted to raise. In this regard, that's so very true. So I'm going to be very short in some of my comments. [some applause] I appreciate the general support of the House in that regard.

It's unfortunate the Member for Little Bow — he's just on his way out — is leaving. I want to amplify some of the points he made. It's not often that I agree with some of the comments the Member for Little Bow raises, but this evening he raised several which I think are very important. In raising them, I think he also provided some advice to the new Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, particularly the comments with regard to deregulation are very important. What we need at this juncture

in the history of Alberta is in fact a complete, all-out war by the various members of the Executive Council and this Assembly on this whole question of deregulation. I certainly encourage the new Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to spearhead the task through her department. I would ask that her colleagues in Executive Council take up the new objective and go with all vim and vigor to do all that we can to eliminate a lot of the needless bureaucracy and red tape that has existed, to a lesser degree in recent years. But I think we've got a long way more to go in that case.

The second point I think is important to amplify once again is the whole question of metrification, although there appears to have been a decrease in the intensity of it in recent months in this province. I know that it exists primarily at the federal level, and it's a situation and a system that's been imposed on all Canadians without having given Canadians an opportunity to have expressed their views through their elected officials in the House of Commons. But I think it's a point that has to be amplified again and again and again. Consumers need some assistance and help from some of the spokesmen they have elected. This one question of metrification — or metrification or whatever phraseology one wishes to use — has put on the consumer, the market place, in the province of Alberta a new cost that certainly a decade ago they would not have envisaged. It has seen an increase in the cost of living. Whether we can forestall the complete objectives that some of our fellow Canadians in Ottawa are attempting to pursue may be debatable at this point. But I would certainly encourage the minister not to hesitate in embarking and using her best effort to do whatever we can to either eliminate that very, very ill-suited objective or to forestall its complete implementation in our province.

I have to disagree with my colleague from Drayton Valley, who raised some concerns with respect to consumer education. She basically put the fault on the school system. I would like to humbly suggest to the Member for Drayton Valley that the fault rests not with the school system and not with our educators, but clearly on the shoulders of all of us in this province who are parents. I think we have an ultimate responsibility, beginning right at home from the earliest years when our children first see their nickels, dimes, and quarters, to teach them money management as best we can and not to forget to spend that extra few minutes or hours a week to encourage them to really understand.

I'm a former teacher and at one time taught consumer education. As far as I was concerned, it was an absolute waste of my time and the time of the taxpayers of this province, because I was being asked to assume a responsibility that in my view could best have been handled in the home by parents.

I'd like to give all members a little example. Currently, I am going through the educational process with a son who is four and a half years old. A couple of months ago, when we went down to one little food store, he convinced me to buy him a hockey sticker book. It cost me 25 cents. However, the real connection is that you have to have 265 hockey stickers to put in the 25-cent book, and the stickers sell five for 20 cents, or equate to 4 cents per sticker. My son is only four and a half years old, but he wanted to complete his collection. So we started off by putting him on a merit award system where he would get a couple of packages of stickers per week. Well, we weren't getting very many stickers, because that only brought us 10 stickers per week. We've escalated that acquisition program

to about \$2 worth of stickers per week, and he's now developed a surplus of stickers. They're duplicates. So he's now got his trader stickers, and I'm now up to \$22, \$23, or \$24 in this little investment.

He has some buddies who are a little older than he is. They're six and half to seven. They're also into it, and of course they have surplus trader stickers too. Last weekend I went home, and he very proudly showed me that he had traded some stickers with some of his buddies down the street. I asked him how he did it. He said: well, I gave — his young friend — him 30. I said: how many did you get? He said: well, I got three. He was very proud. Now I have more of a responsibility. I have to spend more time with him this weekend and suggest to him that a 10-for-one trade is not very good.

I raise that as an example, not that I'm a poor father or a poor parent, just to point out that I have to begin consumer education right at home, and I have to work a little harder. And that's not going to be the fault of the school system if my little son, when he's in grade 1, continues to get bamboozled by some of the faster talkers in the neighborhood, who might be eight or nine. I raise that again, just as an example, to point out that the real importance in consumer education has to begin at home. We as parents cannot delegate that responsibility to the school system.

A couple of comments to the minister with respect to lotteries. I have to take exception with my good friend from Lethbridge West who said he does not begrudge the fact that of the lottery system, and the lottery distribution of funds in the province, 30 per cent goes to Calgary, 30 per cent to Edmonton, 20 per cent to Culture, 20 per cent to Recreation. I am not happy with that proportionate distribution. I don't think anybody in rural Alberta can be happy with that. When the minister looks at the whole question of lotteries and policies with respect to lotteries, I think that distribution of 30 per cent to the Calgary exhibition association, 30 per cent to the Edmonton Exhibition Association, 20 per cent to Culture, and 20 per cent to Recreation has to be corrected, modified, and changed, so that in fact there is a more equitable and fair distribution of these lottery funds to the good people of rural Alberta.

I'd like the minister to bring us up to date on what the expected revenue level is from the new lottery 6/49. Our good colleague from Lethbridge West gave us a ballpark figure of what the anticipated figures would be — between \$5 million and \$15 million. Perhaps the minister is in a position to give us a little more concrete figure and, in giving us the answer to that, tell us how she anticipates that the distribution of those revenues and those funds will be apportioned to all the people of Alberta. If it's a 30/30, 20/20 per cent distribution, then I think we have to rethink it and work a little harder on that to ensure that all the good people of Alberta have equal access and opportunity to those particular funds.

Second last, I'd like the minister to bring us up to date on her new campaign and new policy that she announced in her Christmas message, 1982, to all the people of Alberta, when she encouraged them to go out and spend. She said that, if anything, she would wish to all the good people of Alberta in her Christmas message that they in fact would go out and get the economy of Alberta working again, and perhaps one responsibility we all had was to go out and acquire. I was fascinated with that Christmas message and that new policy direction of the minister for 1983. Perhaps she might like to bring us up to date on how she sees her direction to all of us working,

if she's disappointed in any area in any regard, and how she might be looking at perhaps enhancing or modifying her directive to all of us in the ensuing months.

I want to close, Mr. Chairman, by complimenting the new Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. She's an aggressive and dynamic person. She brings a good background to the office. I think she will be a very good Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs because she will have empathy. She has one little weakness that I think has to be addressed, because this is the first year of her term of office. From time to time she tends to be a bit stubborn and hard headed with some of her colleagues. I would ask that, as the months go by, she recognize that we want to work with her. Together we're a team approach. She should not dismiss some of our statements and comments as being flippant or frivolous. I know she wouldn't, but she should show the great degree of empathy to us that she shows so very admirably to the constituents she represents.

The last comment I'd like to make is with respect to some of the people she has in the Edmonton regional office who really help and assist the good people who live in the constituency of Barrhead. In particular, I'd like to make mention of the name of Mr. Pat Brennan, the regional director of that office. I've found in previous years that he has been super in responding to me, very effective in responding to my constituents, and empathetic when they have called him with their concerns. From time to time we have to make mention of hard-working, dedicated public servants we have in our province.

In closing, my best wishes to the minister for the next four years.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of general comments, which I'll break into three questions. First of all, in terms of the importance of your ministry, I think it's going to be a relatively important one in the next three or four years, especially if the price of oil falls more and the economy gets worse. I believe that right now, small businesses face the highest bankruptcy rate in Canada. I'm sure that will have an effect on this particular department.

In fairness, I think I'd accept some of the comments some members are making: you can't do everything for everybody. There's no doubt about that. But I expect that there would be a fair amount of consumer pressure in the next little while to do things. If there is one department in government — and I think I'm reinforcing what my colleague said — it is this particular department that people have to look to, if you like, as a friend. In regard to that, one of the questions I would like to ask is: is there a fair amount of contact so far between the minister and the Consumers' Association president, Mrs. Hall? I was just wondering if they get together from time to time and discuss issues a fair amount.

The other thing I would like to come to is consumer education. I hate to disagree with the hon. Member for Barrhead on this issue. I would agree in terms of consumer ed. As a high school counsellor, I saw it. I think some of it was done well in the schools. But it is really such a hit-and-miss basis. There are business foundations 10 and 30, a few courses in business ed. But the bulk of the kids, in high school at least, the area that I know best, get no consumer education at all.

It's well and dandy, Mr. Chairman, to say that parents should do it. It's like a lot of things, I agree; the parents should do it. Obviously not all parents are able to do it, as we now know in Alberta, with the bankruptcy rate and

the problems that other members have talked about — the abuse of credit. If we don't teach attitudes or these skills, I don't know where else they're going to get them. We can say that it's not appropriate. I know there's a trend in education, Mr. Chairman, to move toward the three Rs or back to the basics. I've never understood exactly what that was. But I think we're not serving our young people well in a very technical- and consumer-oriented society if we do not give them the skills to deal with consumers, prices, interest rates, and the whole works.

I think we have to look at more consumer education in schools. I know that's not just your department; I know I'm talking to the Minister of Education. I think it's one area there is a crying need for in schools. Even kids who are interested in going to university — we take the academic courses, whether it be Chemistry 30, Social Studies 30, French 30, or English 30. There really is not that much for those kids in terms of consumer ed. We think, well, they're bright kids; they're going to university; they should know. It's just not that simple, unless you sit down and get involved in consumer ed. You have to know what it's all about. Most kids at that level don't even know what the banking system is about, and we're expecting them to go out and be consumers sort of by trial and error. Unfortunately that's not good enough in this society, because trial and error can put you very far in debt.

So I just disagree. I would agree if the parents could do it, if many of them were able to do it in a reasonable way. Some are. But I really suggest to the hon. Member for Barrhead that most of the kids aren't getting that, at least the ones I saw in high school counselling.

The other thing that I found was happening to many kids — if I can go into that area — is that when times were good, we were developing some sort of false hopes. A lot of the young males, at least, in my school were getting part time jobs at \$10 or \$12 an hour. They thought this was the way it was. You get high paying jobs, there's no problem getting a job; then you buy a car, you have lots of money to spend, you can buy clothes and all the things that young people want. But they had no realism in terms of how to handle that money. Maybe now, with recession and the inability to get those jobs, they're looking at it differently. But I doubt it.

I just suggest to the minister — and, I guess, partly reinforce what the Member for Drayton Valley was saying — that I'm not blaming the teachers. It's just not part of the curriculum, other than for a few business education students. I don't think we can leave something as important as consumer education to chance, because it affects all of us later on.

We know we have a high divorce rate. Kids move out, and the first time a young family has to face debts is one of the first things they're going to fight about. That's going to be one of the causes of divorce later. So I think it's much better to have it in an educational sense. I would just throw that out as a concern. I think we have to look at a little better job in the schools. I know that's not strictly your department.

The other thing I would like to ask, though, and there's been a lot of talk of it from time to time — I believe that back in 1974 a Conservative private member's Bill talked about a consistent wholesale price for gasoline in the province. While it's not particularly a city MLA's worry, because we have the cheapest gasoline in the province, I'm just wondering if there's any move toward looking at a more uniform gasoline price throughout the province. I

know it's a complaint, and I'm sure rural MLAs get this from time to time: the idea that we can go to a liquor store and buy a bottle of rye for the same price up north or down south, but gasoline seems to be very different from province to province. Because it has been raised from time to time — as I said, I go back to 1974 when a Conservative private member's Bill talked about a consistently wholesale price — I would be interested to see if there's any thought about looking in that direction in the future.

I conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying that I believe that your department is going to be on call a lot as we face tough times. I would be interested in asking if you have noticed more activity for the department since the recession has hit us full steam. If there is any department in government that people are going to be looking to for help, sometimes for answers that they don't know about — and there are some good commercials. I agree with the one the hon. member from Lethbridge was talking about. Those things are excellent. But I think there's going to be a cry for help. I just wonder if the department is ready for it.

So I leave those general comments with the minister, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The score in the hockey game is now 4 to 1.

MR. ZIP: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I wish to congratulate the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in her appointment to this important ministry. I think it was a very wise decision to place a person of your high quality into an area where the additional benefit of a lady's intuition in an area as important as consumerism can be brought into play.

I am also concerned with overregulation in the market place, as the leader of the Independents so eloquently expressed. He has a real point. In addition to overtaxation, overregulation is killing our economy. Yet as the Leader of the Opposition also so eloquently stated, we have to admit that there is a real need to protect those who have difficulty protecting themselves from sharp operators; that is, those whose concept of good business is ripping somebody off. I've had a number of complaints directed to me in the short time I have been in this Assembly concerning abuses which ranged from poor merchandise, poor service, to questionable financing practices. I've had my own bad experiences in virtually every area of commerce. I still say that experience is the best teacher of all.

I remember years ago when I was in Mexico for the first time and didn't know anything about the metric system. It didn't take me long to learn it after the Mexicans ripped me off a couple of times. I learned it awfully quick. A simple thing like checking my cash register tape before leaving the store has saved me tens of dollars in the course of a year. It is strange how seldom the store makes a mistake in your favor; it's always in their favor.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

I heartily endorse the suggestion made by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley on consumer education. Proper consumer education is far better than baby-sitting consumers through a multiplicity of regulations. A simple thing like comparison shopping and checking out the firms you deal with; this way you can find some very

significant differences in price. Nowadays just going from one store to another will show you a big difference in price on the same item. No amount of regulation can protect a person from that sort of thing.

I heartily endorse the lotteries the hon. minister now has under her jurisdiction. The money from them goes to worth-while causes, one of which is amateur sport, which keeps kids in this province busy and out of trouble with the law. I differ with the hon. Member for Barrhead's comment on the allocation of lottery funds to the major exhibition boards. When we look at the fact that over 60 per cent of the population of this province resides in the two major centres, and the enormous benefit that the exhibitions boards bring not just to Edmonton and Calgary but to all of Alberta, I think this is a very worth-while and justifiable allocation of these funds.

In closing, I just hope and pray in these hard times for good judgment on the part of our minister and her staff in stickhandling all the various problems that will come up. I know there will be problems. Keep in mind: let's not jump, get excited, and overregulate our economy. Thank you.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Chairman, I will just make a few brief comments. Regarding regulations that the Member for Calgary Mountain View was just referring to, I think it's important to keep in mind that when we're talking about regulations in the market place, these regulations also protect the fair businessman. The majority of our businesses within this province rely on regulation to ensure that there is fair trade in the market place. Too often we think of only the consumer, but it's the businesses that are contributing so much to our economy that also are protected through a certain degree of regulation. It's a balance we must always keep in mind.

Secondly, the Member for Edmonton Norwood referred to consumer courses within the schools. While I agree with the sentiment he puts forward, I hear from teachers that are communicating to me: don't give us any more courses, we've got too many courses already, we need to handle the ones you've given us already; cut back, if anything; don't give us any more. However, I know when I was in school — which was at least five or six years ago — I was a student in household economics. We learned consumer education, not by a consumer education course but each week when we did our little cooking project. We had certain responsibilities for going out to the grocery stores and picking up the ingredients for that item. We learned how to make a market list, how to compare prices. That's all consumer education, and it was part of the courses at least five or six years ago. So it's a shame that they wouldn't perhaps include them in subjects already being taught. It can be a lot earlier than in high school courses. Any consumer education has to start, as the Member for Barrhead said, within the home before children get into school — starting to learn the value of money, what money means to the individual and how it can be managed wisely.

I'd like to ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs one question. I also add my voice of congratulations to her. I'd like to ask her a question related to the financial counselling aspect of her portfolio. During times of high interest rates and when money was easy, I know there were a large number of families within the province that got themselves into very difficult financial circumstances. The Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in Alberta has played a very strong role in assisting families in an orderly payment of debts, in financial

counselling for those families, and in a very effective ad campaign, in my opinion, through the Before You [Go Under] program. There were pamphlets and television commercials.

At this point, when we're now into a situation of much higher unemployment, times when the economic conditions are far more visible to the average individual, I am wondering whether there is the same demand for financial counselling or whether people are finding ways of dealing with their financial problems before they get into that circumstance. Perhaps the statistics are not yet available to compare whether there's been any significant change over the last couple of years. The minister may not have those figures with her, but I'd be interested in knowing if there is any relevant comparison.

I just heard on the news reports today of an American who has been living in Canada for several years who made the comment that Canadians would be far wiser to invest in the stock market than to spend so much of their money buying lottery tickets. The funds that come from the lotteries obviously contribute to some very productive programs. I add my voice to those of the smaller communities that would like to see a more equitable sharing of the funds that come from lotteries, if we have to have lotteries at all. I'm not totally convinced that lotteries are the best investment for funds.

Perhaps in the consideration of looking at consumer education and also having responsibility for the Securities Commission, which regulates companies within the province and provides, with a prospectus, a good amount of information regarding these companies, it may be worth while to consider a very elementary course that can be offered throughout the province related to simple investments, where at least investors have a little chance of making some profit or getting a return on their dollars, rather than the very high odds of winning a lottery.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make those few brief notes about the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs which in whole, I believe, plays a very important role within this province. I hope to see it continue with the success it has over the past years.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few brief comments. The first one would be to congratulate the new minister on her new portfolio and to thank her very much for the assistance and advice that she's provided me as a new member in this Legislature over the past four or five months. She's been most helpful to me.

I have a couple of areas I'd like to address with the minister, Mr. Chairman. The first is in her capacity as the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs as it relates to Class A fairs. The minister is intimately aware of the new facility called the Westerner and the relocation of the Westerner in Red Deer, which is our agricultural society. She opened the new Altaplex in Red Deer in the first part of November, and she's completely familiar with the relocation. The relocation of the exposition was a bold move for Red Deer in the sense that instead of moving the exhibition association from its downtown location to a site outside the city, it was decided to move the Westerner into an urban setting, and the land was purchased within the city limits. That made it costly. It was the right move because Red Deer is becoming a major regional trading centre, but because it is an urban park it was an expensive proposition. The province has certainly contributed financially — I think some \$5 million — and the city has made a major contribution in terms of financial assistance as well.

Because it is in an urban setting and because of the cost of the land, many of the dollars that went into the Westerner went into the ground. The servicing was very expensive. The new Altaplex is there, but there is a great need in Red Deer to provide additional people facilities to make the Westerner the agricultural showcase that I think it will become. Already the Westerner is attracting major agricultural shows from all over the province. I called down the other day to get the statistics, but I haven't received them yet. I'm told that generally the Westerner at Red Deer is now attracting many of the major agricultural shows that were going to Edmonton and Calgary. Because of its accessibility, it's easier for cattlemen and people who are showing various livestock to get into the Westerner. So work has to be done on that.

I'm very much looking forward to working with the minister in her capacity as the overseer of Class A fairs, in terms of expanding the much needed facilities at the Westerner.

I suppose that would also lead one to discuss a little bit about the lottery. Much has been said about that. No doubt, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs will be receiving briefs from people from Red Deer with respect to her sessions with constituents on the reallocation, if you will, of lotteries, come this summer.

With regard to consumer protection and other matters relating to the minister's portfolio, protection of the consumer is absolutely important; no one would question it. There's an interesting golden thread between protecting the consumer and what we must also do in being certain that the market place is able to operate properly. The question I would like to direct to the minister is: in terms of the investigators of her department, are they prompted strictly by complaint against a business, or do they perpetuate some of the complaints themselves? A businessman told me that there was a complaint either lodged or an investigator found out about a particular item of a contract, and he was investigated a full year after the contract had been consummated. It seems to me people must be responsible and we must recognize the sanctity of contracts. So I put that question to the minister as well.

Finally, I would just like to add my congratulations to the minister. I'm very much looking forward to working with her over the course of the next few years.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, as best I can I'll address some of the questions that have been raised that are fairly specific, others that are sort of rhetorical, and maybe bits of advice here and there. Actually I got a fair amount of advice. I am looking at the balance in terms of the advice that I'm getting and wondering if I walk the middle ground if I'll be doing the right thing, especially when I'm speaking to the allocation of lottery dollars. The hon. Member for Little Bow thought somehow I was going to be having hearings. The comment I made was that I'd be pleased to receive submissions from people who felt they would like to see an alteration in the way the dollars were being distributed. I hadn't talked about hearings, which to me have the connotation of something very formal. When it comes to making that final determination, with the help of my colleagues and the advice that will come from right across this province, from every constituency, I'm sure, we'll be wishing that Solomon were available for the job. Hopefully, with the help of all the members of the Assembly, we will be able to do a fair

job of that allocation if it's determined that indeed there should be a change.

In terms of some specifics, maybe I'll just start with some of the last speakers first. I certainly appreciate some of the very kind comments from members, particularly the Member for Red Deer. He has raised a matter that is specific to his constituency, in terms of the Westerner, and I know how supportive the hon. member has been of that project and his constituents and their endeavors. Certainly they have very wonderful plans, maybe dampened slightly by the economy that we find ourselves in, but we'll be looking to work with the hon. member and his constituents in a co-operative way to find our way through that particular dilemma right now as best we can. I think that at least a number of the fairs across the province have found themselves, to either a smaller or greater degree, in that particular position right now.

The hon. member also asked something to the effect of how investigations are triggered. Depending on what area you are in, basically complaints come to my office or the regional offices of the department across the province. I'd say the greater number of complaints are triggered that way in terms of investigation, though certainly there may be some very blatant practices, I suppose, in terms of advertising — shall we use that as an example? — that might contravene the Unfair Trade Practices Act. Our investigators may not wait for someone to make a complaint that can be brought to the company's or the individual's attention that may have even inadvertently contravened that Act. I think there is to some degree a balance there. But if the hon. member has a specific for me in terms of something that has happened, as long as it's not too far in the past, I'd certainly be pleased to have it looked at to make sure our practices are in keeping with what we believe modern-day business practices should be.

There was a fair amount of discussion raised. The hon. members for Edmonton Norwood, Drayton Valley, Barrhead, and a number of members talked about consumer education. Certainly that's a priority, and it stays a priority. It isn't an area we would see diminishing in any way at all. I think most hon. members are aware that the Garneau office, where most of the material is kept and disseminated from, was opened last year. Some very interesting services are offered from there. I think they're just tremendous. Hopefully, to some degree, they go part way in assisting those people who will be in the classrooms, to have that overview.

I think the hon. Member for St. Albert put it well. Consumerism is something that touches us in almost every aspect of our lives. It's a matter of it having a bit of a profile. If we can assist those who are going into the teaching profession — for instance, I'm looking at a sheet in front of me on in-service workshops that are offered: helping professions — workshops are conducted on request with other government departments and social agencies concerned with consumer education; teacher workshops are conducted on request; teachers in training — sessions will be conducted annually for education students at the U of A, U of C, and U of L. I have no doubt that as the knowledge of what services are available becomes more widely known, we may find that the people we have in place now to handle that particular area of our programming may well be stretched. Possibly that's a good place for it to be stretched, because the better equipped the consumer is, obviously the better the choices that are going to be made, especially in the times we're living in right now.



The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood asked if I had been in contact with Mrs. Hall. Yes I have. I've met her on a couple of occasions. On one particular occasion she came to my office, and we had an excellent discussion. As a matter of fact, this Saturday the Consumers' Association from across the province will be meeting in Edmonton. I will be in attendance at their meeting, and I'm sure I will get an overview in a very good way of their concerns and what's happening around the province from an organization that's probably in the best position to give me that overview. I'm pleased to be able to work with them.

The whole education field: the hon. Member for Barrhead made mention of the responsibility of parents. In my view that's precisely where the responsibility should lie. Interestingly enough, where we can we have to assist all people in some way to get the tools in their hands to do that job we're talking about. If you overexpand the department, put too many crutches out there, you have people leaning more and more and doing less and less of the kind of thing that the hon. Member for Barrhead mentioned, and that was to take responsibility for doing that job yourself. I kind of smiled in his sharing with us the episode of his son, who in his own way, I suppose, was embarking on his first business adventure. To begin with, I wasn't sure whether we had something that fit under the Securities Commission, corporate registry, or exactly where we were. I suppose the hon. Member for Barrhead will have his young son in hand and, by the time that young man gets to spend a fair amount of money, he will be well educated. A number of us will be watching that situation.

I believe the Member for Edmonton Norwood also raised the point that at one time there was a Bill in the Legislature that spoke to a uniform price for gasoline. I have no knowledge of that Bill. I have no reason to doubt it was here, but I would only say that with the exception of Petro-Canada, we're talking about private industry engaged in retailing and wholesaling gasoline. I have no reason to believe that this government would choose a route of regulating those prices. Certainly there are no plans in that regard.

One area touched on by most of the members who chose to participate in this debate tonight was basically some plaudits for the department. I, and I know that my officials, certainly appreciate that. The department has undergone a fairly extensive, I suppose you would say, reorganization in terms of finally bringing the idea of regional delivery to fruition. The hon. Member for Lethbridge West talked about being able to go in and search a company's name, register, and so on. That's precisely the way those regional offices are intended. There are six of them, and now two suboffices which should be fully operational this year. It's precisely the way we intend them to operate. All those people who are working in those regional offices indeed are fully worthy of the kind of plaudits that were given to them tonight for their service.

I think that in a lot of ways their talents are utilized to the fullest. If they had been in a position and in a job where they were only doing one thing, as opposed to the kind of overview they have now — instead of sending out four officers, all with different investigative skills or different program areas they're responsible for, we now can send one person out. These people truly are doing a terrific job. As I said, their talents are now coming to the fore, in terms of how capably they have taken over and been able to deliver the goods, so to speak, in those regional

offices we have looked forward to.

The Member for St. Albert also raised the consumer education topic raised by a number of other members, as well as the financial counselling aspect of the programming we have. I cannot answer the hon. member's question now in terms of whether there has been — I don't believe there has been a significant change in the amount of financial counselling done. But certainly if we were to possibly be in a situation where many more citizens were strapped for funds and hadn't the kind of tools at their disposal to give them the knowledge to handle that, we may be looking at more in that area. From my point of view and perspective right now, I think we may have reached a peak in that regard. Certainly there is a fair amount of that done.

The hon. Member for Calgary Currie also made some very kind comments, and raised the matter of the Securities Commission. I just quickly twigged back. In the question period, I think I heard the hon. member raise that before. Obviously he's promoting, on behalf of his constituency in Calgary, the move there by the Securities Commission that he believes is logical. I must say to the hon. Member for Calgary Currie that I'm told there are not a lot of reasons from a practical standpoint. With the method of communication and the technology we have today, it isn't really going to matter where the offices are. I can only say that I have this information, but I promise to look at it further. I certainly will undertake to get a fuller answer for the hon. Member for Calgary Currie and take a look at his representations on that move, that I suppose are on file. I haven't seen them. The hon. member will get more information on that.

One other question the hon. member raised was about one particular food chain. Insofar as I'm aware, if you had cause to believe something inappropriate or even illegal were happening, that type of activity would be regulated by the federal government. For instance, if information were to come to our attention that we believe that in fact that area was gray and deserved looking at, it would certainly be incumbent upon us to inform the proper authorities. But I'm not aware of any activities under my department which would give me the ability to step in and do an investigation of that sort.

I did appreciate the advice of the hon. Member for Little Bow. I think his advice may be slightly closer to my philosophical stance than the other hon. members'. But it's not fair for me to read into their submissions and real concerns, on behalf of the consumers particularly, that they have a sort of philosophical stance. This is just a fast comment in terms of listening right now.

I believe the hon. member said, watch the growth, the organization, and regulation. Certainly that's been done over the last few years. I think several things are happening. The previous minister embarked on deregulation and did a terrific job. Last year alone something like 55 licences were deleted from the requirements of those 11-cences being held.\* I haven't changed in terms of picking up that pursuit and carrying it on. There are several areas we're looking at right now. But often when you get into the area of deregulating, you have to make sure that those businesses you're looking at are able to police themselves to some degree, because the consumers want to know who's really looking at this.

I realize there is no way you can hire legions of people, nor should you, to look at everything. It's just absolutely impossible. But on the other hand, if there have been procedures in place, and citizens of the province are used to those procedures and believe there to be inherent in

\*See Hansard, April 15, 1983, page 593, left column, paragraph 7

them some protection, and then they're removed, I think it behooves us, first of all, to explain what we've removed and, secondly, to also add what has been put in place, if you will, if those licensing procedures allowed us to have a look at how business was being conducted. Certainly I appreciate the hon. member's advice. In terms of the objectives for the department this year, basically ongoing from last year as well as several areas of interest I have and believe are important in this particular year '83-84 that are added to the list, deregulation is right near the top. So hopefully the hon. member will be pleased with that.

Mr. Chairman, he also raised a question about the Class A fairs. It's probably wise that I speak briefly to that. If you talk about the hundreds of agricultural societies across the province, there's absolutely no change in their status. There is the close working relationship with the Department of Agriculture, and that is not an area that my department would be into in any way, shape, or form. But because the major fairs, so to speak, the Class A fairs, are embarking on areas that are not only serving the agricultural community but a much broader community — if you take a look at the kinds of shows, exhibitions, promotions, and so on, that are going on in the facilities under the umbrella of these fairs, then you realize it's much broader than even agriculture, though agriculture is a very major component. We obviously don't want to see that diminished in any way, shape, or form.

But the operating and capital grants that have flowed to most of those fairs have come from pari-mutuels, and I think that to some degree pari-mutuels, lotteries, and so on, under the same umbrella make some sense. So those Class A fairs were broken off in that to some degree they are in a much broader field of operation. You can hear what the hon. Member for Red Deer was speaking to in terms of what the Westerner is embarking on, and even the smaller Class A fairs have gotten in — the trade shows and so on that are being put on by the agricultural societies; hence, to some degree, some of the rationale behind splitting those fairs off. But I would in no way, shape, or form want those other agricultural societies to think their role vis-a-vis the Department of Agriculture was diminished in any way. It will be exactly the same situation as before. I know the Department of Agriculture has a marvellous staff in place that will continue to encourage those fairs in the smaller communities.

The hon. member also spoke — and I think to some degree the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. Member for Little Bow were both talking about the market place. On one hand, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is concerned with: do we have enough safeguards in place for the consumer and so on. The hon. Member for Little Bow is concerned in terms of our economy. It's so true. If you put too many strictures in place, you're not going to have any business; hence, no jobs. So somehow, the balancing act is there. In a time of fiscal restraint and economic slowdown, I think we can look to both the consumer and the retailer, people in the business community, as having to be equally responsible. If you were to look at the complaints on both sides, I believe you would find just as many retailers saying, people haven't paid their bills and we have some irresponsible consumers, as you will find complaints from consumers about retailers or people in business in terms of their conduct. So if anything, at a time of restraint both consumers and those people in the business community are going to have to take more pains to present

themselves in a very straightforward fashion that introduces the kind of confidence into the market place that we so badly need.

I know the hon. Member for Barrhead mentioned my so-called Christmas or end of the year address. I think I commented about spending and that I would hate to see consumers in this province taking a position that even though they had contemplated purchases they decided not to do it only because they're a little nervous about the situation, and instead put the money in the bank, so to speak, or some other tool of deposit. I say that because if commerce slows right down to a stop, obviously there are going to be a lot more people unemployed. In no way am I trying to encourage people who can't afford to, to go out and spend. But there are some people who have reached a stage in life where they are fairly secure, yet for some reason or other have sort of done the double-take in restraint. It just magnifies the economic problem we have. I think all of us should think about that and take a good look at what our spending habits are, and have we overreacted to the situation we find ourselves in.

My husband made the comment that I made that remark so it would be picked up and then I could go out and spend, saying it was my civic duty. But that's not true. I really do believe it's important for us to take note of that area and, where we can, make sure the economy keeps rolling.

The hon. Member for Barrhead also asked a question about the dollars that may be flowing from the 6/49 that is now a part of the province's lottery system. I don't have a precise figure on that. The overall dollars that will be available from that game this year will depend on whether we carry out a policy to pay off all the equipment that has been put in place to run that game or whether the payments for the equipment will be spread over a period of time; hence, there would be a greater return. So I can't give the hon. member that figure now, but I will try to get some projections for him. In terms of the overview of the allocation of lottery dollars, of course the 6/49 will be part of that overview.

Some very important questions about our financial institutions were raised by the hon. member of the opposition. I think the hon. member was referring to the trust companies in particular. I made some opening comments about financial institutions. But when I spoke about confusion in the minds of people who think themselves to be depositors but find out they've been part of an institution that indeed was an investment as opposed to a guaranteed deposit, I was talking about other types of institutions, where you have something running in the province that doesn't have any strict legislation that governs it, yet almost the same kind of institution running in the province governed by federal legislation does have very strict regulation, and in fact is guaranteed by the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Speaking specifically to trust companies, I believe it's fair to say that we have as good or better trust company legislation as you will find anywhere in the country. I suppose you have to decide how far you actually want to go in governing these institutions. If you become so strict in terms of the percentage of liabilities for which they must have assets on hand, so to speak, you could finally reach the point where we may as well take the old tobacco can and bury the money in the back yard, because you won't have allowed them any room to manoeuvre and to make investments. Obviously if you expect a percentage return on your money, that's what has to happen. But I also recognize the public concern

and that there is some basic guarantee.

I think all of us are fairly happy about the federal Bill raising the limit on guaranteed deposits by the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation from \$20,000 to \$60,000. I understand it still has to go through the Senate, but that should be expedited fairly quickly. I believe that that Bill is going to be retroactive to the beginning of January, possibly January 4, the first banking day. So that's just excellent news for a number of people affected by some events emanating from the province of Ontario.

The hon. member also mentioned the rent controls that we formerly had, his concern about all aspect of rentals, and how we really have a handle on it. There are various agencies that supply a number of departments with information that is vital to that department in terms of policy making. A lot of our information in Consumer and Corporate Affairs is to keep an overview of what's happening out there in terms of cost and a number of other things. The kind of detailed statistics that would be required in terms of the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health, I'm sure that minister can speak to in terms of the statistics, where they come from and if they're precisely germane to the program area you're concerned about. I don't feel qualified to comment on that.

Certainly the landlord and tenant associations across this province also have a good feel in terms of what's happening: how many complaints they are dealing with that they may have to arbitrate between landlord and tenant, and unfair practices that tenants may complain about. That gives us, to some degree, a feel for what's happening in the rental market.

The hon. Member for Little Bow did raise almost a specific, and it may be something the hon. member would like to give me more detailed information on afterwards. I guess the hon. Member for Lethbridge West also raised this. There was concern that there may be duplication, whether we're talking about other government departments — Tourism and Small Business was mentioned — or, in the case of the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, I believe he mentioned the federal government. That question was raised with us before. We did have a look at it. We believe there's very little duplication. There are always the kinds of calls you get in the initial inquiries you have to make in terms of whether something is provincial or federal jurisdiction. But if the hon. member has a specific about an area where both Tourism and Small Business and Consumer and Corporate Affairs have officers or people working in program areas, both dealing with a similar situation, that's the kind of information I'd be pleased to receive, because I'm not aware of that at this point in time. I'm sure the hon. minister responsible for the other department that was mentioned would also be pleased to receive that.

A comment was made, again just as an overall comment I believe: the business community regulating again, this time speaking to the securities field. Of late the Securities Commission has introduced new policies that allow certain businesses to go to the market without an expensive prospectus. I think you'll see some fruits from that particular policy over the next short while.

The Member for Lethbridge West mentioned his concern about the kind of building materials that are used — I believe most of those materials are tested by the federal government — and whether it has ever been brought to their attention to look at the contents of dwellings from a safety point of view. I think that's what the hon. member was speaking to. I don't know. I think it's possible the

hon. Minister of Labour would have some information on that. Certainly he speaks to building standards. But it's an interesting observation to think that if you had a fire in your house, the walls wouldn't burn but you'd have so much highly flammable material in it that you would be in an incendiary position in almost an instant. I think we've heard of some pretty tragic fires in large buildings in the United States that were caused simply by that type of thing.

The hon. member also mentioned the Automobile Insurance Board as it applies to rates that are being charged in the province. I can't comment for the benefit of the hon. member whether the raising of insurance payments with the advent of speeding tickets are based on a history or a correlation that if you speed very much, you have more accidents. I would have thought there was logic in that regard. But it may well be that the question should be asked in terms of the rationale for that. It would occur to me — I'm sure the hon. member has thought of this too, unless he looked at it in more detail — that that would be the precise reason for raising one's insurance premium. But if that not be the case, then I believe it bears looking at.

There is a study that has just almost this instant, if you will, been released by the insurance industry. I don't know whether it's the final study. It just came into my office. I haven't had the opportunity to look at it. That study came about as the result of the concern of human rights commissions across the country for premiums and the discrimination that appeared to be practised in the way categories were set to work out what premium would be paid. I'll be interested in looking at that. I have no advice for the hon. member whether the — I think it's called a bona fide occupational qualification, and it's an exemption from the Act. It was done on a temporary basis to the end of this year, I believe, so this field could be studied, and all insurance matters were suspended. Obviously that matter is going to have to be addressed very, very soon.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I have caught most of the questions I could answer for hon. members. I'm very pleased with the questions tonight and the interest in the department. Unless an hon. member has a question that I haven't covered, I think that that's all I can add to the discussion.

#### Agreed to:

1.1.1 — Minister's Office	\$157,640
1.1.2 — Executive Management	\$505,140
1.1.3 — Financial Services	\$320,810
1.1.4 — Personnel and Staff Development	\$250,430
1.1.5 — Research and Planning	\$137,960
1.1.6 — Audit	\$417,990
1.1.7 — Administrative Services	\$539,850
1.1.8 — Information Systems	\$3,038,090
1.1.9 — Communications	\$25,960
Total Vote 1.1 — Central Support Services	\$5,393,870
12.1 — Regional Offices	\$3,703,760
Total Vote 12 — Regional Delivery	\$3,703,760
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$9,097,630
Total Vote 2 — Consumer Services	\$1,307,495

3.1 — Program Support	\$177,860
3.2 — Regulation of Insurance Industries	\$225,000
3.3 — Regulation of Automobile Insurance Premium	\$139,760
3.4 — Business Incorporation and Registration	\$2,659,010
3.5 — Registration and Regulation of Trust Companies	\$122,270
3.6 — Regulation of Credit Unions	\$125,490
3.7 — Licensing	\$422,290
3.8 — Regulation of Credit Grantors	\$192,810
3.9 — Regulation of Business Practices	\$197,180
3.10 — Regulation of Real Estate	\$187,040
3.11 — Regulation of Co-operatives	\$30,180
Total Vote 3 — Business Registration and Regulation	\$4,478,890
 Total Vote 4 — Regulation of Securities Markets	 \$3,086,445
 5.1 — Financial Assistance — Operating Support	 \$3,157,000
5.2 — Financial Assistance — Capital Support	\$4,129,000
Total Vote 5 — Financial Assistance to Major Exhibitions and Fairs	\$7,286,000

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the votes be reported.

[Motion carried]

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPELBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration and reports the following resolutions, and requests leave to sit again:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, sums not exceeding the following for the department and purposes indicated.

For Consumer and Corporate Affairs: \$9,097,630 for departmental support services, \$1,307,495 for consumer services, \$4,478,890 for business registration and regulation, \$3,086,445 for regulation of securities markets, \$7,286,000 for financial assistance to major exhibitions and fairs.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Assembly will deal with second reading of Bill 26 and, if there's time, other Bills on the Order Paper that are also standing for second reading.

[At 10:15 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]