

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Wednesday, November 30, 1983 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, today I'm very proud to be able to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly Mr. Surendranarain Saxena and Mr. Resham Singh of ONGC of India, who have been here for the last two weeks to inspect the first of 12 workover rigs which have been sold to India by IPS Oilfield Equipment Manufacturing Ltd. They are accompanied by Mr. Jim Helps, president and general manager of IPS. The value of those 12 workover rigs is \$12 million, and Mr. Helps tells us that in the last six months the staff has increased from 10 to 63 and that that order of 12 workover rigs has in fact given spinoff jobs to 60 other Alberta companies.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you and my colleagues would want to join me in wishing Mr. Saxena and Mr. Singh good health and happiness and, of course, ONGC of India and Mr. Helps continued success. They are accompanied by Mr. Aki Nawata, our executive director for the Far East in International Trade. I would like to ask them to rise to receive the welcome of this Assembly.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the answer to Question No. 146.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the reply to Motion for a Return No. 207.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the reply to Motion for a Return No. 208.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table with the Legislative Assembly the annual report of the Electric Energy Marketing Agency for the year ended March 31, 1983, and the annual report of the Department of Utilities and Telecommunications for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1983.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 28 students from Ottewell junior high, situated in the constituency of Edmonton Gold Bar. These students are also residents of the southeast area of Edmonton and represent the constituencies of Edmonton Mill Woods and Edmonton Avonmore. These students are members of the student council and the room rep. organization. They are accompanied by their principal, Al Muzyka, teachers Julia Cartledge and Terry Patterson, and bus driver John Greco. They are situated in the members gallery,

and I would ask them to rise and receive the usual accord of the House.

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 25 students from the current affairs class of the Alberta Vocational Centre, which is situated in Edmonton Centre. They are accompanied by their teacher and leader, Mrs. Anne Nikolai. They are seated in the members gallery, and I would ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to members of the House, 10 representatives of the Committee of the Unemployed, hailing from as far south as Lethbridge, from Whitecourt and Barrhead in the north, and from the city of Edmonton. They are seated in the members gallery, and I would ask that they stand and be recognized by members of the House.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

**Housing Corporation Land Purchases**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the hon. Minister of Housing, and ask whether Alberta Housing has any plans in place for the development of the 1,800 acres of land it owns near the community of Fort Kent?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to check on that particular matter. Yesterday, in responding to a question, I indicated that the Alberta Housing Corporation had considerable land holdings throughout the province and that generally those land holdings resulted from a request by a municipality. I'd have to check on the status of a particular block of land at any particular time, in terms of how far development has proceeded and what the plans are.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, would it be appropriate for me to respond to questions raised in the House yesterday with respect to certain land near the town of Smoky Lake?

Questions were asked with respect to the policy of the Alberta Housing Corporation on purchase prices of land when the government considers purchasing them. The policy of AHC is to obtain a private appraisal for any purchase over \$200,000. For parcels of land less than \$200,000, internal appraisals are conducted. When I conclude my responses, Mr. Speaker, I'll file copies of the appraisals with the Legislature Library.

In my first response, I indicated that we generally respond to requests by municipalities. In the case of Smoky Lake, the request was conveyed to AHC by the town of Smoky Lake and confirmed by council resolution. Subsequently, the purchase took place. With respect to searching titles, we particularly search when the land is owned by a company, and we do a search of the Companies Branch. Mr. Speaker, on this particular question that was raised by the member of the opposition, the Member for Redwater-Andrew raised a similar question with my predecessor on a previous occasion. The matter was checked into thoroughly, so I'll be filing a number of documents.

The second question that I took notice of related to the plans the government has for developing the land it owns in the town of Smoky Lake. At the present time, the land is banked. There are no plans to service it and develop lots at this time, because the need and demand has changed rather significantly since the purchase in 1980.

The third part of the question was what the reasons were that Alberta Housing paid \$1 million for a quarter section of land east of Smoky Lake, which was worth \$.5 million the very same day. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be useful — I'm going to file a copy of the duplicate certificate of title in order to assist the Leader of the Opposition to improve his research in the future. The interests by the companies were registered on the title dated ...

MR. NOTLEY: Make sure your research is right now, Larry. You've had a day to think about it.

MR. SHABEN: I wish to advise the Assembly that the Alberta Housing Corporation purchased the quarter section of land from a numbered company, 121106 Development Ltd., on July 29, 1980. The interest of that company in that land was registered on the duplicate certificate of title — which I'll file — in 1978, when Keno sold the land to that company under an agreement for sale. So it was on the title.

In terms of the value of the land, in my first response I indicated that the policy of the corporation is to have private appraisals conducted. The appraisal that was conducted on June 30 provided a value of \$1,046,500 for the property, and that was one month prior to the purchase. Subsequent to the request by the hon. Member for Redwater-Andrew to look into the matter in the fall of 1981, we conducted another appraisal of the said property — which I will file as well — that provided a report of a value of \$1.2 million for the property.

Mr. Speaker, I believe these respond to the questions that were raised.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in the question period, that's a little difficult to get into without inciting a debate. But I will just pursue my question with respect to today's agenda, and ask the hon. minister what the policy of the Alberta Housing Corporation is with respect to the use of numbered companies in purchasing land.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't understand the question. Does it refer to the Housing Corporation establishing numbered companies to purchase land, or is the question with respect to the Alberta Housing Corporation purchasing land from numbered companies?

MR. NOTLEY: It's with respect to the question of the use of numbered companies. [interjections]

MR. SHABEN: I still don't understand in what manner the hon. member is referring to "use of numbered companies".

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll be glad to be a little more definitive, then. Perhaps I could come specifically to the question, and ask whether or not there has been any departmental investigation of why the Alberta Housing Corporation used a numbered company — used a numbered company — to purchase three quarter sections of land near Fort Kent.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the very first question the hon. member asked me this afternoon related to that matter, and I indicated that I would check into it and reply.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. During the course of that checking, could the minister also determine, and report back, whether the government is in a position to evaluate or check that the solicitor for the numbered company that purchased one of those three quarters valued the land at

\$320,000 but that Alberta Housing Corporation paid \$645,000 for that land? Has the minister undertaken any investigation of what appears to be a rather significant discrepancy between the valuation and what the Alberta Housing Corporation in fact paid?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that the policy of the corporation was to obtain private appraisals for land for which the corporation pays in excess of \$200,000. I'm not sure of what content and in what way the appraisal the member refers to has been provided. I would have to check and see whether that reference is to an appraisal obtained by the corporation or another appraisal.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It's becoming increasingly apparent that this is not a topic that can be handled in a practical way in the question period. The hon. member has some particularized information which may or may not justify the conclusions that he is implying or stating in his questions. These questions really should be on the Order Paper.

I was astonished to hear the hon. minister, in one of his answers, indicate to some extent that the matter related back to something that had occurred in 1980. I would respectfully suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that if he has any further questions that are in any way similar to the number that he has attempted to ask so far — some without success, because they're obviously not intended for the question period when they go into that kind of detail — he should put them on the Order Paper, or perhaps even better than that, simply write the minister a letter and outline the details he wants.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. The reason we got into a more detailed question was because of a question to me, across the aisle, by the minister.

But I will ask a general question; that is, ask the minister whether or not the government, through the Alberta Housing Corporation, has undertaken any review or study of the adequacy of the appraisal methods used by the Alberta Housing Corporation.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure of the intent of the question. I indicated that we undertake appraisals through private appraisal firms prior to the purchase of land. That's on properties of a price in excess of \$200,000. If the question is, have we conducted an appraisal of our appraisals, I'm not sure; I'd have to check on that. I will do so and report back to the House.

#### **Petroleum Exploration Payments**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, and ask him what the government policy is with respect to paying funds to oil companies who are performing seismic-shooting exploration procedures. In particular, what attempts are made by the government, in developing policies, to ensure that there is a verification of the objectives of the companies' activities?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to respond to that question by the hon. member. At the outset, I must say that I'm somewhat surprised that that question is only arising today, given that last Friday the hon. member put out a full press release, with background, calling for a provincial inves-

tigation, yet has only seen fit today to finally raise it in the House.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If you're going to insist that we don't incite debate on this side, fair enough. But when that kind of provocative statement is made by a minister, it should be ruled out of order. Now I'm quite prepared to see the rules set aside, and we'll incite debate on both sides of the House. But I think the rules have to apply fairly.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we get too exercised or excited about this situation, I've interpreted what the hon. minister was saying as a point of order.

MR. NOTLEY: Oh, what nonsense. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. leader is being totally improper in that comment. He says "what nonsense" when I have just completed the first sentence. I was about to enlighten him by explaining why that was a point of order. If he wouldn't be quite so hasty with remarks which are absolutely not becoming to a Leader of the Opposition and totally unparliamentary, perhaps he would give me an opportunity to give reasons for what I said. I've noticed on a number of occasions that the hon. leader doesn't like to be interrupted in mid-sentence either.

Let's just deal with this question of a point of order. As I understood what the hon. minister was saying, the hon. Leader of the Opposition gave out a statement a week ago — I wasn't aware of it — in which he gave information on the topic he is now asking for information about. Consequently, that raised in my mind the possibility that there was a point of order here. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition already had the information, to the point where he made a press release on it, then it would be publicly known and would not be something to ask about in the question period.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Speaker well knows — and the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources is an accomplished performer in the House — that if you have a point of order, you rise on a point of order. That is the normal way to raise a point of order. I find it rather strange, Mr. Speaker, that in your position as the non-partisan Speaker in the Chair, you would find points of order when in fact what you had was a clear effort on the part of the minister to incite debate, which is fair enough. But then he shouldn't be surprised when he gets a response from this side.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It isn't necessary for someone raising a point of order to say they're raising a point of order. The substance of what the member says is quite adequate in most cases.

When we come to talking about performers in the House, I would suggest that that might be given some further consideration, not to the point of withdrawing it; I'm not asking that it be withdrawn. But it's an indication of insincerity on the part of the minister, to say that he's a performer in the House and that what he's doing is a performance rather than a genuine statement.

The matter is closed. If the hon. leader wishes to proceed with his questioning, I'll hear him. If he wishes to continue on the point of order, I'll recognize someone else.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to continue on the point of order; I'm going to continue on a point of privilege. I am really quite astonished, sir, at the assertion you've made;

quite astonished that you suggest that the comment I made that the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources knows the rules, in the sense of being a good performer in the House, is somehow a suggestion of insincerity on the minister's part. It was not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. This is the second time this afternoon that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has used a device of this kind. The way in which the remark was made did not indicate at all that the hon. leader was complimenting the minister on his excellent performance according to the rules of the House; that's the construction he's putting on it now. The same thing arose previously, when the hon. Leader of the Opposition was asking about the use of numbered companies. I wondered about the question myself, because he didn't indicate whether he wanted to know about the use of numbered companies by the government or by a seller of property or by whomever. He subsequently used that point to justify the amount of detail which we went into.

MR. MARTIN: What's this got to do with what we're talking about?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm just saying that that is not an acceptable type of approach, that's all.

Now the point of order and the alleged point of privilege have been dealt with. I'm saying for the last time that if the hon. Leader of the Opposition wishes to proceed with his line of questions, I'll be glad to recognize him. If he wants to deal with the point of order or the point of privilege, I propose not to recognize him.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll pursue the questions, because they are important ones. I had put the question to the minister, and asked what attempts are made by the government to verify the objectives of companies' activities before paying out money to oil companies performing seismic shooting exploration procedures.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to have the opportunity to respond. The matter that the hon. member is raising is a concern that the government is aware of. I should hasten to add that the concern raised in respect of the incentive programs is one that, to my knowledge, has been unsubstantiated. Nevertheless, I should make clear that in the administration of both the geophysical incentive program and the related petroleum incentive program, the government has been undertaking an even more rigorous technical evaluation of the geophysical incentive applications. In respect of the petroleum incentive payment applications, audits of those applications are conducted.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, to be a little more specific. What guidelines are then in place with regard to both the Alberta incentives program and PIP, to prevent exploration activities from shooting only as much as they can, as fast as they can, without ever indicating that their objectives are close to finding major discoveries?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I trust it will come as no surprise to the hon. member that when one is doing geophysical activity, the objective is to search out oil- and gas-bearing formations and, relatedly, there is never any certainty about that. It's a very high risk business, and that is the nature of the industry and the business, which I trust the hon. member would acknowledge.

Mr. Speaker, I should say that with respect to the geophysical incentive program, the guidelines that are followed — and it's important to understand that under the geophysical incentive program, the incentive payments are on a flat-rate basis, a stated amount per kilometre. In order to ensure that the programs are properly implemented, the department currently operates under information letter 83/10 — subject, geophysical incentive regulations, 1983 — of June 8, 1983. That information letter spells out the technical standards that must be met in order to have specific geophysical activity qualify for the grants. Relatedly, the Alberta petroleum incentive payment program is one in which the incentive is paid on the basis of the actual cost incurred by the explorer. In that regard, to ensure that the benefits paid match the actual costs incurred, auditing procedures are in place.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the minister. In those procedures, what consideration has been given to concern expressed by people in the industry about what one might describe as speculation shooting, as opposed to seismic development related to clearly defined exploration objectives — speculative shooting as opposed to work specifically done for a client company which has exploration objectives in mind before undertaking seismic work.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: In fact, Mr. Speaker, the term that I understand in the industry is reconnaissance geophysical work. It is not uncommon in the industry, and that has been a practice for many, many years.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the minister. What discussion has taken place with the industry committee, which has recently been brought together, of people concerned about the impact of the incentive programs and the fact that there is, in the view of at least some people ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. leader now wishes to embellish the question with some allegations by other people that he wants to throw at the minister. The question is complete.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, the government has been working closely with the various associations involved, including the Independent Petroleum Association of Canada, the Canadian Society of Exploration Geophysicists, and the Canadian Association of Geophysical Contractors. More specifically in answer to that question, meetings were held by officials of the petroleum incentive payment with the Canadian Society of Exploration Geophysicists on July 20, July 27, August 10, September 16, September 23, and October 17. Relatedly, meetings were held with the Canadian Association of Geophysical Contractors on September 21, and with the Independent Petroleum Association of Canada on September 20, September 29, and November 1.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the minister. Why were no meetings held before, given widespread concern in the industry about the practice, particularly the practice of speculative seismic shooting, and the concern of companies that this in fact may mean that public funds are not being wisely ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is quite out of order. The question was quite complete when the hon. member asked why meetings weren't held before. The rest of it was just something that the question was used as a vehicle to fit into the question period.

MR. NOTLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, then let me put the question to the minister: why is it that meetings were not held until September of this year, when everybody in the oil industry ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, the meetings, if the hon. member didn't hear me, were held as of July. In fact, in terms of these unsubstantiated allegations, there has been good communication with industry and government throughout. If the hon. member has some direct evidence, I trust he will be tabling it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

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

MR. NOTLEY: Is the minister telling the House that no one in this government received any complaints about the impact of speculative seismic shooting and possible abuse of the PIP grants, until meetings were held in September of this year? Is that what the minister is saying?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, what I have done is outlined the dates of formal meetings with specific industry associations, which commenced in July. There are other ways to communicate, as the hon. member would be aware, and communication would obviously initiate some time before formal meetings were held. I should mention to the Assembly, and for the benefit of the hon. member, that we have an ongoing and very healthy dialogue with industry.

#### Child Welfare Legislation

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health is with regard to the Child Welfare Act, which will remain on the Order Paper. Could the minister indicate what procedures are in place for that Bill to be studied between now and the spring session?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to. As I indicated when we introduced the Bill, we welcome public input relative to the principles of the Bill. We sent out 1,500 copies to different agencies and individuals across the province, and we asked these individuals and groups to provide us with input. It's my intention to meet with as many individuals as I possibly can within the time frame between now and the spring session. The expectation, however, is that these groups or individuals would prepare written statements to send to me, in the process of reviewing the principles of the Bill, and to come in with revised legislation in the spring.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Will public advertisements be placed in various papers, requesting input into this respective Bill? Will the minister travel the province and make himself available to the various publics that would like to meet with him, and would those dates be announced with plenty of lead time?

DR. WEBBER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would check *Hansard*, it is very clear that I outlined the process when the Bill was introduced. It's not the intention to have public hearings. That process occurred when the Cavanagh Board of Review had public hearings across the province to get input on child welfare matters; that's been completed. The intention

here is to get input from the public relative to reaction to the Cavanagh Board of Review, as well as to Bill 105. As I indicated, I'd be happy to receive that input, but there are no planned public meetings across the province.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Could the minister advise whether he will be available and has set time aside in the month of February — normally the ministers are on holiday in January — so that the public has direct access to the minister and any type of input is not filtered through the bureaucratic system? The reason for my question today is to know whether the public will have access to the minister, and is there deliberate planning in place that makes that access available to the general public?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member certainly has access to my office if he would like to provide some input. I would also expect that many individuals and groups in the public would approach their MLAs for their involvement in terms of bringing their views forward for debate in this Legislature when the Bill is discussed next spring.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is the minister saying that the only route to him is through the MLAs in the respective constituencies and that he will await the response of the public through the MLAs into this House? Or will there be time available to the general public to meet directly with the minister?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I have difficulty . . . I'm wondering why the member is asking the question two or three times. I've indicated a willingness to meet with those individuals and groups there's time to meet with, between now and the spring session. The preferred route would be to receive very clear impressions through written submissions. However, any individual or group is free to ask for an appointment, and we'll try to accommodate these people as best we can.

#### **Young Offenders Legislation**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar, who is carrying the Young Offenders Act through the House. Could the hon. member indicate what procedures will take place between now and the spring session, to allow the public direct access to the member who is sponsoring that Bill in this House?

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, is it appropriate for a private member to respond to such a question?

MR. SPEAKER: I think there is a recognized rule that a question may be directed to a private member, or a non-ministerial member, in relation to some special responsibility that member may have. I don't suppose it would extend to all special responsibilities, but this seems to be a rather public one.

MR. HIEBERT: In response to the hon. member's question, as was stated when the Bill was introduced, it will be left to die on the Order Paper and we will be soliciting responses to it. I have already had some inquiries from throughout the province and have circulated the Bill to the various interested parties, and they've indicated that they'll be making a response. I'm sure other members will be receiving some response to the Bill, and we will take that under consideration.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Will the hon. member set aside a special time, say the month

of February, in which presentations can be made to the member, and there's open access to the general public for his review?

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, at this point in time, I'm not in a position to give such an indication.

MR. SPEAKER: Having answered a question, I suppose the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar should have his turn by-and-by. The hon. Member for Stony Plain, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar.

#### **Vehicle Registration Program**

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Attorney General, in his capacity as Acting Solicitor General. Can the minister inform this Assembly why the issuing agencies for licence plates are not allowed to distribute the plates from their offices, and the plates must be sent through the mail after the application is complete?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice and make some inquiry about the current procedures.

MR. PURDY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the minister can also get an answer for me on this one. In this time of restraint, why is the province allowing expenditures of approximately \$3 million to support the federal post office, when the local licence issuers had the ability to pass out the plates in previous years? Why can't we revert to the old procedure?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'm not at all sure that the answer will be as good as the question.

#### **Container Shipping**

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, my question isn't to the hon. Member for Little Bow, but rather to the hon. Minister of Economic Development. There has been a great deal of discussion about an inland container port facility. Is the minister in a position to indicate what the progress has been to date on this proposal?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, the government wouldn't be the only one that could build an inland container terminal. We're interested in that as a concept simply because it's come to our attention that, in many instances, because of backhaul rates, it's cheaper to ship a product from Quebec to the Orient than from Alberta to the Orient. For a variety of reasons, we can't get too definitive yet, because the studies revolve around backhaul rates, so the economics of the project are a moving target. But we continue to examine it simply because a great many of the commodities that we will be shipping in the petrochemical sector, as well as agricultural products, might be more beneficially shipped in containers that are stuffed in Alberta, in a freight-rate sense.

MR. HIEBERT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It's my understanding that a number of parties have made representation with regard to such a facility. Is the minister in a position to indicate whether the report entitled Container Port Facility for Metro Edmonton, and the accompanying response, will be made public?

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, the conclusions from the report and the work that's ongoing are not yet complete. There will

be a time when we'll ask for public comment on the document. Unfortunately, there's some considerable amount of commercial confidentiality in that document.

MR. HIEBERT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is there any indicator that the minister could give with respect to some concrete action, when they would actually look at some siting?

MR. PLANCHE: First of all, Mr. Speaker, we've got to determine whether or not, in our judgment, it's something that's of value on a cost benefit. Again, it's not solely the purview of this government to build such a facility. It can be built by the private sector, by warehouse, or by a division of a railway or other freight-moving companies. Our interest in it is simply getting our product to tidewater as competitively as possible. In that there are backhaul rates involved and they're not published or fixed, it's requiring more extensive work than we'd hoped.

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

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to indicate if plans are under way for the construction of a port facility at Ridley Island, to complement any proposed facility for the Edmonton area?

MR. PLANCHE: The member will know that the grain elevator is under way, and the coal facility is under way and in fact will be complete at the end of this year. The grain facility will be complete at the end of next year. We are in preliminary negotiation for a transshipping warehouse type of facility for petrochemicals, but it requires a proponent and, unfortunately, it also requires a volume. Many of the shippers are presently using CP and CN through Vancouver, but we continue to plan for a transshipping warehouse style of facility at Rupert, and also at Vancouver.

#### **AGT Operations — Camrose**

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, my problem is with Alberta Government Telephones. Is the Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications aware that AGT has proposed to the city of Camrose that the old exchange building in Camrose continue to be used, as AGT was placing an area DT switch into that building, and that the number of operators in Camrose was planned to increase from 78 to 87 over a four-year period? I would like to know — and so would the people of Camrose — why AGT has decided that they have no use for the former exchange building and are trying to sell it or lease it.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot respond to the hon. member in great detail. I can indicate that it's my understanding that a new telephone exchange building was built in Camrose, that indeed the telephone operators have moved into that building, that the old exchange building is currently sitting empty, and that in fact AGT has made a corporate decision to sell the excess property.

In a more general context, Mr. Speaker, I might mention that a number of plans that were quite active two and three years ago are currently on hold, due to the lower than anticipated growth that will occur not only in the metropolitan centres but in the smaller cities and rural areas of the province. I might remind my hon. colleague that in the past number of months, the staff of AGT has shrunk by more than 14 per cent. It's

quite likely that part of that shrinkage has occurred in the hon. member's constituency and that there has been some effect in his community because of that.

MR. STROMBERG: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. That's not the worst of it. Is the minister aware that in the very near future, 12 full-time AGT staff will be transferred from the beautiful city of Camrose to, of all places, Leduc?

MR. SPEAKER: While the hon. member's question has a sad undertone, I always have concern about questions that give information instead of asking for information, even when it's done under the guise — and it's often happened — of asking the minister to confirm something. But we're now getting into a matter which is undoubtedly very important but also a question of local detail, and it's similar to another topic we were pursuing earlier. I would suggest that the hon. member might get that particular detailed information outside the question period.

MR. STROMBERG: I will abide by your decision, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to ask a direct question. Will the minister intervene, on behalf of the city of Camrose, to stop this rather questionable centralization?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is referring to a corporate decision made by Alberta Government Telephones some time ago, to move its work plant from south Edmonton to Leduc. I'm also aware that Camrose was one of a number of communities considered for that move. It's my further understanding that through its economic development officer, the city of Camrose was notified of that decision early in 1982, and that may in fact tie in with the expectations of growth in other areas within Camrose. But in fact the decision was made some time ago. I do not view it as part of a centralizing move, as the hon. member has indicated. I see it rather as a matter of economizing. It's decentralizing in the sense that we're going into another smaller community in the province, and it's part of the ongoing objective of Alberta Government Telephones of providing the most efficient service at the lowest possible cost to the customer.

#### **Sour Gas Development**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. In light of the evidence as to the long-term health and environmental impacts of sulphur dioxide being presented to the ERCB hearings into the Lodgepole blowout, my question is: will the minister consider a freeze on further sour gas development in the province, until the final report of the Lodgepole inquiry is in and has been properly evaluated?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's reference to evidence being presented at that particular hearing suggests to me that he has been entirely selective in his reading of the evidence. I don't think it would be appropriate for me to get into any particular comment on what is essentially a quasi-judicial hearing, but it is pretty clear that there is evidence being led that would take one in a variety of directions, in terms of the impact of sour gas.

We look forward to the results of the important and extensive hearings into the blowout in question. There is a great deal of work being done in terms of studies, initiated both by government and elsewhere, into the question of whether or not there is a health impact involved here. We think that's the

appropriate course to follow, and we'll govern ourselves based upon the results of those assessments and other factors, including the specifics of the inquiry to which he makes reference.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister, with respect to the application of Amoco to build a sour gas processing facility adjacent to St. Albert. In light of the allegation of the city of St. Albert that critical environmental information was withheld from the ERCB at that time, have any discussions with respect to reopening hearings into the Amoco application occurred between the minister and the ERCB?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I trust that the hon. member is not suggesting that the government should interfere with a decision of a quasi-judicial body. That would certainly not be our intention. I believe there have been public comments made by the chairman of the Energy Resources Conservation Board that it will be assessing the matter that has been raised, looking to see if in fact there is new evidence and whether or not there are legal grounds upon which some reopening could occur. We respect very greatly the integrity and autonomy of quasi-judicial bodies of this nature, and I trust that the hon. member does as well.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. The question was specifically in light of the city of St. Albert saying that information had been held; it had nothing to do with the integrity of the board. My question was, have any discussions with regard to that allegation occurred between the minister and the ERCB?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't been talking to judges.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the Minister of the Environment. What evaluation has the minister's department undertaken of the potential health and safety threat posed by the proposed St. Albert sour gas plant to not only the residents of St. Albert but the citizens of the entire Edmonton region?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, the department has undertaken its normal review process with regard to the application and has found it to be entirely in order.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member. The time for the question period has run out. I suppose I have contributed to that result. There are a number of members who still wish to ask their first questions, the hon. leader of the Independents wishes to ask a further question, and the Minister of Housing wishes to supplement some information. Would the Assembly agree that we might continue for a maximum of a further 15 minutes?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. MARTIN: My supplementary question to the minister is: in light of the two previous sour gas blowouts involving Amoco wells in the Drayton Valley area, what discussions has the minister held with Amoco to ensure that similar problems will not be encountered with a proposed sour gas processing facility located in the St. Albert area?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I personally have not had any discussions with Amoco with regard to this matter. As I indicated, Amoco has applied under the normal procedures with regard to this type of facility. I wouldn't want to confuse this question with regard to the development of a gas processing facility, with the actual drilling of a well. As far as I am aware, they have met the terms and conditions of the normal requirements.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What evaluation has the minister's department undertaken of the conclusions of a report by Dave Fraser, a retired meteorologist, that the geography of the Sturgeon River valley makes inversions more likely, thus resulting in higher potential concentrations of sulphur dioxide in the air than might be experienced elsewhere in the province?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check on the specific, as to whether the department has in fact received that analysis.

MRS. CRIPPS: A supplementary to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Has the minister's department, through the Provincial Board of Health, been able to evaluate the occurrences of Amoco flu this year in comparison to the number of reported concerns last year?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, there have been no diagnostic exercises by the provincial lab as to what constitutes the cause of this particular flu. It's my understanding that rather than any concern about any gas causing the flu, it's the flu causing some gases.

MRS. CRIPPS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I am given to understand — and it's evident in this building and around the province — that there are as many cases of flu in the province this November as there were last year. Has the minister's department tried to ascertain whether or not that is a correct statement?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the data shows. Certainly the local boards of health would be able to provide that information to the Provincial Board of Health. We are all aware of the flu concerns of last year and the concern that there might be some relationship between that and the Amoco gas. However, at that time it was confirmed that there were other causes for the flu. The hon. member indicated that we have a lot of flu around at the present time, the degree of which I am not aware. But in recollection, and from what I hear, it is probably of the same significance.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the ministers of Social Services and Community Health, the Environment, and Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation. Will your departments be evaluating the report on hydrogen sulphide health effects that was done for the hearing?

DR. WEBBER: Maybe the hon. member could clarify what report she is referring to.

MRS. CRIPPS: I don't know the name of it. It was provided at the Amoco hearings last Monday.

DR. WEBBER: I would have to check and follow up on that. I am not aware of what report the hon. member is referring to. To my knowledge, we already have any reports or studies that

the Provincial Board of Health has been involved in. With respect to other parts of the province, there are some ongoing studies. We dealt with some of those during last spring's session, and some of those reports haven't come out yet.

#### **Insurance Rating System**

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the hon. Minister of Labour. It relates to the Human Rights Commission. A year ago, the Human Rights Commission found it a discriminatory practice to charge different rates of insurance for people of different sexes. I am wondering if the minister has been requested by the Human Rights Commission to have the cabinet extend the exemption order they granted, lasting until December 31, 1983?

MR. YOUNG: No, Mr. Speaker, the commission has not requested an extension. The issue in question is an exemption order that was issued to the insurance industry relative to differential charges, based on sex, for automobile premiums. The exemption order expires on December 31, 1983. The industry has asked for an exemption. The complicating factor that I and my colleagues will be considering very quickly is that recently some legal advice arrived which suggests that the Charter of Rights now has some implications in this particular matter. That is new information, or a new consideration. We will have to take that under advisement before making the determination of whether or not to extend. But the commission has not asked for an extension.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The insurance industry has asked for time to develop a rating system based on an individual's driving record. Could the minister tell us whether in fact the industry has come back to her department with that assessment done on individual driving records, to perhaps resolve the problem of the difference in premiums?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the only information I have has been communicated to me basically by the Automobile Insurance Board. Apparently there have been some representations to the Automobile Insurance Board that there is difficulty in rationalizing those rates in the time frame that the industry had first anticipated. But I haven't had direct discussions with the industry.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the hon. Attorney General. In the event that the reference to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms mentioned in the Constitution is deemed applicable to this, is the Attorney General prepared to use the override or notwithstanding clause in the Constitution?

MR. SPEAKER: May I respectfully suggest to the hon. member that that hypothetical question might be left until the event occurs.

#### **Labor Relations — Food Processing Plant**

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. However, in light of your comments to the Member for Camrose, I seek your guidance, sir. I view it necessary to provide some background information to solicit a comment from the Minister of Labour.

Is the minister in a position to comment on the situation in Red Deer whereby Fletcher's Foods recently announced a major expansion which would see the creation of 100 new jobs? In

recent conversation, my understanding is that the local union agreed by a 95 per cent vote that the new employees of the firm would be paid somewhat less under the collective agreement than the existing employees. Having had that agreement, construction commenced. I am under the understanding that the international body of the union, out of Washington D.C., has now taken this company before the Labour Relations Board for unfair labor practices. In view of these circumstances, it has been determined that the company is now not going to continue with the expansion, at the loss of 100 jobs.

I suppose I could frame my question to the minister this way. Is it reasonable for a national union from outside Alberta, and indeed the country, to provide this kind of direction to the Labour Relations Board against the wishes of a local union?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, he has provided a great deal of information in the question period. Whether something is reasonable or not is, of course, a matter of opinion; it's not a matter of fact. I suggest that the hon. member may wish to pursue that in other ways outside the House. This is clearly a matter of opinion. I'm rather concerned that even the extension of time is running out, and there are some members who haven't been recognized.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, may I conclude from your ruling that I could try to frame my question in such a way as to solicit an answer?

MR. SPEAKER: Not to solicit an answer but to solicit facts.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate whether a union with a head office outside the province can bring a company before the Labour Relations Board?

MR. SPEAKER: I think we're getting in a little deeper. Now we have a question of a legal opinion. Perhaps the hon. member might give this idea some further thought.

#### **Non-Permanent Bodies of Water**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife. It is with regard to a court decision handed down by the Court of Queen's Bench in Calgary between the province and Roland Very, his wife, and associates. The judge's decision came down in favor of the respondents and, in my opinion, was a very good decision and quite accurately laid . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Could the hon. member come to the question, please.

MR. CLARK: I'm right on the verge of doing that, Mr. Speaker. I guess my question will be in two parts, in case I run out of time.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't see how that extends the time.

MR. CLARK: Can the minister inform the Assembly why his department tried at such a late date to establish ownership on the slough in question. In other words, why was the action started in the first place? Secondly, is his department now going to appeal the decision that was handed down by the Court of Queen's Bench?

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, as my good colleague the Attorney General handles all law cases, I should turn this ques-

tion over to him. Before I do that, I would like to assure the House and the Speaker that there is no intention in our department to extend the interpretation of section 4 of the Public Lands Act with reference to any involvement by the department in the ownership or management of intermittent bodies of water, like this case, that appear on private lands throughout the province. This specific case, though, has been handled by the Attorney General, and I would want him to comment on the case.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think I might usefully add something to the answer given by my colleague. In this particular case, a notice of appeal has been filed for the purpose of keeping the options open in the sense of the expiry of the appeal time. It is most unlikely that any appeal will proceed, and I think hon. members, many of whom are interested in that on behalf of their constituents, should know that. It is there only for the purpose of maintaining for a brief while, until further legal assessments are done, the option of having one or another of fairly narrow legal points determined by a higher court. There is no intention to change the existing policy of the government which, in its implementation, is basically that the beds of non-permanent bodies of water belong to the landowner.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking followed by the hon. leader of the Independents.

MR. CLARK: I still have a short supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: We're running critically short of time, and I do try to reach each member. Perhaps we could briefly deal with the supplementary.

MR. CLARK: Okay, just a quick supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister has considered the precedent this will set if this decision is overturned. Many farmers have a large acreage in sloughs on their places. The ownership will now come into question, seeing as this slough has been the same as most of them. They've been paying taxes on it for many years, and it has even been farmed.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps we could treat that as a representation, of which there are quite a few, as you know, in the question period.

#### **Metrication**

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I'll try to make this into one question. It's with regard to the new interpretation of the metrication Act. I'd like to direct the question to the Minister of Agriculture, in reference to labeling chemical cans and whether or not we will be issuing instructions to chemical companies as to whether they will put imperial measures on chemical cans.

I would like to know what our policy position is on acre and hectare measurement and, as well, whether publications on metrication that the Department of Agriculture has out will be changed to imperial measures.

MR. FJORBOTTEN: First of all, Mr. Speaker, the labeling of chemicals is under federal jurisdiction, and we certainly don't have any control of that.

With respect to the second part of the question, our position on acres and hectares, I'd like to make it clear that all agricultural publications and material being printed by the Department of Agriculture will include both the acre and the hectare measurement. That will be in future publications. The publi-

cations presently there will be used. When they are gone, the new ones will be in acres and hectares.

The use of acre and hectare measurements in agricultural publications follows the government decision that all departments and agencies of the government of Alberta which have moved to use the hectare as a measurement will be required to provide equivalent information in acres, with the option of which measurement appears in brackets. The only exemptions to that policy are the Energy Resources Conservation Board and specific areas within the Department of Energy and Natural Resources pertaining to their responsibilities and interactions with the oil industry.

Also, Mr. Speaker, today or tomorrow I intend to give direction to my deputy minister that all future publications will not only be in acres and hectares, but acres will be first and hectares in brackets.

MR. SPEAKER: We've run out of time again. If there's any wish on the part of the Assembly, we haven't reached the hon. leader of the Independents and the hon. Minister of Housing.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### **Health Care Premiums**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Very quickly, to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. In my hand I have a waiver of premium application, which cites that postsecondary students may not apply for waiver of premium if they are able to obtain a loan. I was wondering why they were selected as one group that couldn't get waiver of premium under conditions of need.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the answer to that today, but I'll take it as notice and report back to the member.

#### **Housing Corporation Land Purchases**

*(continued)*

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, earlier in the question period, the Leader of the Opposition asked questions with respect to certain lands banked in the Fort Kent area and with respect to whether or not the government made use of numbered companies. There were eight quarter sections purchased from the Housing Department under the long-term land banking fund — that's the Department of Housing as opposed to the Alberta Housing Corporation — through local realtors at an average price of \$3,000 per acre. As well, a trust company acquired land — three quarter sections — and that trust company used a numbered company. The Department of Housing did not, nor did Alberta Housing Corporation. There were also additional purchases in the Bonnyville area.

The question also was put: what was the purpose of these lands? These lands were purchased at the time of the proposed development of the \$14 billion Esso Cold Lake heavy oil project, and this was a part of the long-term land banking to meet potential housing needs. That was the reason for the purchase.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have the consent of the House to revert for a moment to Tabling Returns and Reports.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### **head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

*(reversion)*

MR. RUSSELL: I'd like to table Motion for a Return No. 145. It's one of yours, Ray.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

#### Bill 71

#### Condominium Property Amendment Act, 1983

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 71, the Condominium Property Amendment Act, 1983.

[Motion carried; Bill 71 read a third time]

#### Bill 81

#### Electoral Boundaries Commission Amendment Act, 1983

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 81, the Electoral Boundaries Commission Amendment Act, 1983.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, before we move through third reading, I'd certainly like to issue my concern again with regard to the principle of the Bill at this point in the debate. I feel that the citizens of Alberta have not been told the real story with regard to this commission. In its present format, it is not objective and neutral; it is partisan. What the people of Alberta are going to be presented with on the passing of third reading is an instrument by which partisanship and gerrymandering will prevail. We are on the track of a very corruptive style of establishing electoral boundaries in the province of Alberta. I think that's unfortunate.

It will live as a symbol of this government. They will have to remember, whether they're in or out of government, that they established this pattern, established it not only for this Legislature but for generations ahead. Because often it is felt that when legislation like this comes into place, another new government, a new set of MLAs, will come in and say: well, they've done it before, so let's do it that way again, because it's to our benefit as a government; we can protect our power position; we can protect our constituencies for the respective members now representing those areas.

It erodes a principle of objective decision-making in terms of this responsibility. I think it's an unfortunate situation, irresponsible at the least. And it's alarming that a new minister of cabinet sets this kind of precedent as to his present and future actions in the Legislature. So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly am voting against third reading of this Bill. Every principle in it is wrong; there isn't anything right about it. It gives complete grounds to vote against it.

In the many speeches I'm able to make between now and the spring session, I hope that Bill will be the focus of discussion. The people of Alberta will be told the truth of the other side. It's very interesting when you go to these public meetings and raise these kinds of incidences. They say, oh, we didn't know that. I don't know whose fault that is. I know the government wouldn't tell them, and the press doesn't really care about it either. Back in 1969 it became a major item in the newspaper, but today the press hides its head because it's a little afraid to raise it too high in terms of issues such as this that will have other repercussions.

Mr. Speaker, what we're doing today in this Legislature is wrong. It's not much of a grand finale for the final day of the Legislature. But the government is hellbent to pass it, and it looks like they're going to. They do have a last chance to change their minds, but we know that once it goes through

caucus, they think the matter has been blessed. After that, it's just a routine action of putting it through this Legislature. The Legislature isn't important anyway; it's only a fifth wheel that is often used as a convenience for the Conservative Party. That is wrong in itself as well, but that's a broader issue.

In this specific one, hopefully other members that feel the same way, even if they're on the Conservative side, [will] stand up on principle. We will never be able to come back to this principle under the present conditions and maybe other conditions, because usually it's tough for new governments to go back to basic principles again. We've started a trend. So, Mr. Speaker, I'm voting against the Bill. I hope we have a standing vote on it, so when I speak at public meetings I can take a list naming various members in different constituencies and how they voted in this Assembly. If they're not here, then that means they supported it as well.

Mr. Speaker, that's the way I feel.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

#### For the motion:

Adair	Gogo	Pahl
Alexander	Harle	Payne
Alger	Hiebert	Planche
Batiuk	Hyland	Purdy
Bogle	Hyndman	Russell
Bradley	Koper	Schmid
Campbell	Kowalski	Shaben
Chambers	Lee	Shrake
Clark	LeMessurier	Sparrow
Cook	Lysons	Stevens
Crawford	McPherson	Stiles
Cripps	Miller	Szwender
Diachuk	Moore, M.	Thompson
Drobot	Moore, R.	Webber
Elliott	Musgreave	Weiss
Embury	Musgrove	Woo
Fischer	Nelson	Young
Fjordbotten	Oman	Zip
Fyfe	Osterman	

#### Against the motion:

Buck	Notley	Speaker, R.
Martin		

Totals: Ayes — 56 Noes — 4

[Bill 81 read a third time]

#### Bill 98

#### Hospitals and Medical Care Statutes Amendment Act, 1983

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 98, the Hospitals and Medical Care Statutes Amendment Act, 1983.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, for a few minutes this afternoon, I'd like to offer some comments on Bill 98. I can assure the hon. minister across the way that I have not changed my mind about this Bill. I intend to oppose Bill 98 on third reading, as I did on second reading and during Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker, the minister tries to tell us that the principle in this Bill is not really user fees but all kinds of other principles. But when one reads his comments on introduction of the Bill, when one reads the Bill, there's absolutely no doubt that user fees are a very important aspect of Bill 98. I oppose user fees because they represent a deterrent. They are inconsistent with the principles of the Hall commission report; they are inconsistent with the concept that people have a right to the very best health care possible.

This government might have been able to advance some arguments, however weak, for third reading of this Bill had they really done something about the various reports that would have saved money in the health system, including their own utilization committee report. But, Mr. Speaker, for political reasons, this government has failed to move on any of the major recommendations of the committee on utilization report. During committee stage, we even had the hon. Member for Edson take the most bizarre reasoning to suggest seat belt legislation would suddenly lead to the banning of motorcycles, hang gliders, et cetera, in order to somehow rationalize the fact that this caucus, this government, has not been able to come to any resolution of some of the principal recommendations contained within the committee on utilization report.

Mr. Speaker, it isn't good enough for members of the House to simply say: we're going to save costs, and we don't like one or two of the recommendations of the utilization committee report. All we have to do is look back at *Hansard* over the years when the utilization committee was undertaking this important assignment and recognize how much emphasis the government apparently gave to the work that committee was undertaking. But while all kinds of plaudits were given to the work during the time the review was undertaken, all of a sudden, when the committee report was completed, the recommendations were left adrift because this caucus apparently couldn't come to grips with some of the more controversial ones. Apparently a government that can't decide on the question of seat belt legislation can decide to introduce a system of user fees which is going to seriously jeopardize the quality of health care in this province.

As I mentioned during Committee of the Whole, I find it hard to understand why the government concludes that user fees are worth the time and effort when the minister himself tells us his estimate of the total operating cost of hospitals will be raised by around 3 per cent as a consequence of user fees. That's about \$35 million. There's no doubt that \$35 million is the kind of funds which could be raised in ways other than user fees. Mr. Speaker, when I look at some of the wasteful expenditures of this government — the \$257 million we were allotted in 1981-82 for consultant fees, for example — by cutting back on some of these frivolous expenditures, we might very well be able to find that \$35 million which, at maximum, the user fee program will raise. Of course, user fees will not net anything like \$35 million, because the local hospital boards are going to have to administer the program.

So now we have the minister telling us he's in favor of this new found local autonomy — local autonomy to take the rap for a very unpopular program, so when people write in from any community complaining about user fees, the government members will simply say it's up to the hospital boards. We'll have the hospital boards put in the invidious position of having themselves blamed for a government policy. Particularly in the first several years, you will have some boards that will have no choice but to implement user fees because they don't have the tax base.

At this point, the acquisition of tax money is for improvements, but some of these hospitals that the government has just

built — there's a pretty tidy little bill there too, I might add, which is now going to be added on to the local tax base to pay for some of the site improvements for these new hospitals. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, local hospitals that find themselves in a position to have to implement user fees are going to have patients complaining. Patients will complain to the government and the government will write back and say, it's really the board at the hospital. The implication will be that somehow it's inefficient management. The fact of the matter is that what we've done is used political autonomy as an opportunity to evade political responsibility, and simply shifted the burden of taking the flak from Albertans to the local hospital boards in this province.

I say to the members of the government that that practice, that approach, isn't going to work. Most Albertans know who is responsible for the introduction of user fees; it is a policy of this government; it's a policy that their federal colleagues are a bit embarrassed about. Mr. Mulroney dances all over the place when the issue of user fees is raised. During the next federal election when Mr. Mulroney comes to Edmonton seeking votes, I very much doubt that he's going to have the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care introduce him at the rally. I suspect the minister won't be on the platform with him. I suspect the minister won't be asked to campaign for Tories in the next federal election. And why? Because the federal Conservative Party won't want to be saddled with the political liability of a user-fee program which is going to draw them into a policy which is completely unpopular.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to members of the House this afternoon that even though the government has shown a resistance to reason on this issue, an unwillingness to listen to Albertans — I have yet to run into a constituent in my riding who's come up to me and said, go back to the Legislature and support the principle of user fees. There may be some in Spirit River-Fairview, but they certainly haven't gotten on the phone, and they do on many issues. There have been times when I've had to be quite frank, when I've taken unpopular stands in this House. When I voted against the cutback in oil production, I had all kinds of members of both political parties, the NDP and the Conservative Party in my constituency, write to me or phone and say, we disagree with your position. So I know they're not afraid to approach their M.L.A., because there have been times when I've taken positions and they have been quite prepared to tell me that I was on the wrong track.

But on this issue, to my recollection not a single person has contacted me and said, go down and support the hon. Mr. Russell in his quest to bring in user fees. As a matter of fact, even in talking to members of the Conservative Party in Spirit River-Fairview, what I've found is: we're Conservatives, but we're not Russell Conservatives; we're not in favor of user fees; we're not in favor of what they're doing to the medicare system; we're not in favor of what they're trying to do in Bill 98. At least in the riding I represent, I know I would be quite happy if the only issue in the next election were Bill 98. If the hon. member who introduced the Bill would like to come up there and run, I would welcome that indeed. It would be "a piece of cake", if I can use that expression in the House.

But the fact of the matter is that regardless of what the people in Spirit River-Fairview think, Mr. Speaker, I have an obligation to represent their views, and they're telling me that Bill 98 is a bad piece of legislation. I say that beyond the people of my constituency, I don't believe the people of Alberta want Bill 98. I don't believe that most Conservative voters want Bill 98. I think that they are opposed to the principle of user fees. So I would like to move that the motion for third reading of Bill 98, the Hospitals and Medical Care Statutes Amendment Act, 1983, should be amended as follows:

By striking all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following therefor:

"Bill 98, Hospitals and Medical Care Statutes Amendment Act, 1983, be not now read a third time but that it be read a third time this day five days hence."

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to both Bill 98 and the amendment, the normal hoist is for six months. However, that is a tradition. The hoist contained in this amendment is for five days. The reason the hoist is for five days is that for the next three days the Alberta Hospital Association is holding its convention, and its convention is an opportunity for this Assembly to get a very clear picture from representatives of hospital boards across the province of their views on the issue of Bill 98.

The Alberta Hospital Association is not the only stakeholder group, but it's an important one. No doubt there will be discussion of user fees during the course of that important convention. The hoist motion would simply hold the matter over until Monday next, at which time members of the House would have an opportunity to formally receive from the Alberta Hospital Association their judgment on user fees. Because after all, Mr. Speaker, if we're going to ask the hospitals, in this new-found autonomy that they're going to enjoy, to administer a program that is overwhelmingly rejected by the vast majority of Albertans, it's not unreasonable that we should ask them for their input and advice before we finalize third reading.

Mr. Speaker, I think the arguments for a hoist are valid, but the arguments against what the government is doing in Bill 98 are even more critical. I know that we had a strong debate the other day. People in the government caucus may feel that there is no other choice. I think there are other options. We heard the minister tell us: oh, these people are opposing user fees; they said last spring, why didn't we bring in income tax increases instead, and now they oppose income tax increases. The fact of the matter is that last fall, a year ago when this government was offering itself for re-election, nobody was told that we would have an increase in medicare premiums. Nobody was told that there would be user fees. Nobody was told that there would be an increase in personal income tax. Nobody was told that there would be an increase in property tax, at least part of which is due because of the site improvements which are assessable against property. No, last fall this government was quite prepared to leave a lot of those things unsaid. Mr. Speaker, if in October 1982, leading up to the November 2 election, the Tory Party had very clearly said, we intend to fundamentally alter the health care system, then at least there would be some moral claim to introduce this legislation. I wouldn't agree with it. I would still oppose it.

Coming from the vantage point that I do, I know some of the people who worked to get medicare started. Today I had a few moments to glance at an article about one of the genuinely great Canadians. I don't know if the minister ever knew the late Woodrow Lloyd, but the man was premier of Saskatchewan when medicare was enacted in that province in 1962. He was one of the people who, for me, will forever be in that rare group of political heroes, a person with a great deal of compassion and a great deal of judgment and common sense. He brought what was a dangerous situation in July 1962 to the historic Saskatoon compromise, which brought in medicare in the province of Saskatchewan and made it possible for this country to begin on the road to the Hall commission report and a health care system which is among the finest in the world.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the government had gotten a mandate, a sort of moral right from the voters to bring in user fees, I would have opposed it, but I would have respected the government's position because I would know that they got a

mandate from the people. But that wasn't the case. I don't recall a single Conservative during forums — and I travelled this province extensively in the last provincial election. I don't recall a single Conservative putting ads in the paper saying, vote for me so I can bring in a system of user fees. I don't recall a single Conservative at the forums that were held around the province, at least those forums where Conservative candidates bothered to show up, standing and saying, re-elect me and I will vote in favor of user fees.

If you were going to introduce that kind of important change, surely it should have been made part of the request for a mandate, Mr. Speaker. I find it difficult to think that things changed so radically from November 2 to the announcement of user fees during the early stages of the budget debate this spring that it could not have been clearly placed before the people of Alberta last fall. So this government has no moral right to bring in user fees. We have heard no clamor for user fees from anybody other than the Conservative caucus in this province.

Mr. Speaker, at least until the deliberations of the Alberta Hospital Association have been held, it would be my submission that we should hold off third reading and allow the members of the House to have an opportunity to fully evaluate the views of the Alberta Hospital Association, and other groups as well. I think it's very important that we not just look at the question of the AHA, important though they may be, because there are all kinds of groups that have made representation. What this amendment is attempting to do is to ask this government one more time to wait and to listen. And if they wait and listen and genuinely attempt to hear what people are saying, they will respond by saying to the minister, just a minute, Mr. Minister, there are better methods of raising additional funds for health care; user fees are inconsistent with the principles of health care, therefore hold off.

With those words, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend the amendment to members of the Assembly this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: Might I make a brief observation with regard to the amendment. As hon. members know, the more or less traditional motion on second or third reading for denying approval of a Bill is the six-month hoist. I think perhaps there are some parliaments where they also deal with a three-month hoist. I know of no reason at the moment why a five-day hoist should be out of order. However, applying the practice which applies to a six-month hoist, it would be my view — and I am not suggesting that anyone has an amendment like this in mind — that the length of time of the hoist is not subject to a subamendment. In other words, you can't go from five days to four or 50, or any other time. The reason for my having that view is that the time limit which is expressed in a motion for a six-month hoist is not amendable either. Therefore, regardless of the time expressed, I assume it would not be amendable by a subamendment.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, you are entirely correct. I assure you that I do not have a subamendment for a three-hour hoist or anything. In terms of supporting the amendment, it is clear that we have asked, and obviously have not won many votes, about public hearings. We have gone through the process that the minister talked about on the last day of Committee of the Whole. We are asking now that the hoist be five days hence. I know that hon. members would be glad to come back here in five days, because it is an important Bill. I know that the Government House Leader would be overjoyed about coming back five days hence.

We talked about the other groups that are involved. But the reason we picked the five days and went away from the tra-

ditional six months is that I think the minister would at least recognize that there is a very important convention going on. If you like, these are the people who are partners in having to try to collect user fees, if they decide to go that way as a board. As my colleague said, the AHA convention is occurring this weekend. Mr. Speaker, it will be interesting to hear what they say. It looks like they are going to have a debate. Maybe the minister could allude to it. But it's clear that they probably are going to have a debate. It's a major item at their convention.

I think the central Alberta hospitals have said very clearly that they plan to fight against user fees. They said, it is imperative that our organization discusses it. The central Alberta hospitals — a particular person from Lacombe, Mr. McDermand, once called the user-fee plan an administrative jungle and now says it's worse than they even anticipated. So a very good debate is going to occur there with, if you like, the other partners that would be involved.

They are saying — and I think this is important to the minister — that if we're not going to collect money from user fees . . . Obviously we've argued the case on the principle of user fees and all the rest of it, but one of the reasons we're into user fees is supposedly so we can make money to help spiralling hospital costs, Mr. Speaker. At least one of the central Alberta people is estimating that half of the patients — as the minister proudly pointed out, there are exempt Albertans — won't pay user fees. He suggests that administrative costs will be so high that hospitals will not make a cent because, to begin with, they will have to decide who should pay user fees of up to \$20 a day, check to see if patients have paid the \$150 annual maximum charge for individuals or the \$300 for families, and then try to collect.

Mr. Speaker, through you to the minister, I think what he is saying is that this is going to be a bureaucracy of the worst kind. He says that nothing will be collected. If nothing is going to be collected, or even if it is minimal, what is the point of bringing it in if it is not going to be significant and all we are doing is creating a bureaucracy? Even the person who is in charge, the AHA president Mr. Knight, says — and he is trying to be very careful here — that there isn't a great deal of money to be generated with user fees, and collecting them is going to create another level of bureaucracy at the hospital. I think that says it all. That's why we're suggesting the five days.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's his job.

MR. MARTIN: That's his job. Here's a private enterprise government that loves bureaucracy and loves throwing it off on somebody else. I am sure they will be glad to hear from you on that one about creating bureaucracy.

The point we're trying to make is at least . . . Maybe we're wrong. Maybe the convention will overwhelmingly say, bring on user fees, because it is just what we want and what the people of Alberta want; we support the minister. But we could come back in five days and pass this in third reading, Mr. Speaker. I am sure it would be no problem at all.

With those few remarks — I try to keep my remarks short, because I know that the hon. minister loves hearing from me and I like teasing him. I could perhaps say something later on. I will leave it there, Mr. Speaker, and ask that we at least wait for five days until this convention is over.

[Motion on amendment lost]

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MARTIN: I would just like to speak for a few minutes. I won't go on for a great deal, as disappointing as that may be

to some of the members. I am not going to go over the old arguments, Mr. Speaker, but I want to make a couple of comments to clarify what's happening. With third passage and just waiting for Royal Assent, I am under no illusions. I can count. We have been defeated in votes enough times in this Legislature. This is going to go through in a few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I say through you to members in the Assembly that this is indeed a sad day for medicare and health care in Alberta. I have seen nothing at all from this minister — even though he says no — that this is not a deliberate move toward privatization. Maybe what we have here is the Republican Party north, trying to get rid of medicare. Some of the Stanfield Tories and British Tories, in the best traditions of this House, would be appalled at what is happening here. The hon. House leader knows precisely what I am talking about. But that's fine. The people of Alberta are the losers in this.

I know they say it's \$300. As we pointed out, that's not written in stone. It can be \$600, \$900, or whatever, as this government continues to mismanage the economy and looks for more money in the future. But that's fine. I will say as clearly as I can that the battle lines are clearly drawn between those who would pick away at medicare in the guise that they are putting more money into it.

First of all, we start with higher medicare premiums when we talk about privatization and private foundations and when we talk about user fees. Make no mistake about it — and I say this as clearly as I can to the minister — if you think this is not an issue, it will be an issue in the next couple of years. We can't win this battle here in the Legislature; we are well aware of that. But mark my words, Mr. Speaker, we are going to carry this battle about user fees and where medicare sits in this society right into the next provincial election. I for one look forward . . . I say to members of the caucus that this is one of the Bills they are going to regret in the next election campaign. I make that not as a threat but as a promise, because a lot of Tories are going to lose their seats over Bills like 98. That's fine, Mr. Speaker. We know that this party has moved over to the right wing. I look forward to the battle, us against them, in the next election over Bill 98. While this battle may be lost today, the war is a long way from being lost in the next provincial election.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Motion carried; Bill 98 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
106	Oil Sands Conservation Act	Crawford (for Zaozimy)
107	Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1983	Crawford
108	Summary Convictions Amendment Act, 1983	Crawford
109	Real Property Statutes Amendment Act, 1983 (No. 3)	Crawford

#### **Bill 110 Labour Relations Amendment Act, 1983**

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 110, Labour Relations Amendment Act, 1983.

MR. MARTIN: I know the minister would be disappointed if we didn't have a few last words on Bill 110, amended as it is.

I say candidly to the minister that I have not changed my mind about the intent of the Bill, even with the amendments. I believe clearly that this Bill is a back door, right to work, the Alabama style — not quite that far yet, but going in that direction. Nothing has come to me that changes my mind about that.

Again, I believe and I'll say — I won't take long, because I know the minister has heard it before — that for a government that espouses government to stay out of the market place, not to involve itself in people's lives, this is government intervention of the worst kind, involving itself in the collective bargaining process, involving itself, I believe, even in the freedom of association. Legally that may be hard to proceed with, although I'm sure we'll find out in the courts down the way; I think the minister and I both agree that that's not the best way.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe it is a denial of people's rights, as I pointed out, of freedom of association. When you start involving yourself in the collective bargaining process on one side or the other, that's basically against the Charter of Rights and the ILO, that I've talked about. I believe that this Bill clearly is anti-union. I'm not alone on that. It's not just the opposition. The minister is well aware that even with the amendments — if he has talked to people, and the minister probably has — the vast majority of labor people and labor leaders in this province consider it anti-union. If the minister has had time to talk to people, it's clear that they consider the amendments sugar coating and the amendments, basically, have no value at all in terms of the intent of the Bill. I'm not speaking alone here; I'm speaking for a number of people who have asked the Official Opposition to continue to speak on this issue. I'm sure the minister is well aware of that.

The only good thing about this Bill — and I've said before that there's one thing the minister has done. He has brought the trade union movement together like it has never been together before. I think that's probably a by-product from Bill 44 and now Bill 110. But the stability the minister has asked for and I believe that he legitimately wants — again, he is going about it in the wrong way.

I do not expect that the government having come this far will back down, but we are in for some tough times in the next few years, Mr. Speaker. I only hope that after this is passed, the minister will monitor it and be honest enough, if these Bills are not working, to come back to this House as quickly as possible and change.

I say to the minister as clearly as I can that we check into other places where labor relations work and begin to take a look at it, unless we really are into Republican north in terms of this party. If we want something that works, regardless of ideology I say as honestly and sincerely as I can to the minister that I sincerely believe — not just for the sake of being in opposition — that Bills like this do not work in the future.

Mr. Speaker, with that I want a little more time to discuss, and the minister being a very rational person . . . Here we are late in the evening, but midnight has not struck yet. There's still time to come to one's senses here. As a result, I have an amendment.

By striking all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following therefor:

"Bill 110, Labour Relations Amendment Act, 1983, be not now read a third time but that it be read a third time this day six months hence."

That is the traditional hoist, Mr. Speaker, and I think my reasons are very clear. We do not think this Bill will get the stability the minister wants. It will serve two purposes only. One is to lower working people's wages and their purchasing power. If that's the goal, it will do that in the short run. But

in the long run it is going to create havoc in labor relations in this province.

We see the Bill as very bad, as they well know. If it were given six months, maybe it would give the minister time to continue the consultation he is talking about with the various component groups in the construction industry and also time to take a serious look where labor relations are working well. It's certainly not going to be by Bills like this. Regardless of political persuasion, Mr. Speaker, I commend that we all want what is good for this province. A six-month cooling off period at this time would be very, very wise indeed.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to address a few comments to the amendment — I'll be dealing with the Bill a little later on. [interjection] You don't like the speech, but . . .

MR. MARTIN: That's the best reaction you've had so far today.

MR. NOTLEY: Yes. That's the reaction of the people of this province to the government.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say to the minister that while the government has suggested that we have some kind of compromise by merely failing to proclaim after Royal Assent and holding proclamation until the end of January, that is not seen as an olive branch at all. I know no one whom I've talked to about this issue in the last several weeks or since this Bill was introduced who feels strongly about it who thinks that simply deferring proclamation is any kind of compromise at all.

Surely a wiser course for the government to follow would be to hold off final reading so the Bill could still be sent back to committee. As we mentioned with our pleas in committee stage, pleas that were made by both opposition groups — not just on behalf of both opposition groups but on behalf of most Albertans — surely the most sensible thing is to hold the Bill until the working committee, which the minister seems to be putting a good deal of faith in, has had an opportunity to review what is admittedly a difficult, tricky labor scene.

To go ahead and say, we're going to pass the Bill and simply delay proclamation, puts that working committee in a totally invidious position, because any suggestions they make really are going to do what? Well, the minister tells us that by the end of January the Bill is going to come into force anyway. If he were to say to the members of the House this afternoon that if the committee makes recommendations that the minister agrees with, and he can convince his caucus colleagues — and of course we know that that's a fairly difficult task when it comes to dragging them kicking and screaming, as Adlai Stevenson once said of the Republicans, into the 20th century. But every once in awhile, I'm sure the Minister of Labour attempts to do that. Nevertheless, if he can do that, the problem is that we've passed the Bill. The amendments which might be beneficial to both sides and to all Albertans really can't be made until such time as we then go back to square one when the spring session is held.

Mr. Speaker, I really think that is going to put the committee in a position where, rather than getting the best out of it, rather than creating a spirit of harmony and co-operation which surely must be the basis for the committee to do its job effectively, you're going to find at least one side, at least one of those two principal partners in the committee process, saying we may go but we're not going to be happy about it, because we still have the proclamation hanging like the Sword of Damocles over our head. I don't think that's an acceptable compromise at all. The amendment my colleague has moved would make it possible

for the government to reconsider and then have the thing sent back to committee.

I might just say that the proposal of the Government House Leader that we adjourn rather than prorogue — I presume we will end up in 1984 with precisely what was done in 1982; that is, we would come back the day before the new session is opened, when we would complete unfinished business. I would guess, Mr. Speaker, that if the committee were to come forward with recommendations on changes in the Act acceptable to both building trades and the construction industry — I think that's not overly likely, but perhaps it's possible — I would certainly be willing to undertake in the House this afternoon to advise the minister that there would be no difficulty with opposition members holding up such an agreement in committee stage, were we to deal with the Bill when the House reconvenes before the spring session. That is assuming that there could be agreement between both sides, both parties to this important work which the minister is assigning the committee to undertake. That is one of the principal merits of the amendment that my colleague is proposing.

The other of course is that we really should look more carefully at industrial relations in other parts of the world where there has been a much better degree of labor peace because we have worked with the trade union movement as a partner rather than seeing them somehow as some kind of bogeyman or using all kinds of right-wing rhetoric to blame trade unionists for every possible ill that afflicts the economy. Mr. Speaker, should the government proceed with [third] reading, Bill 110, the way it is worded, is going to come back to haunt the members of this government. But so be it; fair enough. They make their political decisions, and they will reap whatever consequences come. That is the way of politics. But before you get into that corner, an unnecessary corner, it certainly isn't unreasonable that you consider carefully the merits of deferring this final decision until such time as the committee which has been struck by the minister has an opportunity to attempt to set out clearly a better set of guidelines for labor relations in the construction industry.

[Motion on amendment lost]

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, we have dealt with the amendment. I certainly would not want to leave the Legislature for any length of time without telling the government on third reading — whether they like to hear it again, that's their problem — what I think of this absolutely abominable piece of legislation, which a small, unrepresentative group of people are thrusting upon the people of this province. I don't hear the plumbers and pipefitters calling for Bill 110; I don't hear the IBEW calling for Bill 110; I don't hear the carpenters calling for Bill 110; I don't hear the teamsters calling for Bill 110. As a matter of fact it's pretty clear what they are calling Bill 110, and I can't describe it, because it would be unparliamentary. The only people I hear pleading the case for Bill 110 are a few of the backbenchers and the minister.

Even the big construction companies are fairly discreet. Presumably they're behind Bill 110, but they are quite a bit behind the government in this case, far enough behind so they don't get tagged with a thoroughly disreputable piece of legislation.

So where is the call coming from? It's not coming from the smaller contractors. One might argue that the smaller contractors are in favor of Bill 110. But the fact of the matter is that they aren't, because they are now enjoying more business than they would otherwise have had. All we're doing is making it possible for some of the big companies, the big six in particular, to be able to eat up a larger share of the business.

This is a government that claims to be free enterprising. During committee stage, we had all kinds of suggestions made: look, we've got to help these big companies, because if they don't have the business, the trade unions won't have the jobs, and therefore, we have to shore them up. The only problem with that argument is that if one thought that that was such a solidly based argument, then these rather intelligent people that lead the construction trades would have said: gee, why didn't I think of that; the Minister of Labour thought of that and the Member for Edmonton Whitemud thought of that, but I didn't think of that.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the strange thing is that this is not what they're telling us. They're telling us that this legislation is anti-union legislation, that there is a matter of principle in this legislation which they oppose. They are telling us that the way to deal with the rights of people who are already organized is to not allow the big companies one free spinoff, so that they maintain their share of the business at lower wages. They're telling us in this Legislature that we should be thinking twice before we pass legislation which is construed in the trade union movement, almost without exception, as being blatantly anti-labor. If the minister could bring to this House some compelling reasons why we have to move in this fashion . . .

Mr. Speaker, by rejecting my colleague's motion to hoist this for six months, we have decided that we are going to go ahead. I say to the minister: where has this government been for the last year? Why is it that we just now have a committee struck to look at labor relations in the construction industry? Where has this government been for the last year? Why have we not had an effort to try to develop a position so that the legislation before the Legislature today would be legislation coming not as a consequence of the initiatives of the Tory caucus but as a result of a formal report of a committee representing the workers and representing management? We don't have that.

We have the caucus's interpretation of the problem, through the minister. We have the caucus's solution to the problem, through the minister. We have the demonstrated evidence of one of the largest rallies, if you like, or demonstrations, in the history of this Legislature, two days ago, making it abundantly clear: the construction workers in this province don't like the legislation. [interjection] It may be bigger than that, I don't know.

The fact of the matter is that anyone who saw the demonstration the other day would agree that it was a massive demonstration. I think it ill behooves this government, which is so quick to point to the slightest evidence of support for its position, to belittle what was a fairly significant show of strength on the part of the construction trades in Alberta. But that's up to the government. They can say it doesn't count. The Minister of [Labour] can say it doesn't count, and other members can say it doesn't count. They can say: we don't care; there really weren't that many there. The fact of the matter is that if you push ahead with legislation such as this piece of legislation we're dealing with today, you are courting the kind of confrontation in the labor sector, in the construction trades, which is bad not only for the labor movement but for the construction industry itself.

I just want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that we hear a lot about stability. If we're interested in stability, you don't get into a situation where the only people who gain are lawyers. Lawyers are going to have a field day with Bill 110, as well as the amendments to Bill 110. There's certainly no question about that: it's great for lawyers. But you're not going to contribute to the stability that will exist as efforts are made — because as the minister well knows, the building trades are

going to make an effort to organize those spinoff companies, and the companies are going to resist. We're going to have lawyers involved, we're going to have friction, we're going to have problems, and it's going to create the very instability the minister says he's attempting to avoid.

No, Mr. Speaker. I don't know where this idea came from. I don't know who the bright light was who suddenly had the flash of inspiration that inflicted this dreadful Bill on the caucus. I don't know where the government members were when this piece of legislation was passed in caucus, especially the government members that claim at one time to have been members of trade unions. I don't know where they could have been, because they certainly weren't representing the organized workers in their respective constituencies, and they weren't representing the little contractors either; make no mistake about that. No. This is bad legislation and, as we did in second reading and during committee stage and third reading, we intend to oppose legislation that is not really worthy of the best efforts of a government that should be concerned about co-operation, not confrontation.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. minister conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to conclude the debate by restating the issue and the content of the Bill, in terms of the issue as it was presented.

First of all, let all of us acknowledge that the construction industry in Alberta is an industry of which we can be proud. It built to a very high level a tremendous capacity of highly skilled journeymen as well as skilled management and good financial resources. The economic picture changed very dramatically, and the end result is that there is not presently a demand for all those resources. The circumstances then follow that a non-union sector was already developing.

That non-union sector, in response to the economic circumstances, adjusted much more rapidly than the unionized sector. One of the reasons was the fact that the collective agreements were signed for a two-year period and, despite my efforts and the efforts of others throughout the last year, they've been unsuccessful in renegotiating those agreements. Perhaps that was not the answer. That is a view I have that that would have been at least a partial answer. It did not happen.

The end result of that situation is that the unionized contractors found themselves with a collective agreement to which they were signatories, as well as trade unions. It is possible for trade union members, employees of those unionized contractors, who find themselves short of work in the unionized sector to go across to the non-union sector and work at lower wages and at different working conditions, particularly different work practices which, it is generally acknowledged in the industry, are more efficient and less costly in the non-union sector.

So we had one party effectively being able to shift to the non-union sector. The contractors were unable to do that. The consequence of that, as admitted by contractors and by trade unions, is that an estimated several hundred companies have been set up as spinoff companies in the last year. Our current legislation enables a trade union to bring any one of those spinoff companies, if it is deemed to be doing similar work to that of the major corporations, before the Labour Relations Board. If the trade union can show that it appears to be a means of escaping from the collective agreement, the Labour Relations Board could declare that the company would be bound by the collective agreement.

But the contractors made an argument that I think is valid. They said: how can the legislation allow union members to escape the collective agreement while we are bound to the collective agreement? How do we as government, or the Labour Relations Board, know that those trade union members who cross the street to work for non-union competition want to be members of the trade union? Mr. Speaker, it's a fair question, and a fair response was to say: all right, those individuals shall have a secret ballot, and that ballot will determine whether or not they wish to be represented by the union. That is what was provided in the Bill.

The trade unions then made the additional case that it is very difficult to pierce the corporate veil to get information about how companies associate with one another. That is a question which is not adequately responded to in any of the legislation I have seen in this province or elsewhere in Canada. So what we have done by amendment is that if there are more than two corporations doing the same or associated business activities, we have reversed the onus and made it possible for the trade union to bring the corporation before the Labour Relations Board. The company must then prove that it isn't trying to escape the collective agreement requirements.

Mr. Speaker, that is a difficult area, but I think it is a fair resolution to a difficult area. I hope that during the general review of labor relations in the construction industry, it is an aspect that will have further examination.

I'd just like to say that some question has been raised about government intervention. The fact of the matter is that had we not intervened in the first instance, we wouldn't have had this problem, because it would have been an absolutely freewheeling market place. In that circumstance, I'm not quite sure whether there would be any trade unions left. I would also like to say that there is going to be some adjustment in the market. There must be. How that adjustment is going to work, I don't know. But all hon. members have probably observed the statement by the representative of the International Sheet Metal Workers' Union, which this past week negotiated a reduction of \$3.29 per hour in its collective agreement, and is now receiving some criticism from other trade unions. But the business agent was very clear as to their reasons. They were in the position where they either adjusted their labor rates and some of their working conditions or the union itself was in jeopardy. That happened before Bill 110, and I submit that Bill 110 will not have any implications for the labor rates in the future. That will be the result of the market place.

So principle number one, Mr. Speaker, is that the employer ought to be able to address his corporate business in whatever form he wishes. Principle number two is that there should be an ability to communicate freely between the employer and employees, and that is so provided. However, we have made the amendments to assure that in the communication the employer cannot coerce and cannot intimidate. Canada has a very poor record compared to western industrialized countries in terms of work stoppages — the worst in the western world. Surely it is important, if we're going to improve that record, if we're going to improve our productivity, that there should be open communication and the capacity to develop a consensus between employer and employees. That is the second principle contained in this Bill.

There are other problems in the construction industry — absolutely no question. That is the purpose of the advisory committee I announced my intention to develop. I may add, and I think hon. members will have occasion to be pleased that this morning I received a call from the president of the Building Trades Council. We had a good discussion about the nominations he's going to make for this. I am very pleased with the

co-operative attitude he's shown with respect to the advisory committee and with the co-operation he has exhibited over the many discussions held during the past week.

Mr. Speaker, the industry needs to find stability. It needs more jobs. The jobs will follow the stability; the jobs will come after there is an adjustment in the industry to the present difficulties before it. I believe that Bill 110 will assist in achieving that stability, because it is now clear that all the parties involved in the industry must come together. Despite our efforts over the past summer, it has not been possible to bring them all together. But I have now detected a willingness to recognize the real challenges before the industry, a willingness which was not present preceding Bill 110.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Bill 110 to the positive vote of members of this Assembly.

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

[Eight minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

Adair	Fyfe	Payne
Alexander	Gogo	Planche
Alger	Harle	Purdy
Batiuk	Hiebert	Reid
Bogle	Hyndman	Shaben
Bradley	Jonson	Shrake
Campbell	Kowalski	Stevens
Carter	Lee	Stiles
Chambers	LeMessurier	Stromberg
Clark	Lysons	Szwender
Cook	McPherson	Thompson
Crawford	Miller	Trynchy
Cripps	Moore, M.	Webber
Diachuk	Moore, R.	Weiss
Drobot	Musgrove	Woo
Elliott	Nelson	Young
Fischer	Osterman	Zip
Fjordbotten	Pahl	

Against the motion:

Buck	Martin	Notley
------	--------	--------

Totals:	Ayes – 53	Noes – 3
---------	-----------	----------

[Bill 110 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
111	Dental Profession Act	Crawford (for King)
112	Provincial Court Amendment Act, 1983 (No. 2)	Crawford
114	Public Service Employee Relations Amendment Act, 1983	Shrake
115	Natural Gas Pricing Agreement Amendment Act, 1983	Crawford (for Zaozirny)

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wish shortly to move Motion No. 31 but just prior to that would like to deal, if I might, with two matters. I might be allowed by hon. members to give a brief explanation of the first one. The second one will be self-explanatory.

With respect to Bill 102, which is awaiting Royal Assent, a number of representations have been made to my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who is not in the Assembly today to raise the matter himself. The representations have been from municipal governments in the province, and the result of those representations is that the minister would like to see the matter held and not given Royal Assent. In order to do that, I must ask unanimous consent of the Assembly to revert the matter to the third reading stage, where it would stay on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the one other matter before the Clerk calls Motion No. 31, which I will move, is that in the event that Royal Assent and the adjournment go beyond 5:30, I would ask unanimous leave to stop the clock at 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

#### head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

31. Moved by Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved that when the Assembly adjourns, it shall stand adjourned until such time and date prior to the commencement of the 1984 session as is determined by Mr. Speaker after consultation with the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Government House Leader. Maybe I missed something. Could the minister indicate why it is that we are asking that the House be adjourned and not prorogued until the spring session?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to respond to that. In the last year or so, it has been more common for us to adopt a practice which is in Parliament usually and in a number of other Assemblies; that is, if it is of no inconvenience to hon. members, to use the adjournment rather than the prorogation. The prorogation would occur probably on the Monday or Tuesday before the opening of a new session, which is normally on a Thursday.

The sole purpose is that in the event that the Assembly had to reassemble, if there were a need for something to be done on short notice, it is more convenient to call an adjourned session back by way of notice through the Speaker after consultation with the Lieutenant Governor in Council than to begin with a Speech from the Throne and a new session. That's the only reason.

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor will now attend upon the Assembly.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair]

#### head: ROYAL ASSENT

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order! His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

[The Honourable Frank Lynch-Staunton, Lieutenant-Governor of Alberta, took his place upon the Throne]

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly has, at its present session, passed certain Bills to which, and in the name of the Legislative Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

CLERK: Your Honour, the following are the titles of the Bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

No.	Title
45	Utilities Statutes Amendment Act, 1983
71	Condominium Property Amendment Act, 1983
72	County Amendment Act, 1983
73	Department of Tourism and Small Business Amendment Act, 1983
74	Drayton Valley Townsite Repeal Act
75	Government House Amendment Act, 1983
76	Agricultural Pests Amendment Act, 1983
77	Farm Home Improvements Repeal Act
78	Names of Homes Repeal Act
79	Marriage Amendment Act, 1983
80	Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Special Appropriation Act, 1984-85
81	Electoral Boundaries Commission Amendment Act, 1983
82	Provincial General Hospitals Amendment Act, 1983
83	Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act, 1983
84	Vencap Equities Alberta Act
86	Manpower Development Amendment Act, 1983
87	Public Inquiries Amendment Act, 1983
88	Ombudsman Amendment Act, 1983
89	Appropriation (Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, Capital Projects Division) Act, 1984-85
90	Health Occupations Amendment Act, 1983 (No. 2)
91	Pacific Western Airlines Act
92	Environment Statutes Amendment Act, 1983
93	Police Officers Collective Bargaining Act
94	Election Amendment Act, 1983
95	Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1983 (No. 2)
96	Mobile Home Sites Tenancies Amendment Act, 1983
97	Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act, 1983
98	Hospitals and Medical Care Statutes Amendment Act, 1983

No.	Title
99	Property Tax Reduction Amendment Act, 1983
100	Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1983 (No. 2)
101	Alberta Corporate Income Tax Amendment Act, 1983 (No. 2)
103	Libraries Act
104	Treasury Branches Amendment Act, 1983
106	Oil Sands Conservation Act
107	Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1983
108	Summary Convictions Amendment Act, 1983
109	Real Property Statutes Amendment Act, 1983 (No. 3)
110	Labour Relations Amendment Act, 1983
111	Dental Profession Act
112	Provincial Court Amendment Act, 1983 (No. 2)
114	Public Service Employee Relations Amendment Act, 1983
115	Natural Gas Pricing Agreement Amendment Act, 1983

[The Lieutenant-Governor indicated his assent]

CLERK: In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these Bills.

HIS HONOUR: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature:

I'm not going to give you a speech. All I'm going to do is let you get out of here, and wish you all a very, very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year. [applause]

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order!

[The Lieutenant-Governor left the House]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Assembly now adjourn in accordance with Motion No. 31, passed earlier today.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 5:34 p.m., pursuant to Motion 31, the House adjourned]

[The First Session of the 20th Legislature was prorogued by Order in Council 166/84, on February 29, 1984]