

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Wednesday, June 1, 1983 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **PRESENTING PETITIONS**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm very honored today to have the opportunity to present to Members of the Legislative Assembly the petitions of some 22,682 Albertans, from 136 communities, opposing the introduction of user fees. To my knowledge this is the largest recorded petition tabled in the Alberta Legislative Assembly.

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

MR. STILES: Mr. Speaker, the Private Bills Committee has had under consideration the following Bills and recommends to the Assembly that they be proceeded with: Bill Pr. 7, Peace River Bible Institute Amendment Act, 1983; Bill Pr. 9, Paramount Life Insurance Company Amendment Act, 1983; Bill Pr. 10, Alexander La Fleur Minerals Title Act; Bill Pr. 11, Edmonton Canadian Insurance Company Amendment Act, 1983; Bill Pr. 12, Calgary Golf and Country Club Amendment Act, 1983; Bill Pr. 13, Koney Island Sporting Company (Limited) Continuation Act; Bill Pr. 14, Edmonton Convention Centre Authority Amendment Act, 1983; and Bill Pr. 15, Edmonton Convention and Tourism Authority Amendment Act, 1983.

The Private Bills Committee has also had under consideration the following Bills and recommends to the Assembly that they be proceeded with, with certain amendments: Bill Pr. 4, Mennonite Mutual Relief Insurance Company Amendment Act, 1983; Bill Pr. 5, Canadian Lutheran Bible Institute Amendment Act, 1983; and Bill Pr. 6, Calgary Jewish Centre Act.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table motions for returns 174 and 175.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the response to amended Motion for a Return No. 132.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to the Legislative Assembly today, on your behalf, two grade 6 classes from the Aldergrove elementary school in the constituency of Edmonton Meadowlark. They are accompanied by teachers Kim Falkenberg and Dave Nichols. I understand that these students made a special request that I introduce them in the hope that

they may visit the constituency of Cardston on a future field trip. That would be an education in itself. They are seated in the public gallery, and I ask that they rise and receive the usual welcome of the House.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to the Assembly a former member of this Legislature, Mr. Gordon Kesler; as well, an executive member of the WCC party and one of my constituents, Mr. George Schultz. I'd like those two persons to stand and be recognized at this time.

MR. DROBOT: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my friend and colleague the Hon. Ernie Isley, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you and to members of this Assembly 49 grade 6 students from the Glendon school. They are accompanied by teachers Thelma Watrich and Mr. Gary Kissel, and parents Mrs. Elock and Mrs. Wers-tiuk. They are seated in the members gallery. I would like them to stand and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce 20 members of the Friends of Medicare, people who worked very hard on the petition presented to the Legislature today. They are standing in the public gallery. I would ask them to remain standing, and those who are seated to stand, and be recognized by the House.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Forest Fire — Swan Hills**

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It deals with the situation currently existing just south of the town of Swan Hills, with respect to a forest fire. Can the minister advise the Assembly as to the current situation and status of that fire?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I have received a report from the Alberta Forest Service as of eleven o'clock this morning and, for the information of members of this Assembly, can report as follows. I'm informed that there is in fact no danger to the town unless there is some change in the wind. The wind is presently coming from the north. Committed to extinguishing the fire are some 150 firefighters, 32 caterpillar dozers to build a fireguard, eight water trucks, and a dozen fixed-wing and helicopter aircraft. It is anticipated that if the wind conditions do not worsen, the fire should be completely under control by tomorrow. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I could advise members of the Assembly that the acreage involved in this particular fire is in the order of about 2,500 acres.

MR. KOWALSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Should an order for evacuation be given to the residents of Swan Hills, what would be the time frame involved?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. In its present form, that question is highly hypothetical.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might readdress my question to the minister by way of a supplementary. What is the policy in terms of advisement to citizens of a town, should an evacuation order be necessary?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I would simply respond to the question by indicating that at the present time, there is in fact no danger whatsoever. Residents are of course well aware of the proximity of the fire, for more than one reason. I would perhaps refer any further questions with respect to evacuation to the Minister responsible for Disaster Services or the minister who might be sitting in his stead in the House at this time.

Energy Ministers' Meeting

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might also direct a question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly about matters discussed yesterday in his meeting with the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I can advise the Assembly that I met yesterday with the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, the Hon. Jean Chrétien, in Ottawa. The meeting involved a period of time from 9:30 in the morning until approximately 1:45 in the afternoon. We met both privately and with officials. We discussed a number of issues, including, of course, the Alberta/Ottawa energy agreement. I would describe the meeting as a useful one, Mr. Speaker. It was concluded on the basis that we would meet again within the next 10 to 14 days.

MR. ALEXANDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could describe whether the matter of gas pricing was raised and, if so, what conclusions, if any, were drawn.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, without wishing to speak to too much detail of those meetings, which I don't believe would be appropriate, I can advise the Assembly that when one is discussing the Alberta/Ottawa energy agreement, there is of course a natural gas pricing aspect to that. I could add that an additional subject on the agenda was natural gas export pricing. Of course, the position of this government, as stated publicly, is that an incentive pricing arrangement ought to be put in place at the earliest possible opportunity in order to maintain export markets and to provide some opportunity for expansion of those markets in the near term. Mr. Speaker, I suppose I could also add that there is no question that the incentive pricing proposal that is the Alberta proposal and that of industry, provides a price that in fact would still afford to Canadians a much more advantageous price for natural gas.

MR. ALEXANDER: Final supplementary if I might, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister inform the Assembly whether there was any change discussed on either side with regard to the rollback of oil prices from the September '81 agreement?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Again, Mr. Speaker, without speaking to the detail of those meetings, I can state that the public position of this government remains unchanged; namely, we are of the view that the energy agreement provides for no rollback whatsoever in a very explicit fashion.

Provincial Examinations

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my ques-

tion to the hon. Minister of Education, regarding his statement yesterday about provincial examinations. Could the minister advise whether there has been any consideration of a transition period for students who may have finished grade 11 and, with these specifications, may not be able to enter grade 12?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, if I understand the hon. member's question, the problem is not that the students would be unable to enter grade 12 but that perhaps in their grade 12 program, they would not be able to take the courses that are now going to be required for the advanced high school diploma. If, for example, the student just finishing grade 11 has not taken Social Studies 20, he would be unable to register next year in Social Studies 30 and, by my announcement yesterday, Social Studies 30 is a requirement for the advanced high school diploma. We recognize the problem that will exist for a few of those students throughout the province next year, and we have made provision to deal with special cases on a transitional basis.

MR. BATIUK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In one area, the minister has stated that there will be other initiatives taken in the areas of teacher evaluation. I am wondering whether the minister could now advise what initiatives he has in mind and, if he doesn't have them yet, how soon he'll be able to advise.

MR. KING: I'm not able to give the House advice on that matter at the moment, Mr. Speaker, except to say that it is my intention to meet with the Alberta Teachers' Association, the Alberta School Trustees' Association, and other interested bodies, during the course of the next three or four months; that is, through the summer. I expect we would be in a position to make some announcements in the fall. The hon. member might be interested in some very good work that has been done by the Alberta School Trustees' Association on the subject.

MR. BATIUK: One more supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Would there be any provisions for students who have already graduated but, for some reason or other, may not be able to attend or enrol in university? Two years down the line, they may not have these specifications. Will they have to take grade 12 again, or will there be any provision for those students?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, that's properly a matter for the universities to decide. The Department of Education does not set their entrance standards. But I am sure that as a matter of practice, they would not apply new standards retroactively. I can assure the hon. member that we have informal discussions with the universities on matters such as this, and we would not advise them to apply the new standards retroactively. In other words, I would support the hon. member's submission that we should not do anything that would place students in that kind of problem two or three years down the road.

MR. COOK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In his announcement yesterday, the minister indicated that there would be further reviews of the curriculum of the province. Would the minister undertake to do a review of science and math skills taught in the province? I'd refer him to some studies in the United States that show that science and math skills in that country are woefully inadequate for a good science program.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I don't think we need to do a study of the science and math skills. I think we have more than enough information at hand to make the necessary decisions. We have information that has already been generated in this province. We have the benefit of information from other provinces, which is certainly somewhat comparable to our experience in Alberta. I don't think we need to study the problem any more; I think we need to develop solutions to the problem.

MR. COOK: Supplementary question. Then would the minister consider steps like the state of Iowa, which I understand provides a \$25 grant to each student registered in high school science and math programs, in effect an incentive for schools to promote science and math skills? Would the minister consider doing something like that?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, there may be some jurisdictions that have so much money they can just throw it around. We are going to exercise good stewardship, and I don't think we have to offer a financial incentive for people to go into the maths or sciences.

I appreciate the concern the hon. member is expressing. I think it is important that we do something to direct more students into the study of the maths and sciences in order that they can go into teaching, prepared to teach in those areas. I acknowledge the importance of the hon. member's question. We will look at a variety of ways of encouraging that. Financial incentives would be low on my list of priorities.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary question. Only two students who are going to be teaching in the Alberta school system next year graduated from the University of Alberta with a major in math. Is any thought given to trying to work with the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta or at Calgary or at Lethbridge, to try to promote the development of math and science skills in the students who will be teaching in our Alberta schools in a very short period of time? What are we doing to get our teachers proficient in math and science skills?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, there is really a more basic consideration; that is, for many years, teacher education in the province has been predicated on the idea that teacher preparation should concentrate on teaching instructional skills rather than on developing specialized knowledge in a field of discipline, such as math or science. The result of that is, for example, that in our school system we don't recognize subject area specializations. If the hon. member is making a submission that we should, he's joining a lot of other people in the province. That is increasingly becoming a matter of public debate. But at the present time, our training of teachers is not directed towards giving them a subject area specialization.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary by the hon. member, followed by a final supplementary by the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills.

MR. BATIUK: All right, Mr. Speaker. I was going to ask my second question. But if that's the case, I have a supplementary for the Minister of Education.

I am well aware that the Alberta Teachers' Association has accepted this proposal, but could the minister advise

whether the Alberta trustees' association has responded to this?

MR. KING: To the best of my knowledge, they have not responded to the announcement made yesterday. But I certainly believe, on the basis of discussions I have held with the Alberta School Trustees' Association, that they are likely to respond very positively.

MRS. KOPER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Education, regarding the presentation of the diploma and the changes thereon. Presently there appears to be no way that Alberta Education can recognize students who have completed some of their education in a second language. I wonder if the department is planning some way of recognizing bilingual accomplishments through high school certification on a high school diploma.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of policy, we would like to respond positively to that submission made by some members of the public. So I can say that it is our intention that we should be able to recognize proficiency in a second language on the high school diploma, but there are a number of ways in which this might be done, and we have not yet decided which of those ways would be most effective.

Trade Mission to Far East

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of International Trade. Regarding the announcement yesterday on the mission to the Far East, could the hon. minister indicate the purpose and the major priority of the trip which will take place in June?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, as a result of a mission which the World Bank initiated for officials of the Daqing oil field to the United States, we will be able to get these people here to Alberta to make them realize, so to speak, the capacity and technology we have in our province, specifically for their Daqing oil field and the recovery of heavy oils, as well as initial drilling and other programs which they have developed for this area.

We were told that China will issue approximately \$900 million of tenders in the month of June for this type of equipment, technology, and engineering, and we hope that Alberta companies will participate. For that reason, we're going to take along with us one of the executives of the Canadian Oilfield Manufacturers Association. Hopefully, as one of the priorities, we'll then be able to show the people of the Republic of China that Alberta is indeed capable of supplying at least part of their equipment.

Of interest would be that China itself will possibly be paying part of it; part of it's being financed by the World Bank, and another part hopefully through the Export Development Corporation of Canada.

MR. NELSON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Has the Republic of China sent people into Alberta prior to this trip? Have they been invited to attend the various areas in the province to learn of our expertise at this point?

MR. SCHMID: Referring to the oil and gas technology, yes, we have already had several delegations in Alberta. Since the Daqing oil field is similar in formation to our

Pembina oil field, it has been found — at least we have been told by the Chinese visitors that they're very interested in the technology we have developed in that area.

I should also add that we had a delegation here from China, I think a year ago, purchasing hides in the agricultural sector. As a member of the Department of Agriculture will be coming along with us, part of the mission in June to the People's Republic will also be to look into the marketing of our dairy and meat production programs.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the hon. Premier. As I understand he is to take a similar trip in August-September, could the Premier advise whether this might be a follow-up trip to conclude any agreements that may be made during the hon. minister's trip?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't be a follow-up trip. My visit has two other functions in addition to that of the Minister of International Trade: one has to do with our grain sales to the People's Republic of China which, as the grain producers in this province are well aware, is very significant, and to establish and strengthen relationships with the People's Republic of China, confirming Canada's and Alberta's reliability as a grain supplier; and secondly, to respond to the initiative of the People's Republic of China through their province of Heilongjiang, which is twinned with the province of Alberta, the only Canadian province involved in that relationship that emanated from a visit of the governor of that province to Alberta in September 1981.

Provincial Examinations
(continued)

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a further question to the Minister of Education. This is with respect to the proposed labelling of two high school diplomas. Given that electronics, second languages, and fine arts, just to mention a few, are very challenging and advanced programs, I wonder if any consideration is being given to keeping one diploma for high school students, but perhaps labelling the diploma specified in the announcement "academic" or "matriculation", to indicate its real purpose.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, we thought we had given a good deal of consideration to the best possible name for the two diplomas, but even at this point we are open to submissions from the hon. member — and indeed from anybody else — as to the name of the second diploma. The problem is that matriculation has some very specific meanings in other jurisdictions, and that was one of the things that was taken into consideration, that some other courses are very academic besides the ones involved in this. That was one of the considerations. But rather than go on at any further length here, I will only undertake to meet with the hon. gentleman and pursue those or other suggestions privately.

MR. APPLEBY: A supplementary to the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. From the announcement yesterday, I understand that this program will come into effect in September 1983. I wonder what the schedule would be as far as actual examination times. Would there be semester examinations or once a year? What would the program be?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, there will be three writings each year: one in January, to correspond to the end of the conventional first semester; one in June, to correspond to the end of the conventional second semester; and one in August, which would be an appeal exam.

I was very careful to use the phrases "conventional first semester" and "conventional second semester" because we have four, or perhaps five, schools in the province that are on what is called a compressed semester basis, and we are having discussions with them about how to provide the exams on a basis that is suitable to their schedule.

Information was mailed out on a privileged basis to every school [superintendent] and high school principal in the province, and it arrived yesterday. In some cases, it may arrive today; I can't speak for Canada Post Corporation. That information included the specific dates for the January and June writings, so all school administrators have that information now.

MR. APPLEBY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In a number of subjects, particularly the Social Studies 30 program, there are certain optional units which the teacher may choose to use as part of the curriculum. I wonder if provision is being made to deal with that special aspect when examination time comes.

MR. KING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In such cases, the emphasis of the examination will be on the so-called core curriculum, which should be common to every classroom experience in the province. Where the exams deal with the so-called optional units, it will be on the basis of students making choices, so they can choose to answer questions about the optional units they will have taken in their particular class. The point is, though, that the majority of the material in our curriculum is described as being core content. It is supposed to be studied in every classroom in the province, and the exam will focus on that so-called core content.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Has the minister developed any plans, or does he propose any plans, to communicate to the students the changes announced yesterday with respect to evaluations and certification?

MR. KING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In addition to the package I just referred to, which has been sent to every high school principal and school superintendent in the province, a similar package of information was sent to the editor or news manager of every daily and weekly paper and every radio and television station in the province. In addition a brochure is being printed this week, which will be delivered on Monday and Tuesday of next week to every high school in sufficient quantities for every high school student. So Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday of next week, every high school student in the province will get a brochure they can take home and discuss with their parents. It will deal with all the major features of the program.

That same brochure will be distributed the following week, the week of June 13, to every home in the province, because we think there's a good deal of public interest in this program. We think that people other than students and parents are interested, and it is going to be provided to every household in the province. The text of the brochure is being delivered to every Member of the Legislative Assembly.

Hazardous Waste Disposal

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a couple of questions to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. They relate to the concern of some people that hazardous materials are being dumped in community dumps. Have there been any recent studies of the types of materials now being dumped in Alberta community dumps?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the responsibilities for municipal waste sites, municipalities are not obligated to take any waste they consider to be dangerous, and they're responsible for monitoring it. The local board of health is responsible for monitoring the operation from a public health standpoint.

MR. COOK: Does the department have any plans to consider regulation of dumps and to provide the budget necessary to do that, either in its own departmental staff area or providing the necessary resources to local boards of health? For example, I'm concerned about the dumping of acids, herbicides, and pesticides at dumps like the Clover Bar site.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, there are regulations in place, regulated by the Provincial Board of Health. However, once those regulations are in place, as they are now, the responsibility for monitoring the operation is with the local board of health and, subject to checking, I'd have to see whether or not there are any proposals for any amendments to the regulations.

MR. COOK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister consider having the Provincial Board of Health work with the local boards of health to make sure those regulations are in fact being enforced?

DR. WEBBER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COOK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would those regulations include some sort of checking of bills of lading? I understand that trucks can enter the Clover Bar dump with a bill of lading whenever they want, and there is no checking of that bill. Would there be some sort of checking or monitoring procedure on that?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier with regard to that particular issue, what goes into the local waste disposal site is the responsibility of the municipality; they're responsible for monitoring what they accept. The local board of health is responsible for monitoring the operations from a public health standpoint. In terms of the Provincial Board of Health, as I indicated, I'm sure they'd be prepared to work with local health units in case there are problems.

Hospital User Fees

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care and pertains to user fees. I've had a number of calls and letters from constituents regarding the exemption from user fees as it pertains to level of income. There seems to be serious confusion between actual income and taxable income. Would the minister please clarify the income amounts for single Albertans and family groups? In other words,

would he give taxable income levels and actual income levels for those who would be exempt?

MR. NOTLEY: Put it on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: I have some concern about that question, because it appears the hon. member is asking for an interpretation of something which is public knowledge.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm bringing it forward because of the fact that there are a number of concerns between taxable and actual income. I will abide by your ruling.

Commercial Fishing

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. I refer the minister to *Hansard* of Tuesday, May 17, 1983. I asked the question, for a second time, whether "a decision has been made or will be forthcoming with regard to the freight subsidy" in the Fort Chipewyan area. Fourteen days having elapsed since I raised that for a second time, would the minister advise if a decision has been made yet?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, a decision has not been made. As you know, we've just gone through our estimates and there were no funds in my budget this year for that purpose, although I have not stopped there and used that as an excuse. After receiving our intergovernmental report on fish marketing, I have made recommendations and am working on trying to obtain funds for a freight subsidy for them.

MR. WEISS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In reporting back, the minister also made reference that they would be reviewing the processing and marketing of fresh fish in Alberta. Are there any further comments to advise the Assembly with regard to that?

MR. SPARROW: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As late as yesterday, we met with the president of the fresh fish marketing board, talking with them about freight equalization, and we hope to further that subject along with our adjoining province. We've requested them to join with us in a study for processing and filleting fresh fish in Alberta, with the emphasis of that study looking at increased markets within Alberta.

MR. WEISS: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As the season is fast approaching for the pull in the Fort Chipewyan area this year, would the minister assure us that he will have a decision with regard to the freight subsidy within the next 14 days?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, if it were my decision I would hope to give it to you today, but all I can do is make my recommendations through the normal process. I hope that with the fresh fish marketing board, we'll take a very serious look at the freight equalization. That's part of our problem. I can also say that as of yesterday's meeting, we have a commitment from them to get a better turnaround time on the commercial fishermen's requests for sales outside the market place that are not sold by FPMC.

With reference to our commercial fishing problem, I have gone one step further and named an official in my department who is now in charge of commercial fisheries

for Alberta, and I will be looking at having him primarily look at the future problems of marketing and assisting the fishermen in the province.

Medic Canada Convention

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Economic Development. In view of the fact that his department committed some \$150,000 to guarantee the Medic Canada meeting just concluded at the Edmonton Convention Centre, would the minister give this Assembly any information he has which would indicate the value of the meeting and justify that financial commitment?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I'd be delighted to. All the reports I had are very positive. It was a splendid show and, for those who haven't had an opportunity to be in Edmonton's new Convention Centre, they should hurry and do it, because it's a delight.

The purpose of the investment was to get Alberta a profile in the world medical research fraternity, and I'm sure we achieved that. In addition it gave many of our manufacturers an opportunity to see what potential there was for joint venturing in medical appliances and devices. Finally it gave a lot of us an opportunity to dialogue on the issue of how to properly, technologically transfer medical devices to the private sector, so from all reports it was a very useful convention.

On the issue of the guarantee, that had to be put up front early in order that all of the deposits for rooms and one thing or another could be made. That would only be at risk if the receipts didn't approach that number. I don't have that in yet, but I'm sure it will be fine.

DR. BUCK: It was a nice picture of you too.

MR. PLANCHE: Thanks very much, Walter.

DR. REID: And he's got hair as well, Walt.

MR. NOTLEY: That's the high point of the question period.

DR. REID: A supplementary to the minister. At the meeting, was there any indication of any potential for future involvement between the people who were attending the meeting and the medical research foundation for expanding basic research in the province?

MR. PLANCHE: Yes, I personally have two avenues that will require following up. The department is having a debriefing meeting tomorrow with all of the exhibitors and participants, and we'll know further how it went. But I understand there was some considerable commercial activity.

Crowsnest Pass Freight Rates

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Development. Has the minister, perhaps along with the Minister of Agriculture, had a chance to assess Pepin's latest proposal on the changes in the Crow rate and how they would affect the livestock industry in Alberta?

MR. PLANCHE: We haven't formally done that, other than that we've been apprized of what they are. I didn't

see anything that would affect the livestock industry one way or another. The latest two involved a ratio between the value of grain sold and the rates, in terms of a maximum. My first reaction would be that the percentage is too high, and the second one was inclusive of four or five other crop items that would be covered by the new rate system. None of them affect the livestock industry.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

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

head: Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure (A) 1983-84

Department of Energy and Natural Resources

Agreed to:

33.1 — Administrative Support	\$410,000
33.2 — Well Servicing Incentives	\$10,000,000
33.7 — Development Drilling Incentives	\$70,000,000
33.8 — Pipeline Servicing Incentives	\$10,000,000
33.9 — Battery Servicing Incentives	\$10,000,000
Total Vote 3(a) — Minerals Management	\$100,410,000

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

[Motion carried]

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe this completes all consideration of estimates. I'm not sure we need ask for permission to sit again. Would the hon. minister wish to word the motion in that way, that we just rise and report?

MR. RUSSELL: Well, that's good news, Mr. Chairman. I move that the committee rise and report progress.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

Resolved that a further sum not exceeding \$100,410,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, for the minerals management vote under the Department of Energy and Natural Resources.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

Bill 38

Health Care Statutes Amendment Act, 1983

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the Health Care Statutes Amendment Act, 1983.

The Act incorporates amendments to three existing statutes — the Alberta Health Care Insurance Act, the Alberta Hospitals Act, and the Workers' Compensation Act — insofar as a couple of minor housekeeping amendments that are required for various Acts from time to time are incorporated in these. Other than that, there are two or three important principles I would like to comment on for a few moments.

Dealing with the statutes in the order they are listed in the Statutes Amendment (Grant Provisions) Act, first of all the Health Care Insurance Act will do three things. It will make it legal for the Alberta health care insurance plan to make payments to doctors and hospitals on behalf of those parties making claims that used to go to the Workers' Compensation Board. This is seen as a big step administratively, in that it means one institution in the province, instead of two, will be paying. It will be convenient for doctors, for example, to send all their bills to one agency to get paid for all their patients. The other thing the amendment does is permit the health care plan to keep track of those costs, to keep track of the administrative costs of paying those claims, and to bill the Worker's Compensation Board at regular intervals for the cost of those payments.

Members will recall that late in 1971, amendments were made to the Worker's Compensation Board following the report of the select committee dealing with workers' compensation matters. The way the amendments were worded, it was clear that the intent of what our government had meant to do was not embodied in the legislation; in other words, the legislative amendments transferred not only the administrative responsibility but also the financial responsibility for payment of those claims. It was never the intention to transfer the financial responsibility; merely the administrative responsibility. That would have been a very dramatic step to have taken in Canada, and it's something that we are not prepared to do at the present time. So this amending legislation is necessary to satisfy the requirements of the Provincial Auditor and to make it clear that those assessments which are going to employers throughout Alberta will be used to pay the workers' compensation health claims.

There has been some response from employer groups around the province that this is retroactive legislation and that it will increase the levies. I want to assure all those groups that have written, that this is not the case. This maintains the status quo; that is, it transfers the administrative responsibility and allows the health care plan to recover those moneys from the Workers' Compensation Board who, in turn, since 1981, have been applying those levies to pay for those claims. So I wanted to clear that matter up. About a year ago, my colleagues the minister responsible for the Workers' Compensation Board and the Provincial Treasurer and I signed a three-way memorandum outlining this, and this was the first opportunity we had to bring in this correcting legislation. It would have been brought in last fall, had there been a fall session. So that's the second important thing that occurs in that Act.

There is a small section, which members have probably

read, dealing with confidentiality of records. I believe that is self-explanatory, and I don't need to go into that. It maintains the confidentiality of a person's medical records but, upon the release of signed agreements, permits such information as may be necessary to be transferred between the health care plan and officials of the Workers' Compensation Board.

Mr. Speaker, there is also an important section in here dealing with the authority to retrieve health care premium arrears. This has been a matter of some public discussion. I believe the figure is well known out there: in the last two years, the accumulated arrears for health care premiums have gone from about \$25 million to in excess of \$45 million. Although there are a number of classes of premiums that can be written off, there are still substantial sums of money owing to the health care plan by citizens of Alberta.

We considered very carefully how to do this and looked at the arrangements of the other two provinces which have health care premiums in existence, as to the methods they use. We are adopting the exact same method as in the province of Ontario, which is the less harsh of the two methods; B.C. having the other one. In the province of Ontario — and this is the intent of this legislation — if a person's health care premium has expired, then benefits are not paid on behalf of that registrant until the arrears are paid or until arrangements to clear the arrears are made. That is the system Ontario has had in effect for many years, and they manage to maintain their arrears at the level of about 1 per cent of registrations, which is the target we're aiming for. The system that B.C. uses is harsher in that they simply don't pay any claims on behalf of a registrant who has let his premiums go into arrears.

I am happy to say that there's been quite a flurry of activity at the health care plan since our intention to do this was made known. People are coming in voluntarily, before the passage of this legislation, and making arrangements to pay their arrears. So that has been an encouraging start on that matter. There is a section in the Act which permits the spouse of a registrant who may be derelict in paying the family premiums to make his or her own arrangements, so that kind of situation is not harshly or unfairly dealt with.

I believe those are the important principles contained in the amendments to the Health Care Insurance Act. There are other minor amendments, as I mentioned, but they really are only one clause or so long, and I could answer questions on those in committee.

In the Hospitals Act, the main thing is that we have brought the requirements for elected hospital trustees into the same class of qualifications as for other elected officials at the municipal level in the province. That has replaced the resident qualification with the one where it used to call for a ratepayer.

The third Act which is amended by this statutes amendment Act is the Workers' Compensation Act. I think it's fair to say that all the amendments in there deal with the consequential amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act that relate to the program of paying doctors' claims, which I referred to earlier in my remarks dealing with the Health Care Insurance Act.

In essence, that is the purpose of the Act, Mr. Speaker. In summary I think we can say that it contains two really important principles: number one, to clarify once and for all, and in legislation which is clear, the fact that the health care plan will administer the payments of workers' compensation benefits from doctors and hospitals

throughout the province and, in turn, will retrieve the costs of those from the Workers' Compensation Board; and secondly, when this Bill is passed, if it should get passed, the health care plan will have the ability to go after residents that are in arrears and make those citizens responsible for those arrears or lose the benefit of health care insurance coverage.

It's important to note that the health care premium arrears are not tied to hospital access or benefits. I mention that because that is something that had concerned the federal government with respect to our coming user fee program for hospitals. I want to make it clear that the premium system is not tied to hospital access.

Other than that, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I think these are necessary and important things which have to be done relating to a program as expensive as the health care plan. It maintains what we believe is an element of absolute fairness, in that those who are responsible for these liabilities are the ones who will be asked to contribute toward them.

Thank you very much.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in second reading of Bill 38, I want to focus the bulk of my remarks on the provision contained within this Bill which will allow the withholding of benefits to those Albertans who have not paid their medicare premiums, either directly or on behalf of their families. I suppose that if one is committed to the notion of premiums, there has to be some penalty for people who don't pay the premiums. One of the reasons the New Democratic Party has always argued in favor of the elimination of the premium concept is that while we feel that everyone must bear their share of the cost of a program such as medicare, the best, most efficient, and fairest way to do it is through the general taxation system.

When we discussed user fees the other day, one of the members jumped up and down with excitement when he thought I had said we should increase personal income taxes. He should be under no doubt that most people who argue in favor of a universal system of health care recognize that people have to pay for it. It is a fairer way to pay for it through a tax related directly to the ability-to-pay concept, so that an increase in personal income tax will mean much more to a person who is earning \$50,000 or \$60,000 a year than it would to a person with \$10,000 or \$12,000 a year. I say without any sense of embarrassment at all — and I think the hon. Member for Glengarry was the member who noted this — if he wants to distribute it widely throughout his constituency, he is more than welcome to do so. That has been a position that my colleague and I have not only taken but I have proudly taken it. So have most Canadians, I might say, who support the principle of medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with some of the implications of the Bill we have before us. We have a government which is going to get tough. That's a very popular appeal to the right wing. It's interesting, though. We're talking about \$46 million in back medicare premiums that haven't been paid. No one is defending people not paying their bills. But this government would have been a little more convincing in its position had we not had another \$46 million figure that a rather large company owes the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission. When one of the hon. members from Calgary raised this issue in the House about whether this company was going to be forced to pay up — are we going to cut them off? Well, we found at this stage a slightly different approach

to supplying oil, some \$46 million of which hasn't been paid for by Turbo. I wonder at the inconsistency of a government which is prepared to go after the Mrs. Jones of society who may be behind in medicare payments, but on the other hand turns the other way when it comes to a \$46 million bill that is owed by a large oil company for oil they obtained and didn't pay for. If hon. members want to defend that, I would welcome that kind of debate any time, any place. So first of all, we have the inconsistency of the government's position.

It seems to me that the second thing we have to look at is the basic information base. On May 16 I asked the minister if he would table in the House the year-by-year breakdown of this \$46 million so members could have this information before the principle of Bill 38 was discussed. This is what the minister said:

Yes, I could do that. Members usually seek that kind of information by way of a motion for a return, but I'll take it as notice and get it.

Mr. Speaker, given the assurance of the minister in Oral Question Period some two weeks ago, I would have thought that when he launched into his introduction of the Bill he would have provided members with the breakdown of just exactly what this amount of arrears happens to be. We've had our research office attempt to enquire from the commission, and I don't know how many backbenchers have checked it out. But I must say that it's very difficult indeed to have any idea of what the breakdown is. We're being asked to pass a Bill, and yet the data base which one would expect would be made available to members hasn't been presented. I simply say to the minister that I find that unfortunate in the extreme.

However, from what we have been able to gather, the average amount owing is about \$132.30, the total amount divided by the number of individuals we've been advised by the health care commission are in arrears. But we don't know what the breakdown is. We suspect — and again, we can only go from the minister's answer — that for the first number of years, the total had gradually risen to \$26 million. I might just say that in that first amount, I would expect that there were at least some people who were deathly opposed to the payment of any kind of medicare in 1969. Members will recall that it was a relatively controversial matter. There were some people who, as a form of conscientious objection to the principle of medicare, refused to pay their premiums. I don't agree with that position, but they certainly were part of that original \$26 million which I presume the minister was talking about on May 16.

What we've seen in the last three years is a significant increase. Why? I suspect that the major increase has been in the last few months. One of the reasons I suspect we've seen this increase is that we have serious unemployment, because we have many, many Alberta families who are pressed to the wall. Unless government backbenchers and members are getting totally different responses from their constituents than my colleague and I are getting are from our constituents or other people in the province — we have people phone us or write in and say, I've lost my job; how am I going to pay my rent, my medicare premium? The members can say, oh, but we have this system of exemptions. The only problem is that that really doesn't fit the problems of unemployment very well, because it's based on taxable income the year before. We have a large number of people who, frankly, don't qualify for the exemptions this year. They had a good income last year, but now they're out of work. We had 60,000 people out of work in September; now we

have 140,000 people out of work. A large number of Albertans are frankly forced against the wall because of the economic circumstances. Are we going to say to these people, pay up or else? I guess that's basically what we're asking the Legislature to adopt in this Bill. Frankly, I suggest that there are other, better ways to finance health care in this province.

I want to take just a moment or two to expand on those better ways. Before we commit ourselves to an important principle which is going to impede the access of people to the system — it may not bar them, but it's certainly going to impede access to the system; no question about that — it seems to me that as members of the House, we have an obligation to evaluate the alternatives.

Among some of the intriguing arguments we hear is that it's important to pay premiums because somehow people will recognize, because of a tangible payment they make, the cost of the system. The only problem with that argument is that there is no way that the premiums even begin to cover the actual cost of our health system. They represent a relatively small part, but a part which is inequitably borne so that high-income people pay exactly the same as those people just above the exemptions set out in the Act. What it means is that the working poor, for the most part, are going to end up paying as big a part of this nuisance portion as those with a high income. I don't think that represents any sort of shock treatment so that people recognize the value of the system.

I don't think the collection of premiums has made Albertans any more aware of the cost of medicare than people in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, or Nova Scotia where the Stanfield government eliminated the premium system back in 1969. I don't think the people of Nova Scotia are spendthrifts who have no regard for the cost of medical care services, while the premium system has given Albertans this great sense of personal responsibility. No, Mr. Speaker. I think that argument is just superficial. It is not borne out by the facts. What it tends to do is set up an inefficient method of financing health care.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with why my colleague and I feel there is an inefficient method in the premium system, which is the core of the debate this afternoon. The Hall report, that this government apparently doesn't want to recognize, commissioned by the Clark government to review medicare, made a number of observations with respect to accessibility of people to the health care system and, more particularly, the premium system. On page 41 of the Hall report it says:

The matter of accessibility is more pronounced in the Provinces which collect premiums from residents, those being Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia.

That is the assessment of Mr. Justice Hall in his review of the health care system, commissioned by a national Conservative government. Mr. Speaker, that's important. Right now one of the issues in dispute, which may eventually find its way into the courts, is whether this particular provision of Bill 38, the cutoff of benefits, is in violation of federal agreements. Part and parcel of those federal agreements is that anything that impedes accessibility to the system is inconsistent with the agreements and gives the federal minister the option of cutting off funding.

Mr. Speaker, bearing in mind the seriousness of this situation and that we now have two ministers who apparently agree it's going to have to go to the courts, we have to ask ourselves: are we following a reasonable course of action in this province when we have the architect of medicare, the man who was commissioned by a

national Conservative government, saying that premiums reduce accessibility to the system? Government members can argue all they like but, as far as credibility is concerned, I suspect that the views of Mr. Justice Hall are going to carry a great deal more weight on this issue with most Albertans than do the views of any of us. [interjection] Someone said, than mine. That's quite correct. But I would also hasten to add, of all the members of the government caucus as well.

Mr. Speaker, on page 42 of the Hall report, Mr. Justice Hall notes:

Accessibility is also made more difficult to some by the imposition of so-called *authorized hospital ward charges* . . . This policy and practice of imposing . . . ward charges is an application of the "user-pay" concept which is contrary to the principle and spirit of the *National Health Program* advocated by the *Royal Commission* in 1964 and legislated into being by the *Medical Care Act* of 1966.

Mr. Justice Hall can't be any more explicit than that.

We could set aside some of those philosophical arguments. Members can stand and say that's just the leader of the NDP giving us more dangerous socialist rhetoric that he got from this noted socialist radical, Mr. Justice Hall, appointed by an equally socialist Joe Clark; the socialists are taking over the whole country; they're running away with the Conservative party; we've got people like the Member for Edmonton Glengarry burrowing from within; and it's a very dangerous situation. You could take that line of argument if you wished. But, Mr. Speaker, most reasonable people would not follow that. They would perhaps look at page 43 of the Hall report where Mr. Justice Hall looks at something that, frankly, I think the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care would be very interested in: the money, the cost. I certainly think our minister is cost conscious. I'm not sure how conscious he is of the principles of medicare, but he's certainly cost conscious. Mr. Justice Hall says:

If premiums are used (and it must be noted that the term, "premium" as used by governments is a euphemism for a "head tax" or "poll tax" . . .

The Member for Edmonton Glengarry should listen to this. He's very interested in poll taxes from his experience down in the United States with Jimmy Carter.

. . . but, it is a tax, nonetheless), the central administration costs are higher than if all the funds came from general revenues.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that the Stanfield government in Nova Scotia moved to eliminate the premium system many, many years ago was the simple proposition that it is administratively easier to handle. It is fairer to raise funds through equitably derived taxes that take into account the ability-to-pay principle, and it's a much sounder proposition from an administrative point of view.

On page 44 of the Hall report, the judge contrasts the administration costs of our public health care systems with the notion that somehow we'd be better off if we had premiums and went the route that some argue — and I note that Mr. Pocklington is one of them — that we should have private-enterprise medicare and do away with this intervention of the state.

The information on page 44 of the report is very significant; 97.5 cents out of every dollar, in fact, goes to health services in this country. Only 2.5 cents goes to administration. If you look at the private carriers — this is a pre-1958 experience that Mr. Justice Hall notes, but we come to more recent information in a moment or two —

you find that in the case of Blue Cross, 15 cents out of each dollar has to go to administration; the commercial groups: 23.5 cents out of each dollar has to go to administration. In certain other commercial groups — individual groups as opposed to group insurance programs — 41.8 cents goes to administration; and even in the co-operatives, which by and large do an excellent job, 14.2 cents. So the experience of our public plan in this country shows a lower administrative cost than any of the options available in private enterprise.

Some might argue that perhaps that was true before 1958, but all this has changed as a consequence of the explosion in health costs in the last few years. Again looking at page 44 of Mr. Justice Hall's report, he says:

The most recent data (1977) for the United States reveals that the administration costs as a percentage of total costs were as follows: non-profit organizations, 6.97 [cents out of each dollar]; and, for commercial insurance companies, 17.99 [cents out of each dollar].

In other words, 7 cents and 18 cents respectively.

This means that, depending on the choice of carrier, only 93¢ or 82¢ of each health dollar is actually available for health services, indicating a much higher overhead cost for the advantages inherent in prepayment.

The point I want to underline is that Mr. Justice Hall has not only argued the case that no one in this House, to my knowledge, is formally saying they oppose — that is, that the minister, as far as I know, is in favor of public health insurance — but he has also made the point that the premium system is more expensive than financing it through general revenue collected from the tax base of the province.

I raise those points, Mr. Speaker, because we get into a Bill such as this one, with all the possible combinations, permutations, the hardship it's going to create, the horrendous difficulties — what happens in a situation where one of the spouses doesn't pay and the other spouse isn't able to? What about the cost of administration, cancelling cards, the bureaucratic overhead which is going to be part and parcel of this effort to collect the \$46 million? I don't know how much of it is going to have to be taken in the collection process.

I say to members, before we get ourselves into this mess, why resist what seven of the 10 provinces have done? They have not destroyed their economies in the process; they haven't wrecked their health care systems. The objective data we get from these other provinces overwhelmingly leads one to the conclusion that they have just as good a system as we do, but a system that is more equitably financed. So I simply say to members of the government, before we jump on this particular bandwagon — I don't know whether they have public opinion polls where they think this is a winner, but I do know that it's going to cost a lot of extra dollars to administer. What we should be looking at is moving toward a system of financing through the general taxation of the province. Even in that framework, over a period of time we would be able to collect arrears from those people who in fact are taxpayers.

I think one other thing important, Mr. Speaker. Because financing medicare through the taxation system is related to ability to pay, it is relevant to the current ability to pay, as opposed to the sort of year after the fact situation with a cumbersome to administer, exemption concept that we have in Alberta today.

So my colleague and I are going to oppose Bill 38, not

because we think it's reasonable that people shouldn't pay when they are obliged by law to pay, but because we want to register, as clearly as we can, that as supporters of the system of medicare and universal health care, we feel that this province must get in step with other areas of Canada and finance medicare on an equitable basis. The fact that we have to look to British Columbia or Ontario to prop up our arguments — and the minister tells us that he's not as harsh as they are in B.C.; he's following the Ontario example.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that may be. But that's going to be small consolation to people who are worried, who have the stress. What happens to the wife whose husband is out of work and isn't able to pay the medicare premiums, and they don't qualify for the exemption? What happens in that sort of situation? What happens to the young woman who's pregnant and worried about her health? What kind of stress are we creating in the real world for a lot of Albertans who don't perhaps have the economic strength that almost all the members of this Assembly may have as individuals? These are the sorts of things we have to think through and have answers for. In my view, these are the sorts of things which detract from the very basic principle. For the last couple of decades, people who have been pioneers in the field of health care have fought and struggled to create the concept of medicare and hospitalization to eliminate this kind of fear and concern.

Some may say, oh anyone can pay their premiums. We all know perfectly well — where have we been? Some of the members of this Assembly are well placed, or perhaps some people are backed up by strong organizations, be it a professional organization or a union, where there can be collective bargaining so that one of the fringe benefits is a payment or part payment of the Alberta health care premiums. But there are an awful lot of people in this province, Mr. Speaker, who don't have that kind of back-up. When the Minister of Labour stands in his place and says that 84 per cent of the non-government employees, private employees, in this province are non-unionized, who is going to be bargaining for them? Who is going to bargain for the young mechanic working in a service station in rural Alberta whose wife is about to have a child? Who is going to bargain for the person working in a non-unionized shop? Who is going to bargain for the person who was working six months ago, drawing a good salary, but is now thrown out of work because of the slowdown in the construction industry or the oil drilling industry. Perhaps it's the sort of situation that this government has talked about over and over again: the impact of the national energy policy. Perhaps it's that rig worker who is worrying now about how he's going to pay the bills. Who's going to worry about him, Mr. Speaker, with this cumbersome system?

I believe that before I can vote for Bill 38, we have to have an awful lot better explanation than the minister supplied when he asked for our support on second reading, the discussion of principle, of this Bill.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could make a few remarks in reference to this Bill. I think a couple of points the hon. leader made deserve rebuttal.

The ability-to-pay principle is still affirmed in our legislation. For example, the higher income exemptions just recently announced offer relief for people who are on low or fixed incomes. There are also exemptions for students. The advantage is that people who have a limited income still have access to the health care system.

I wonder if the leader might be interested in staying. I'd like to challenge him to a debate a little later.

The concept of premiums is still not a great barrier to access to the system. The advantage is that people realize that health care does cost the people of Alberta a great deal of money. And they're reminded of that, just as I was reminded yesterday when I got my health care premium bill for \$11.40, I think it was. I had to think that that costs money.

The other aspect the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview referred to is user fees. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they are a deterrent. I think the government wants them to be a deterrent. I think we have to inject some discipline into the health care system and the use of health care services. That's really what the issue is about. The NDP leader admitted in his remarks that health care costs today are exploding. "Exploding" was his choice of word. I agree with him that health care is a service that is exploding in demand. We have to inject some discipline into the demand for health care.

I noted in the annual report of the health care insurance commission this year that the number of services performed for Albertans by the health care system in the province is about 10 or 11 per year. That contrasts with about five or six about six years ago. Albertans are using the health care system more and more. In part, the question we have to ask is, are we any healthier for it, or are we simply getting in the habit of running to the hospital or to the doctor every time we have a minor ailment?

I think the key to the whole issue is the concept that you have to be a big spender to be concerned about the little guy. I think it is an ideological hang-up of the NDP that you can't be pragmatic or reasonable in your demands for the service. If you try to put on some limits, that we would normally put on our own household finances, then you're being heartless and cruel. That's not the case, Mr. Speaker. You shouldn't equate being a big spender with being concerned about people. You can be modest, reasonable, and realistic. I think the NDP are hung up with an ideological barrier that they cannot see beyond, and that ideology is restricting their vision on this issue.

It's unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition ran away as soon as he concluded his remarks. Perhaps the axiom, if you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen, applies here, but he's not here. [interjections] Perhaps his minion from Edmonton Norwood . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would put the word "minion" almost in the same category as the word "baboon".

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, would you accept "side-kick"?

MR. SPEAKER: Do we have to measure degrees of flattery?

MR. COOK: Well, in the same vein, I think "colleague" might do. "Fellow traveller" — how's that?

Perhaps the fellow traveller of the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, who is here, would pass on the message that I'd be delighted to have a debate this month in my constituency, at a time and date to be mutually worked out. I think that would be useful. We'd like to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member again, but lest my silence — whatever you want to call it

— be construed as approval of "fellow traveller", I should say that we're really not, I hope, creating any precedents here. Perhaps we could get on with the debate and not test how many expressions we might use which might be on either side of the, shall we say, parliamentary line.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to challenge the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. Since he's not here, perhaps his colleague would pass this on: it would be useful to have a discussion in the constituency of Edmonton Glengarry, where I think there's a lot of interest in this issue. I'd be delighted to work out a time and place, and I think Edmontonians might be interested in discussing this issue. I think the NDP will find there's a lot of interest in it, and there's a lot of concern that health care costs are getting out of line. There's a lot more support for the issue than is apparent to people who have ideological blinkers on.

Finally, I'd like to make the observation that in the study of law there is an axiom that hard cases make bad law. You do not legislate for the extreme; you provide legislation that is flexible and covers the general application. If there are difficult anomalies in the administration of the legislation, that could be handled on a selective, case-by-case basis by citizen appeal boards. That provision is also applied here. There may be some difficult cases, as there are in the administration of any social program, but we can provide for those hard cases with panels of review.

Again, I think that the concept that you have to be a big spender to be concerned or compassionate doesn't wash and that our friends in the NDP have had these ideological blinkers placed on them, and they can't see that for looking.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Two members rose]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Drayton Valley has been trying to get the floor for some time.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks, I would like to take exception to the remarks the Leader of the Opposition made in stating that medical care is not readily available to Albertans. That's simply not true; it is readily available.

I am getting particularly tired of the Justice Hall report. You'd think that that thing was the be-all and end-all of health care reports. Since it's a 1980 report evaluating and criticizing his own 1962 creation, what do you expect him to do? I mean, really . . . I think the Leader of the Opposition must have memorized that report, because it's constantly quoted in this House. Surely there are other opinions on health care systems. Of course most of them are favorable, so I guess he wouldn't want to quote from them.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that anyone who has ever had a chronically ill family member — and I speak from experience — knows the value and the benefits of the Alberta health care system. Let no one misunderstand that those benefits and values are there, and they are very important and readily available.

I'd like to make a few remarks on second reading of Bill 38, as I have had numerous representations. I want to make my remarks on the changes to the Workers' Compensation Act. I've had numerous representations from employers in my constituency who are concerned about the high cost of compensation in comparison to

wages. For instance, in the oil well servicing industry, class 4-03, the cost is over \$9 per \$100 in wages. So for every \$10,000 in wages, you're spending \$900 in workers' compensation benefits. Over the year, that translates into a major cost factor.

I realize the above remarks aren't on the principle of the Bill, but I believe they're important. The reason for the concern is the changes made to section 3. I'd like to quote from a pamphlet issued by the Workers' Compensation Board. It was prior to January 1, 1982, because it's talking about the new Act which comes into effect at that date. It says all costs of basic health services, as defined in the Alberta Health Care Insurance Act, will be paid under the Health Care Insurance Act. Whether or not that was the intention of the government, that's what is in the pamphlet that went out to the employers in my constituency, and that's what they believed the intent of the Act was. For that reason, I am getting a number of concerns raised.

Most of the correspondence has asked me to consider carefully the effect of these changes. I note that today the minister said that there would be no increase in workers' compensation rates because of this change. That means that the Workers' Compensation Board must have been collecting for those costs over the past year. I sure would like an accounting of what's happened to that funding, what they've done with it. I hope they've earned a good interest rate on it. The changes to section 3 definitely make the Workers' Compensation Board responsible for these medical costs. I just wanted to raise this concern and hope that the issue of these fees paid to Workers' Compensation — not necessarily just for health care costs but all fees paid by employers to the Workers' Compensation Board — will be one of the items the select committee will have a chance to re-evaluate and that employers will have a chance to evaluate the costs of compensation and the accountability of the board to the people who pay the bills, that is, the employers.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I just want to add that note of caution and to re-emphasize that, as someone who has spent a good many years extensively utilizing the health care system — and thankfully I haven't had to use it in the last number of years — whatever we do, I don't think we should decry the value and benefit of the health care system in Alberta.

Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise and speak on Bill 38. It's always amusing to hear from the Member for Edmonton Glengarry. I will carry his wonderful words of wisdom to the Leader of the Official Opposition. It is rather amusing to hear a member who runs around in the Legislature and cuts people's ties in half talk about discipline . . . [interjections] But, regardless, we will pass it on from the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, who has delusions of grandeur about his debating ability. [interjections]

MR. COOK: You take yourself too seriously, Ray.

MR. MARTIN: I see the Minister of Labour finally woke up again. I haven't seen him since last night. Good morning.

I would like to come to the hon. minister's Bill and point out to the Member for Edmonton Glengarry that although there are higher exemptions — I agree that's been done, a slight step in the right direction — the point is that, as laid out, those exemptions are still below the

poverty level.

The other point was made by my colleague, and I guess it comes down, if you like, to a philosophical debate. I suggest that most of the ideology seems to be in the extreme right wing these days. If they want to talk about ideology, it is that the principles of medicare are clear, and the minister knows this as well as I do. It has to do with universal accessibility.

I admit that the minister has a serious problem in this particular Bill because we have premiums, which we shouldn't have and then we wouldn't have this problem. Nobody's talking about that favorite term "free lunch", and nobody's talking about big spenders. The point we're trying to make is that it comes right out of the income tax. We've said this a number of times, and we'll keep saying it: it's based on your relative ability to pay. Surely the principles of medicare mean exactly that. We decided many, many years ago — at least we thought we did — that health care was not an appropriate place to make a buck, that health care was one of the rights people had in an affluent society. So we question why provinces much worse off than Alberta, at least up to the present — though mind you, with the financial policies of this government we may be a have-not fairly soon — have done away with premiums. That was the point: we wouldn't have this problem of burgeoning debt.

Before I make a suggestion to the minister, I make the other point that because of high unemployment and the fact that we just raised medicare premiums for an average family to \$106, this problem will probably become worse in future. So obviously two things are happening: more unemployment is going to force people to have difficulty paying their arrears and, secondly, at the same time we've increased the premiums. So there's bound to be an effect. We're going to have a more major problem.

Of course we have suggested and will continue to say — and we'll continue to say this at the next forum we have; I know the Conservatives think they're here by divine right but, believe it or not, they're not; their day will come. It remains our contention that all moneys required for the operation and maintenance of the health care insurance plan should be advanced from general revenues. Again, it's not a free lunch. It is based on relative ability to pay. It's cheap. It doesn't take a great administrative cost. It comes right out of our income tax. So we don't need government bureaucracy; we don't need government involvement in administration costs, as this government is so fond of saying. The argument is a simple one. The means are equitable and, as I said, are based on an ability to pay. Premiums, regardless of the degree to which they are reduced or eliminated — and we're going in the opposite direction — remain regressive.

Recognizing that there is a problem here — I believe the minister said it's around \$46 million in arrears at this particular time, and I believe this includes all arrears owing since the inception of the program in 1969. Alberta health care records show the number of individuals in arrears since 1969 to be some 370,379. That's from the minister's own department. Simple division yields an average outstanding debt by individual Albertans of approximately \$130. I expect some would owe more and some much less, but the average is \$130. Recognizing that we have a problem because we have premiums and we have that debt — the NDP recognizes that people have to pay their bills. For instance, it's a bad principle to say that this family that was right on the borderline paid their medicare premiums and another family in a very similar situation didn't. So we have a problem. Somehow we

have to make people pay the bills. Even though we don't agree with the law at the particular time, I think it still was the law, and we should try to collect the money. To that degree the minister and I agree.

But I suggest that the policy is how we go about making good on outstanding arrears. Rather than through the Draconian and brutal extreme — we believe Bill 38 flies in the face of a fundamental principle of free access — there's another way to do it. Believe it or not, it cuts down on administrative costs and you don't need to create another government bureaucracy to go out and collect taxes. We're suggesting, as we do for all premiums, that the arrears come through putting them into the standard annual collection of personal income tax payable by Alberta residents to the Crown in right of Alberta. Basically an individual's arrears will be tacked onto their payable provincial income tax.

It's our contention — and maybe we're wrong in this — that this could be done through a simple order in council adopted under section 37 of the Alberta Income Tax Act. Perhaps it can't, and in the unlikely event that this was not deemed proper, a minor amendment to the Act would enable such a collection through our income tax. As most of the individuals affected would in all likelihood fall into lower income categories, the NDP suggests that the dollar amount of any arrears so collected be limited in any given taxation year to a figure not exceeding 10 per cent of the total provincial tax payable and, in instances where this amount is not sufficient to cover outstanding arrears, that such collection be spread over as many taxation return years as is necessary to recover the entire outstanding debt.

The disadvantage of this proposal is simply that we're never going to track down people who have moved to other countries. I think the minister would agree that even under his proposal you can't do that. We're more likely to get the people more recently in arrears. It's unlikely that we're going to get a lot of the people back to 1969 anyway.

I think there are two main advantages to collecting arrears through income tax. Number one, it maintains the principle of universal accessibility to medicare while simultaneously providing that the collection of any arrears will not constitute an intolerable financial burden to the individual involved. But the key is that we are making people pay their bills. One of the reasons the minister brought in this part of Bill 38 is so they're not getting an unfair advantage over other people who did pay their bills under those circumstances. It's collecting it in a much more humane and better way that will not cost the taxpayers as much. It would cut down the administration costs, because we do not need to create another bureaucracy. We do not have to, if you like, create massive government involvement. We simply do it through the income tax.

Mr. Speaker, we go back again to universality. I do not believe in premiums to begin with. But because we've had premiums, we do have this debt, and we should attempt to recover it. I suggest to the minister — if we talk about ideology, that we want to be punitive about it — that this could get the money the minister is talking about in a much more efficient way than setting up this collection agency he's talking about that could create problems in terms of accessibility and what the minister's been talking about with the federal minister, that would end up in the courts. There's absolutely no way the federal minister could say this was against accessibility. It would certainly fall into universality; there'd be no argument at all. We'd be in no danger of losing the federal money. I make that

constructive suggestion to the minister to think over. I believe it solves two problems. Surely it shouldn't be a matter of being a right-wing or left-wing proposal. It's there. I hope the minister will take a look at the idea in good faith. I think it could be done, and that's how I propose it to the minister.

In conclusion, I just say again that we suggest that at the same time there are many other ways to cut costs in the whole health care area. The other day the minister said we hadn't advanced alternatives. We have. We went from seat belts, to looking at clinics, to looking at what paramedics could do, to home delivery: a number of things. But we haven't heard anything back from the minister. We think there would be substantial savings there. Above all, the place to pay for medicare is not through regressive taxes, and that's what a premium is. A tax is a tax is a tax, but it is a regressive tax. Let's collect the money through our general revenues, which was meant to be when medicare was brought in.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NELSON: I've been biting my tongue here for the last couple of weeks listening to some people on the opposite side who seem to be hung up on their own self-importance. It seems unusual but ...

MR. SPEAKER: I don't want to be overly sensitive about a certain amount of give and take, good-natured joshing, and so on, but do we need to discuss the personalities of the members rather than the substance of their arguments?

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, certainly it does become part of the debate and sometimes you have to give a little when you take a little.

Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to understand how people, especially on the opposite side — they stand up and wish to discuss and debate a particular issue. We tend to sit and listen reasonably intently to understand the points of view they wish to offer on a particular subject. I think we do listen and evaluate, as we've done with Bill 44. We listened to the public and to the members opposite, and we made a number of changes to that Bill. Bill 38 is no different. I think we can listen and learn. But unfortunately, some of us run away like frightened pussycats and don't want to listen to our points of view, and therefore don't get the drift of the whole issue.

It's unfortunate that opinions on health care offered by the Leader of the Opposition, so often regarding the Hall report — it seems that this becomes the end-all. The suggestion is that no one else has any views or opinions relevant to health care. Certainly many in the community know more about health care, the issue of the cost of medicine and what have you, than Mr. Hall.

I have a couple of concerns relevant to Bill 38. When the minister responds in closing debate, I would like him to reiterate some of the areas we've been receiving letters on from businessmen and their concern that the costs to them are increasing, that there have been some changes, and that we've double-crossed them in some manner. I've spoken to the minister, and he has indicated this is not the case. I would like to have that on record so when we respond to many of these letters, we are able to do so in a manner that is recorded in the proper fashion to have these people better understand the issue of Bill 38.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make another comment that was made by the Member for Edmonton Norwood, which you didn't pick up. He was talking about the lack

of discipline in our House. I didn't see the Member for Edmonton Glengarry get up and run away because he may not get his way, as the Member for Edmonton Norwood did a week or so ago. If we are to keep the decorum in the House in some reasonable fashion, I think it has to be from both sides of the House. Possibly we may have to start jumping up a little bit ourselves in determining a point of privilege or order, to assist you in closing down some of the activities that are thrown at us. We tend to sit here and take it because we know it's usually garbage anyway and we don't normally want to respond to it. I don't know why I'm doing it here, although I've been sitting quietly for so long.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about financial policies of government relevant to the issue of health care. Bill 38, of course, becomes part of that. Financial policies have to be developed with the whole business of government in mind, not one area of government. If the members of the opposition were to continue to make some of the statements they do, relevant to the costs of operating government — one minute they're saying we should have free health care, the next minute they're saying we should have free this or free that. The next thing you know, the budget they want will be double what we have now, and the deficit would be larger than the province or even the country could afford. So we'd have a social state that is broke, like most social states in the world. Most social states in the world are bankrupt, and we all know that.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the minister will respond to the issue of universal access to medical care. I believe we do have universal access. I would be interested in the minister commenting on this and on the reasons we have it, just so the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood gets the message and also learns something about the issue of medical care in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, rather than get into some other rhetoric relevant to the members opposite, I will again hold my tongue and ask if the minister, in closing debate, would respond to the three or four issues I have raised, plus other issues.

Thank you.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, in order to clarify a few positions and also to address a few comments to some of the speeches that were made here, first I would like to set on record for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, who was a signatory of the report dated April 1980, recommendation 12:

That the Alberta Health Care Insurance Plan assume responsibility for payment of medical aid rendered to injured workers under The Workers' Compensation Act.

As my colleague indicated, the reason was:

By consolidating payment of doctors' fees under one agency there will be improved efficiency and cost savings.

So often we hear the two hon. members speak as if they are champions of small business in this country. Yet they didn't make any comment about section 3 of Bill 38. It is a reversal in the legislation, and we accept it. But it's interesting that they didn't make one remark on the hardship being created for the business community. It was not easily dealt with but deliberated very extensively. I have assured wherever possible — and my colleague mentioned it, but I want to set it on the record — that the Workers' Compensation Board advised in a news release last week that there will be no increase in the rates in 1984 and the rates will be maintained at the 1983 level.

This also takes into consideration the reversal of the legislation that was part of the Workers' Compensation Act in 1981.

Their colleagues the Friends of Medicare — and there may be some of them in the gallery — were the first ones to criticize that the health care insurance plan was absorbing the cost of injured workers in this province. To me, as the minister responsible, it was a difficult dilemma. A portion of employers in this province who are independent proprietors pay their medical premiums to the health care commission and then, if they are injured, are assessed back the cost of health care. But those two hon. members never spoke on behalf of that section of the community. I look forward to the participation of one of the hon. members on the next select committee. No doubt they will be willing to serve on it, because I have shared that this should be, and no doubt will be, a challenge for the next select committee to review once more. The purpose of my reference to this report is that they keep referring to the report by Dr. Hall. Well here is another report. Reports are not always that clear and that acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I support Bill 38. I look forward to further deliberation in the select committee that was promised in the Speech from the Throne and that no doubt will be appointed, and to the participation of the members of the New Democratic Party in trying to resolve this dilemma for the citizens of Alberta.

[Motion carried; Bill 38 read a second time]

[On motion, the Assembly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole]

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

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the committee please come to order.

Bill 11 **Department of Utilities and Telephones** **Amendment Act, 1983**

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment, which has been circulated. Are there any questions or comments regarding the amendment?

[Motion on amendment carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 11, the Department of Utilities and Telephones Amendment Act, 1983, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 12 **Alberta Government Telephones** **Amendment Act, 1983**

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are no amendments. Are there any questions or comments regarding this Bill as presented?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 12, the Alberta Government Telephones Amendment Act, 1983, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 39
Local Authorities Election Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments on Bill 39, with the amendments?

[Motion on amendments carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 39, the Local Authorities Election Act, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 43
Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1983

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions or comments?

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with some of the principles of Bill No. 43 — if I can get some of my papers together — I notice that we have a number of amendments, and I assume we are speaking to the amendments at the moment. Would the minister explain the purpose for amendment (b), whereby section 171.2 is changed by adding section (5) after section (4)? We have just received this. I wonder if I could ask the minister, through the Chair, if some of the concerns I've raised with him in the past have been addressed in the amendments. I haven't had a chance to look at them all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair has some difficulty. I am not aware that there are any amendments. I don't have them anyway. Are there some, Mr. Minister?

MR. KOZIAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, they were circulated about half an hour ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very well. You can carry on then.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might respond to the question that was posed. Since the introduction of Bill 43, the Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1983, I've received indications of some concern from the hon. Member for Red Deer, as well as from municipal governments in the province in those areas where a business tax is not levied or, in the case of Grande Prairie, where they are even considering vacating the business tax levy and, in light of that, the applicability of the business revitalization zone.

The amendment that is submitted to the Bill would accommodate a municipality that did not have a general business tax by-law. That would respond to the concern the Member for Red Deer verbally relayed to me some days ago.

[Motion on amendments carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 43, the Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1983, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 1
Department of Manpower Act

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding the sections of this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the hon. Premier, I move that Bill No. 1, the Department of Manpower Act, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 6
Architects Amendment Act, 1983

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments regarding the provisions of this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 6, the Architects Amendment Act, 1983, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 37
**Department of Public Works,
Supply and Services Act**

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move an amendment to Bill No. 37. I believe it was distributed earlier today, and everybody should have it. I will make a couple of points on the amendment. With regard to section 11, the word "services" is removed, which essentially puts the section the way it was before in the Department of Government Services Act. The reason is that upon subsequent reflection it was found that there was some difficulty in defining the word "services".

In section 21(2), this was a drafting amendment to make it more technically correct in terms of existing procedures with the way the records committee actually operates.

[Motion on amendments carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 37, the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services Act, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 35
**Hail and Crop Insurance
Amendment Act, 1983**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions or comments regard-

ing the provisions of this Act?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. FJORDBOTTON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Hail and Crop Insurance Amendment Act, 1983, be [reported].

[Motion carried]

Bill 36

Provincial Parks Amendment Act, 1983

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment, which has been circulated, even to the Chairman. Are there any questions or comments regarding the amendment?

[Motion on amendment carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 36, the Provincial Parks Amendment Act, 1983, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 48

Universities Amendment Act, 1983

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions or comments?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 48, the Universities Amendment Act, 1983, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 51

**Occupational Health and Safety
Amendment Act, 1983**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 51, the Occupational Health and Safety Amendment Act, 1983, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 57

Public Service Amendment Act, 1983

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments?

MR. MARTIN: I'd be remiss, and I know the hon. member ... But I'll be short, because I can't ring the bells. I will just ask the minister a question. Has any thought been given to calling this the Conservative patronage Act, 1983?

AN HON. MEMBER: Order.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I regret that the member continues to misunderstand the purpose of the Bill.

I would like to make a few very brief remarks about the Bill, because when it was given second reading on May 17, 1983, it led to the Leader of the Opposition making some remarks. I'm sorry he's not able to be in his place, but perhaps the Member for Edmonton Norwood could convey my comments.

When I introduced the Bill at second reading, I indicated that the Public Service Act provides the Public Service Commissioner with the opportunity, with discretion, to exempt appointments on the grounds of persons having specialized knowledge or where there was an urgency for the position to be filled and it was believed that competitions could not result in another appointment. Bill 57 widens these grounds to encompass the effective utilization of employees.

The Member for Spirit River-Fairview and, I presume from the remarks today, the Member for Edmonton Norwood appear to interpret too broadly the key meaning of that clause: the effective utilization of employees. The exemption applies to persons who are already employees. In the Act, employees are those persons appointed to positions pursuant to the Act. Therefore the clause does not change at all the present application of the Act as it applies to appointing new staff. It seems that the remarks we've been hearing are perhaps an historical lesson, but are irrelevant.

It seems unfortunate to have to say this, but rather than exempting employees from areas where service levels are diminishing and providing them with an opportunity, even when they are not qualified to have new appointments, is something the opposition members — I put them all together, since they all voted that way — would not wish this government to do. Rather, it would seem that they would wish the employees to be laid off or terminated.

The point of the amendment to the Act is simply to provide the Public Service Commissioner the opportunity to ensure that employees of the government are given the opportunity to have new employment when they may not be so qualified. Obviously the department which employed the employees would take it upon itself to ensure that those employees are given the opportunity for full training.

Mr. Chairman, I think those remarks will clarify the uncertainty in the members' minds and provide answers to the questions the member raised on the 17th.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 57, the Public Service Amendment Act, 1983, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 62

**Land Surface Conservation
and Reclamation Amendment Act, 1983**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. BRADLEY: I move that Bill 62, the Land Surface Conservation and Reclamation Amendment Act, 1983, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 202
An Act to Amend the
Blind Persons' Rights Act

MR. CHAIRMAN: An amendment has been circulated. Are there any questions or comments regarding the amendment?

[Motion on amendment carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. SZWENDER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 202, An Act to Amend the Blind Persons' Rights Act, be reported.

[Motion carried]

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration and reports Bills 1, 12, 6, 35, 48, 51, 57, and 62, and also reports with some amendments Bills 11, 39, 43, 37, 36, and 202.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I move that we now move to third readings of Bills as they appear on the Order Paper, except for Bills 27, 34, 55, and 21.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

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

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following Bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried]

No.	Title	Moved by
2	Aerial Photographic Survey Repeal Act	Sparrow
3	Registered Music Teachers' Association Repeal Act	Diachuk (for LeMessurier)
4	Planning Amendment Act, 1983	Musgrove
8	Professional Statutes Amendment Act, 1983	Fyfe
9	Consumer and Corporate Affairs Statutes Amendment Act, 1983	Diachuk (for Osterman)
13	Water Resources Commission Act	Young (for Payne)

No.	Title	Moved by
14	Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1983	Young (for Crawford)
15	Department of Transportation Amendment Act, 1983	Fjordbotten (for M. Moore)
16	Companies Amendment Act, 1983	Alexander
17	Health Occupations Amendment Act, 1983	Bogle (for King)
19	Department of Social Services and Community Health Amendment Act, 1983	Koper
20	Rural Gas Amendment Act, 1983	Cripps
29	Business Corporations Amendment Act, 1983	Diachuk (for Osterman)
30	Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Amendment Act, 1983 (No. 2)	Young (for Hyndman)
31	Energy Resources Conservation Amendment Act, 1983	Sparrow (for Lee)
40	Alberta Corporate Income Tax Amendment Act, 1983	Young (for Hyndman)
41	Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1983	Young (for Hyndman)

Bill 42
Tobacco Tax Act

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the Provincial Treasurer, and being a non-smoker, it gives me special pleasure to move third reading of Bill 42, the Tobacco Tax Act.

[Motion carried; Bill 42 read a third time]

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following Bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried]

No.	Title	Moved by
44	Labour Statutes Amendment Act, 1983	Young
46	Department of Housing Act	Sparrow (for Shaben)
49	Petroleum Marketing Amendment Act, 1983	Kowalski
50	Alberta Energy Company Amendment Act, 1983	Young (for Hyndman)
53	Franchises Amendment Act, 1983	Carter
54	Financial Administration Amendment Act, 1983	Young (for Hyndman)

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, that concludes the government business for the House today. It is not the intention that the Assembly would sit tomorrow night. I understand that the day has been given to government business, and it's proposed to proceed with second reading of government Bills 67, 66 and, if time permits, 59, and if there's still time after that, to go to Committee of the Whole for third readings.

I move that you do now call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 5:11 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House
adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]