

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Thursday, May 10, 1984 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, under a special program in co-operation with International Trade of the Alberta government, the University of Alberta, and CIDA in Ottawa, we are privileged today to have with us management personnel from around the world interested in Alberta's high technology and expertise in petroleum and natural gas exploration, drilling, production, and transmission.

From Ethiopia we have Mr. Telahun Balcha, who is a project manager for petroleum exploration. From Indonesia we have Mr. Kaswir Badu, who is a lecturer in drilling; Mr. Soekartono Hadiwarsito, head of the personnel department; Mr. Roseli Landjoemin, from the management division of LEMIGAS; Mr. Maridjan, drilling supervisor for LEMIGAS; Mr. Sardjono Hadi Soemarso, a lecturer for the technical training department; Mr. Soeprapto, head of the training division; and Sri Mintradjo Arham, head of acquisition. From Malaysia we have Mr. Zainal Abidin Alang Kassim, head of the Petronas training centre, and Mr. Wan Zakaria, section head of the production department. From the People's Republic of China — in fact from Daqing — we have Mr. Li Pei Wen, of the Daqing foreign affairs office; and from Turkey, Mr. Isik Muzzafer Turgay, deputy director of the geophysics department.

They are accompanied in the members gallery by Mr. Mel Blitzer, director of the international briefing centre, University of Alberta; Mr. Robin Coutts, assistant director; Mr. Joe Corrigan, assistant to the co-ordinator; and our own trade director for that area, Mr. Michael Sienke. I should add that Mr. Mel Blitzer was our co-ordinator in Thailand two months ago, giving 200 officials of the Thai government a course in Alberta's procedures and ways of promoting, and in drilling and all the other activities involved in oil and gas exploration.

Mr. Speaker, recalling yesterday's communiqués of the western premiers, I'm very happy that these people are here today. They're taking a summer course at the University of Alberta in engineering, procurement, gas processing, management and policy, training and manpower, exploration, production, and even offshore management. It is the Alberta Summer Institute for Petroleum Industry Development. I would like to ask our guests to rise and be recognized by this Assembly.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 19**  
**Fuel Oil Administration**  
**Amendment Act, 1984**

MR. DROBOT: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 19, the Fuel Oil Administration Amendment Act, 1984.

This Bill will amend the current Act in order to provide consistency in the method bulk agents administer the Alberta farm fuel distribution allowance and the domestic heating oil allowance. It will also provide for a standard clause regarding record retention and will generally update and clarify the existing Act.

[Leave granted; Bill 19 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 19 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to file five copies of two sets of documents, the first being Opportunities for Medical Practitioners in Northern Alberta. The second document is the Report on Community/Medical Student Interchange Meetings, which I deemed to be very successful. Both documents have been prepared by the Northern Alberta Development Council.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege this afternoon to introduce 110 very enthusiastic grade 9 students from the Brooks junior high school, which is in the Bow Valley constituency. They are accompanied by teachers Mrs. Delday, Mr. Hartley, Mr. Powell, Mrs. Preston, Mrs. Sekella, Mrs. Tarney, and Mr. Weinmeyer; supervisors Bruce Sekella and Mrs. Talbot; and bus drivers Mrs. Erion, Mrs. Kuipers, and Mrs. Wells. They're seated in both the members and public galleries, and I ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to introduce to you, and through you to other members of the Assembly — in English — a group of students from Saint Mary's University in Halifax and their hosts from the University of Alberta in Edmonton. It's worth noting that three of those hosts are constituents of mine, and all are active in the Progressive Conservative Party. [interjections] They're accompanied by some faculty advisers: Dr. Kay Tudor, from Saint Mary's University in Halifax, and Dr. Susan Jackel, from the University of Alberta Canadian Studies department.

It's worth noting that they're here on the Open House Canada program. I think this kind of program allows us to learn about our differences and respect those differences as well as our similarities; that there is no one way to be a good Canadian and that there are at least ten good ways to be Canadians. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank you as well for providing seating in your gallery on short notice. There are students in your gallery and some in the members gallery. I ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted today to be able to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 32 students from the Brightview school grade 6 class, who are here with their teacher Mr. Walker and three parents who have volunteered their services for this afternoon. The students had the opportunity earlier in the week to visit City Hall and observe the conduct of City Hall. I ask that you welcome them and also that we perform in our usual good manner for them this afternoon. Would they please rise and be recognized by the House.

**head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Natural Gas Incentive Program**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It's with respect to the incentive program for domestic users of Alberta natural gas, which was recently announced by the federal and provincial ministers. Could the minister indicate to the Assembly whether any estimates as to the total cost of the incentive program have been obtained?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I can advise the Assembly that the approach taken to the new incentive plan was based upon a net benefits to Alberta producers and to Alberta approach; namely, we were not prepared to move with a program unless we were satisfied, in consultation with our industry, that the result of the program overall would not be a cost to the industry but rather that additional revenues would flow as a result of offering some incentives for further purchases of gas. So in fact that is the intention and expectation of the program.

In terms of specific numbers, there have been a number of different assessments given under various scenarios. It is our judgment that the specific calculation is one that it's not appropriate to try to enter into as a specific target. Of course it depends very much upon economic factors and upon the take-up by industry to the program. As I said, our assessment is that it will be beneficial. In terms of specific numbers, our judgment is that we will see that in the months ahead, and I think those results will be clear in a very short period of time.

MR. NOTLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's very nice. But could the minister tell the House whether the government, in its various scenarios, has any indication of what the impact would be should existing patterns of production and sales continue in Canada?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: First of all, Mr. Speaker, a question of that precision is rather difficult to respond to in the course of the question period. But I suggest that the factors that are inherent are of such a nature that it simply isn't a useful part of the process to try to specify particular numbers. That hasn't been the approach taken in putting forward this program on our part, the part of the federal government, or in fact the part of the industry.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister is saying that neither the federal government nor the provincial government has any estimates of the cost of this program, assuming there is not an increase in sales; that there are no figures compiled either federally or provincially at this stage.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, the member is not correct in that statement, and I think he's slightly changing his approach to this. He just now said: assuming there are no additional sales. His earlier comment was with respect to the general pattern.

Based upon conversations with distributors and with particular industrial customers, we think the pattern we're likely to see is that we are going to see incremental sales arising out of this. So the judgment is that there will be these additional sales. But there is a whole host of circumstances involving the general economic circumstances and the particular circumstances of various industries. We've set the program up for a three-

year term. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to suggest that I would hope that long prior to that three-year term expiring, there's going to be a fundamental reassessment of the energy policy of this country. That's going to have a pretty significant bearing upon the outcomes of programs of this nature as well.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, could the minister of energy give the Assembly the information that I'm sure his officials have provided the hon. Provincial Treasurer? There must be projections with respect to a policy of this nature. A 36 cent per mcf drop is going to have some impact on royalties. Has any projection with respect to royalty revenue been given to the Provincial Treasurer?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, there has been a variety of scenarios examined in the course of this, in the normal process of examination of the project. The judgment is that it's not a matter of cost but of the extent of the benefits.

I have to correct an implication that flows from the statement of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, when he talked about a 35-cent drop, because that's not accurate. The program as it's structured involves a 35-cent lessened incentive price for additional volumes beyond a certain base. So it's not accurate, and we should have the record clear on that. To speak in terms of some 35-cent drop in the overall — that's just not the case.

DR. BUCK: The hon. Premier.

MR. NOTLEY: The race between the hon. minister of energy and the Minister of Education will indeed be interesting to watch, especially the Member for Edmonton Glengarry in that process.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the hon. minister. What is the breakdown of assuming the costs of this 35-cent reduction, where applicable? How much of it will be borne by the provincial government, how much by the federal government, and how much by the producer?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, the program as it's structured — and again I talk in terms of benefits, of gains, rather than the Official Leader of the Opposition's preoccupation with talking in the negative and of losses.

That division is going to occur in the same fashion as it occurs in the normal course with natural gas revenues. The one added factor that should be outlined and put in place is with respect to the interface of this incentive with the market development incentive program that was contained in the original energy agreement. We as a provincial government took the position that sales which are incremental, which are occurring as a result of this incentive rather than would otherwise be the case, ought not to have the market development incentive levy imposed upon them. Ultimately we arrived at an accord with the federal government which recognized that principle intact. It's a very complicated area, and I think that's about as extensive an answer as could be given in the confines of question period, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Besides the minister's hope that this will increase sales, have any projections been developed by either the federal or the provincial department of energy which could be shared with either the federal finance minister or the Provincial Treasurer, with respect to the fiscal implications of this program?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is really repeating his earlier question. As I said, a range of

projections has of course been undertaken in the normal course of things.

When he spoke of the hope of the minister of energy of Alberta, I should add that the project and the program was devised in extremely close consultation with industry representatives. That's the approach we take as a government, and that's the approach that was adopted in this instance.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In terms of marketing strategy, is the minister able to advise if any immediate planning is under way to move beyond an approach aimed at current eastern customers only and focus instead on offering incentives for natural gas conversions so that a number of new customers could be gained, to offset falling sales elsewhere? In light of that question, what specific assessment has been made of the competition from residual fuels?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: In fact, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the expected results and benefits of this particular program; namely, that it will not only encourage maintenance of market share that Alberta gas currently has in the domestic market throughout Canada, but also that it will encourage conversion to natural gas. The program was put in place in recognition of a measure of interfuel competition that exists, whether it be fuel oil, electricity, or whatever other energy source. We think we've responded in an effective way. As I said, it was done in consultation with industry, and certainly the initial response that has come forward from prospective and current purchasers has been very gratifying. As I said, I think we'll see the results in the months ahead.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Given some doubts expressed in the past — not recently but in the past — about price reduction in terms of expanding markets, and I quote IPAC from 1979 and a recent 1982 National Energy Board report, could the minister advise whether or not any separate government projections of the estimated market penetration to be achieved by this price reduction have been commissioned?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, rather than referring to comments attributed to the Independent Petroleum Association of Canada in 1979 or 1982, I prefer to refer to their projections of 1984, at the time we sat down with them. They were actually involved in a meeting with me and my federal counterpart, Mr. Chrétien, in putting together this program. It's the judgment of that organization that it will have a positive result. I'm sure they have been involved in a measure of calculations of their own. As I said, we are working together with industry, and IPAC shares the view of the government.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary, followed by one by the hon. leader of the Independents.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question wasn't that. The question was whether or not the government commissioned an independent evaluation, either federally or provincially, of the market projections, in light of the fact that these projections from private industry have changed. In light of that question and as part of that question, has any specific consideration been given by both governments to the impact of a price reduction for Canadian users on our pricing in the United States' market?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: With respect to the former part of the hon. member's question, Mr. Speaker, while he may have some predilection and preference for a more academic or esoteric approach to these matters, we prefer to deal with industry and the practical projections they put forward. We think that's the best measure.

I think we could spend a good deal of question period this afternoon on the area of natural gas marketing in the United States. I simply offer the comment that one of our primary undertakings in this calendar year is again working with industry to develop a more market-oriented natural gas export marketing policy so that we as a province and our producers are able to achieve the level of sales, and more importantly revenues, that we think is appropriate to maintaining a healthy and viable industry in this province.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister of energy. It's in light of the fact that in 1983 the large-scale industrial users in eastern Canada decreased their purchases from Alberta by about 10 percent. Just to understand the expectation of the incremental sales, would it be the minister's hope in making this agreement that we recover the 10 percent loss in sales last year, or is there expectation to hold at a level of sales comparable to 1983 or increase it significantly over the actual sales of 1983?

MR. ZAOZIRNY: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is slightly reworking the earlier questions of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I respond by saying that we, the industry, and the federal government believe this program has the potential and the likelihood of both maintaining existing levels of sales and increasing that level of sales from what it would otherwise be.

MR. NOTLEY: But without any independent projections and with no budget for the program.

#### **Bank Credit Policies**

MR. NOTLEY: Could I direct the second question to the hon. Minister of Economic Development, and perhaps also the hon. Minister of Tourism and Small Business. It's with respect to two reports: the report this morning of a number of businessmen in High River expressing concern about the credit policies of banks, and a recent study by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association of 50 Edmonton-area manufacturers. My question to the government, to either hon. gentleman, is: what assessment has been made of the performance of banking institutions with respect to lending to small- and medium-sized businesses in this province?

MR. PLANCHE: In a specific way, Mr. Speaker, that's a difficult study to make, simply because it isn't only a question of whether or not the bank's attitude is correct but whether or not the companies in fact were properly constituted in terms of their financial structure and management. However, the larger question is whether or not the banks in Canada are designed under legislation in such a way that they can respond to companies and activities that depend on world markets for their livelihood. And the larger issue again is whether or not we can do anything to improve that performance so that every time there's a downturn in world markets for whatever we supply, our entire infrastructure in Alberta is not wiped out. We are dedicated to understanding better what the ramifications of all that are and moving appropriately to see that this doesn't recur.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. With respect to the survey of 50 Edmonton-area manufacturers, I believe presented on March 26 by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, Edmonton branch, what specific assessment has the government made of that report, which I gather indicates that some 80 percent of the businesses surveyed are experiencing financial difficulty at the moment?

MR. PLANCHE: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. That document is not familiar to me. I'd be happy to read it and report back.

It would not change what I stated a few minutes ago. The fact is that we need a financial sector in Alberta that's structured in such a way that it can respond to companies, the majority of which in Alberta are involved in activities where the price and demand for their product is set outside our boundaries. We are price takers, and because of that we don't intend to be penalized in terms of our future activities. So whatever needs to be done in that regard will be done.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Given the minister's answer, what review has the government made and what representation will the government of Alberta make with respect to the question of the adequacy of banking as it relates to western Canada, and Alberta in particular?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it's obviously a multifaceted question. Part has been answered by the Minister of Economic Development, part has been answered by the Budget Address and the provisions contained therein, and part has been answered by the proposals made by the Minister of Tourism and Small Business with regard to venture capital.

One of the elements we have faced in this area, with rapid development and growth, is the development and growth being financed to a large extent — and some would argue perhaps to too great an extent — on a debt rather than equity basis. As the Minister of Economic Development noted, to the larger degree that we have debt, when resource commodities fluctuate, as they will in world market conditions, then the pressure on the business community is significant. We have a multitude of actions we've taken, that I've mentioned.

In addition to that is the recent support we've given, through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, for a new banking operation in this province, as well as the support through the treasury branches and other Alberta-based banks. As we noted in the statement when the Treasurer indicated the support of the government for the newly created Bank of Alberta, this does not mean to say that the chartered banks and the "B" banks, as they're called, do not have an important role to play. There is constant communication by me, the Provincial Treasurer, and a number of ministers with the banking and financial community. I intend to speak to the Canadian Bankers' Association when they hold their annual meeting here in Edmonton, I believe in June. At that time I intend to summarize many of the statements I'm making now, that have been made before, and that were answered a few minutes ago by the Minister of Economic Development.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Have there been any discussions between the Provincial Treasurer and the treasury branch officials of this province, especially with respect to the problems faced by some of the smaller business people who feel that, notwithstanding the best efforts of local bank managers, regional and head office managers of the chartered banks are now demanding repayment on less than reasonable terms?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, there is communication on matters of policy in that regard. Certainly I think the record of performance of the treasury branches over the past 18 months or so, and indeed the reputation of the treasury branches in Alberta, is such that they have demonstrated a sensitivity with respect to their accounts in the province of Alberta — a sensitivity to the pressures and problems faced by small-business men — and have done their best in individual cases. Recognizing that each particular case is different and, as my colleague indicated, recognizing that the financial makeup of the company and the management is different in each case, I think their reputation and their sensitivity and approach to the Alberta situation, realizing it is a temporary situation as we move toward recovery, has been demonstrated very well.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question. Has the Minister of Agriculture had any matters brought to his concern that farmers are having difficulty this spring getting bank advances to buy fertilizer and seed? Has that been brought to the minister's attention?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that there is some difficulty with respect to operating capital in the farming community. That was one of the concerns raised by the agricultural community in total, in wanting the grain stabilization Act amended so that a payout would be made and thereby assist with spring planting. The indications that have come to my office have been very few in number, and it is not a widespread concern.

#### University Graduates — Employment

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney General as well as the Acting Minister of Advanced Education. In contacting the Faculty of Law of the University of Alberta, I found that 45 out of 168 law graduates this year do not have firms with which they can article. I am wondering if the Attorney General or the Minister of Advanced Education could indicate whether any type of liaison assistance is being made available to these students by the government of Alberta.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Law Society of Alberta has addressed that concern to some extent. A similar situation existed last year. On the basis of representation by at least one constituent of mine, a young man who wanted to commence articles, I discussed the situation with the Law Society and presented a number of ideas the students had had about how the society might be in touch with members of the profession, how they might make suggestions to the students about what they might do on their own account.

In the result, numbers of the ones last year who were having the problem — I think not all, but numbers of them — were placed, whereas that might not have otherwise been the case. As far as this year is concerned, I think it's a bit too early to tell the extent of whatever problem there might be.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, as the acting minister, I could just add that we understand the students contacted the Law Society, which in turn was in touch with the Attorney General. I cannot answer whether they contacted the Department of Advanced Education at the same time, so I'll take the question as notice on behalf of the minister.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the acting minister. What arrangements can be made through the students' assistance programs for persons who have not

been able to find a place to article? There will be a call upon them to start paying interest and soon capital payments on their loans.

MR. KING: To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, no such arrangements have been considered by the Students Finance Board, because student finance doesn't operate on the assumption that a professional education guarantees employment in that profession. For example, we have teachers who, having graduated from the Faculty of Education, are unable to find work as teachers. However, they are able to find employment in other fields. It is the employment that triggers the repayment of the loan, not employment in the particular field for which a person was trained.

Having said that, it is subject to confirmation, which I will undertake with the Students Finance Board. If my answer this afternoon is not completely accurate, I'll respond further to the hon. gentleman tomorrow afternoon.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, could the acting minister indicate what arrangements are made in situations where the person remains unemployed and unable to gain any kind of employment?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, individuals can make arrangements with the Students Finance Board on an individual basis. As to the matters that are taken into consideration by the board, I can't answer that question this afternoon. I'll take it as notice.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the Acting Minister of Advanced Education indicate, today or in a later question period, whether the unemployment rates among graduates of other faculties such as engineering, dentistry, medicine, or education are somewhat similar to that of the Faculty of Law? Are a number of those graduates finding it very difficult to find employment at this time?

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that the information is collected on a faculty by faculty or professional school by professional school basis. I will inquire of the department and take the question as notice.

#### **International Trade**

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, my questions are to the Premier, and they come from my reading of the western premiers' conference communiqué on international trade. Were discussions held to ensure provincial as well as federal involvement in the development of trade policies? For example, will there indeed be provincial participation in the November '84 General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade ministerial conference?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the position of the western premiers, as reflected by the communiqué, is that there simply can't be national trade policy in a confederation in a federal system without very significant involvement by the provinces. Time and again we've seen that the failure to do so creates an ineffective national strategy for Canada to market its products.

The communiqué at this stage is really a communication to the federal government on a number of items, one of them being the specific reference to the agricultural subcommittee on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in the meeting referred to by the hon. member in his question, as well as in further evolution of the trade policy paper issued by the federal government last September.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, an additional question to the Premier. Can I take it from this that further representation will be made on more of a personal basis, directed to the federal government? Perhaps we can put some pressure on them to try to eliminate certain trade barriers such as the matter of import auto quotas and, as mentioned in the document, other non-tariff barriers. Along that line, will representation be made to make it easier for western Canada to access the northwestern United States' markets?

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, Mr. Speaker. That's very much a part of our policy and covers a multitude of product areas in terms of both import and export. We as a government here in Alberta have taken positions and made representations on a number of these cases where we feel that, for example, if we're selling a product to Japan and they're selling to us, and retaliatory measures are being discussed by the federal government — we're communicating the trade-off impact much more aggressively than has been the case in the past. In short, there may be some short-term benefit in an artificial way in central Canada, but the longer term benefit of having a larger market for the part of our country that really can compete in the world marketplace is in the best interest of Canada.

DR. CARTER: A further supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Is it appropriate to assume that the western premiers had some discussions with respect to another impediment that Ottawa has been putting up, and that's with regard to the matter of the operation of the federal investment review agency?

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there was reference to that. The way in which it was finally resolved among the western premiers was that we believe unnecessary impediments to foreign investment should be removed. I'm going from memory with the quote, but the phrase that was used was: unnecessary impediments to foreign investment being removed. It was the feeling that that particular phraseology would meet the satisfaction of all four western governments.

DR. CARTER: A final supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Does the Premier really hold out much hope that the federal government is in a position, or is willing and in a state of mind, to entertain some of these kinds of discussions in a positive way? Is there any room for any kind of negotiation there? For example, are they really prepared to discuss an item mentioned in the communiqué, duty-free zones in western Canada?

MR. LOUGHEED: That's very difficult to answer, except that I believe the nature of events that are occurring during 1984 provides an ideal opportunity to communicate the views of western Canada. We should note that in some of these cases, the views of Atlantic Canada are very similar. So one could not envision more appropriate timing than during the events of 1984 to present a constructive western approach on these issues. In our judgment, that is what occurred as a result of our deliberations and the communiqué from the Kelowna meeting of the western premiers.

DR. CARTER: Flowing from that, Mr. Speaker, does the Premier then really have full confidence that a co-operative approach with respect to a co-operative system dealing with international trade can be developed in western Canada among all four of the provinces?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, we have to accept the fact that there are bound to be differences, either differences of

philosophy by one government compared to another or differences because of the resource position of one province compared to another. But I generally felt, as we expressed yesterday and as we expressed when we were in Kelowna, that this was one of our best western premiers' conferences. We came out with three communiqués that have been constructive and covered a number of important elements. From my experience, I believe the statements contained in those communiqués form a very sound foundation for further work by the four western governments in a co-operative way. It's this government's intention to do everything we can, wherever we can, to present a combined and united western Canadian position.

### Trucking Regulations

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Transportation, in relation to the regulation of the trucking industry. Truckers in the Wainwright area have strongly expressed concerns and difficulty in obtaining authority to truck across the border in and out of Saskatchewan. Can the minister advise what efforts, if any, are being made to reduce the regulations the trucking industry is faced with?

MR. M. MOORE: First of all, Mr. Speaker, it's important to note that any trucking industry that wanted to haul in both Saskatchewan and Alberta would have to apply to the Alberta Motor Transport Board and to the Saskatchewan board. I'm not aware of the details of which board the firms are having trouble with or if it was both boards.

I can say this about the whole matter of regulatory control over the busing and trucking industries as it is applied by motor transport boards across Canada: we've been working very hard to try to get other provinces and the federal government to move with a responsible regulatory reform position so that many of these people who are involved in the motor transport industry can freely compete with their competitors without having to go through the lengthy and difficult processes of obtaining operating authority from several jurisdictions that they now do. We've had some success in getting my colleagues in other provinces and the federal Minister of Transport thinking this way. As a matter of fact, on May 30 there will be a meeting in Ottawa, which I will be attending, to deal further at the ministerial level with the manner in which we believe deregulation should most appropriately occur in Canada.

In addition to that, I've had discussions directly with the Saskatchewan Minister of Highways and Transportation, in an effort to try to see if there isn't some joint provincial co-operation that can be carried on between our two provinces to break down some of the barriers that presently exist with respect to our truckers moving into Saskatchewan. The initial effort there was to try to get a 20-kilometre free zone on each side of the Alberta-Saskatchewan border, where people who had Saskatchewan operating authority could operate 20 kilometres into Alberta on that authority, and vice versa. A hearing was held in Lloydminster some time ago and, since that time, the Saskatchewan board and the Saskatchewan government have turned down that concept.

We're now working on the possibility of expanding that concept and, rather than the 20-kilometre zone, having certain commodities that can be hauled freely from one province to the other. Saskatchewan has suggested that livestock and grain would be nice commodities to have moving from their province into Alberta without operating authority in Alberta, because they're anxious to get livestock into Provost and grain into the rapeseed crushing plant in Lloydminster. I've suggested that

in return, oil field equipment into all of Saskatchewan from Alberta would be an excellent start.

MR. FISCHER: A supplementary. In view of the fact that Saskatchewan will not allow our truckers to load up and haul out of Saskatchewan back into Alberta and we do allow that for Saskatchewan truckers, have any efforts been made to take this unfairness out of the system?

MR. M. MOORE: Those efforts are being made. I think it's important that we try everything we possibly can to get other jurisdictions to relax their regulations before we go to the point of putting additional regulations or roadblocks in the way of people in the trucking industry who want to do business in this province from other parts of Canada or indeed the United States.

So our first objective, and the one we're working very hard on, is to try to break down that regulatory control that regulates against our truckers in other provinces. If that fails, obviously we'll have to take a hard look at some of the protectionist schemes that are being used in other provinces, and it may ultimately be that we have to adopt those ourselves. But we believe very strongly that our industry in Canada, the Canadian economy, and certainly the Alberta economy would be served much better by a freer operation of the trucking industry throughout the country.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, has the Minister of Transportation ever addressed the licensing of Saskatchewan equipment, particularly the trucks, when they're working on our highway jobs here in Alberta and are still using out-of-province plates?

MR. M. MOORE: I'm not sure what the hon. member is referring to. With respect to gravel trucking, there is a requirement that an operator of a gravel truck working in Alberta must have been a resident of the province of Alberta for six months. That situation is totally different, separate, and apart from the general trucking industry, wherein you haul general freight, livestock, oil field equipment, or whatever, wherein operating authorities are granted for extraprovincial operation. I'm not exactly sure of the import of the member's question. Perhaps he could expand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LYSONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to expand. It would be the service trucks on the actual worksite where they're doing road construction, building, or whatever, but primarily on the service truck end of it.

MR. M. MOORE: If the hon. member is referring to the actual vehicle licensing of trucks working in Alberta that come from other provinces. I'd have to refer that question to the hon. Solicitor General.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, is the show on the road?

MR. LYSONS: Maybe I'll address the question to the Solicitor General — we caught him by surprise.

Where the owners are doing contract work in Alberta, service trucks are allowed to use Saskatchewan or out-of-province licence plates on their trucks. I wonder if you could address that particular problem and, if they're doing contracts in Alberta, have them at least have the common courtesy to have Alberta plates on their vehicles.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that as notice and check with the department on exactly what they are doing at the moment with out-of-province trucks. There has been a problem with

out-of-province people staying longer than the six months with automobile plates, for instance, and continuing to use their out-of-province plates. With any luck, with the new computer system we'll be able to keep a much better check on out-of-province plates being used for any length of time within the province.

But in relation to trucks, there are the interprovincial agreements, and I'll check that and get back to the member.

#### **Doctor Shortage — Rural Areas**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Is the minister in a position to indicate how severe the shortage of doctors in the rural hospitals in the province is at this time?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, that question has come up before in previous sessions in the Legislature, and it's no different this year than it has been in previous years. We do keep in touch with the College of Physicians and Surgeons. Generally there is in the neighbourhood of six to eight regions or communities that do have a shortage of doctors at any given time. It's not that those regions are constant, though; it tends to be a changing situation. If the hon. member wants an inventory of what those regions are this month, I could get it and report back to him.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to indicate if there are any rural hospitals in the province at this time that do not have any full-time resident doctors to serve those hospitals?

MR. RUSSELL: That's something I'd also have to take as notice, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in the minister's discussions with the College of Physicians and Surgeons, have the two joint bodies looked at any type of incentive or bursary programs to attract young medical graduates to go to some of these underserved areas?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, that is an issue that has been given some attention, Mr. Speaker. There seem to be two plans considered by other provinces as well as ours. One involves a bonus system which is layered on top of the standard fee for service, as an incentive for physicians to practise in the rural areas. The problem with that is that in Alberta many of the rural-based general practitioners are already among the highest income earners in the medical profession, so that would merely be an added bonus for them.

The other method, of course, is to try to find some program of start-up incentive or a rotating program with an incentive built into it, and that's something we've been looking at for several months.

DR. BUCK: On that very point, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Have there been any discussions with the educational institutes as well as the college, to look at some type of bursary program to assist medical students to go through the university and then back to these underserved areas, as they do in other bursary programs?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe officials of the department have had those kinds of discussions with the deans of medicine. I'm not certain of that, but I have the impression those discussions have taken place.

In talking about this problem with some rural citizens, they've expressed some concern that they would be on a rotating basis of continually being serviced by fresh graduates who might change every few months or so. In their view, they would like something more permanent than that.

#### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

MR. SPEAKER: Might we revert briefly to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### **head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS** (*reversion*)

MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 14 grade 10 students from the Irma high school. They are accompanied by Mrs. Elsie McRoberts and Miss Raye Elrick. It is an added pleasure for me today to introduce this group of students, because they are my friendly neighbours from my home town of Irma. They are seated in the public gallery, and I ask them to rise and receive the welcome of this Assembly.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the questions and motions for returns, we advise that the government is prepared to accept Question 165.

I move that questions 171 and 172 and motions for returns 174 and 175 stand and retain their places on the Order Paper.

[Motion carried]

#### **head: WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

165. Mr. Notley asked the government the following question: With regard to the meeting of the Water Resources Commission in Lethbridge on August 23, 1983, attended by the Minister of the Environment and combined with an inspection of irrigation rehabilitation projects by Northwest Irrigation operators:

- (1) in addition to the Minister of the Environment and the members of the Water Resources Commission
  - (a) what other members, agents, representatives, or employees of the government attended the meeting of the commission and, in each case, in what capacity, and
  - (b) what other persons attended the meeting of the commission and, in each case, in what capacity;
- (2) (a) what members, agents, representatives, or employees of the government participated in the inspection of irrigation rehabilitation projects and, in each case, in what capacity, and
  - (b) what other persons participated in the inspection of irrigation rehabilitation projects and, in each case, in what capacity;
- (3) what were the primary topics of discussion at the meeting of the Water Resources Commission;
- (4) at any point during the course of the meeting or the inspection, was the desirability and/or feasibility of cross-border transfer of water from Alberta to the United States discussed?

head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN  
GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

214. Moved by Mr. Cook:

Be it resolved that the Assembly encourage the government to further develop the electrical engineering and computer science departments at Alberta universities to support the new and growing electronics industry.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to be able to present to the House this afternoon a motion relating to electrical engineering and computer science.

I think the motion is timely. We have an economic strategy paper being presented to the province in June, and the province and the government have to consider economic approaches to make sure our existing industries are efficient and for the creation of new technologies and jobs. At the same time, we have the education curriculum being reviewed by the minister and the Department of Education, and we have also had a science policy in the form of a discussion paper presented to the people of Alberta by the Minister of Economic Development.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in Alberta, its future, and its people. I think we have a very exciting prospect in front of us, if you think about it, Alberta is very well positioned in the world. We're close to the west coast of the United States, we have tremendous markets in the Pacific Rim countries, and we have very talented and resourceful people as well as our bountiful natural resources. As well, we have in Alberta three very fine universities providing conventional education, as well as Athabasca University. Those three universities have the capability to provide high-quality education in computer science and electrical engineering, in the case of the University of Alberta and the University of Calgary, and a good program beginning at the University of Lethbridge, I understand.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to begin by thanking the department chairmen of computing science and electrical engineering at the University of Alberta. Dr. Lee White and Dr. Bob James. I've spoken to both of those gentlemen, as well as the Dean of Engineering, Dr. Peter Adams. Those gentlemen are all excited about the prospects of the province but somewhat frustrated by the barriers being placed in their way.

It's worth noting that Bell-Northern labs here in the city of Edmonton has begun its operations, with almost 100 electrical engineers on staff now. If you go out to the Bell-Northern labs research facility in Mill Woods, the place is humming with activity. They're selling ideas and products worldwide in the telecommunications field, and that's the kind of new industry that is being created to replace old industries that are no longer viable. I think many of us in the Assembly have faced the closures of plants in our constituencies. I had a meat packing plant close in the area; not in my constituency directly, but many of my constituents are employed in plants like that. With the loss of that employment because of new efficiencies in that operation, we have to find alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, Bell-Northern labs is just such an alternative. In a speech a little while ago, the national president of Bell-Northern labs noted that there is an extraordinary shortage of trained computer scientists and electrical engineers. He advocated that graduates of electrical engineering or computing science not go directly into the industry. I thought that was kind of strange, because he has a shortage of people. He said: no, what we need is people to go on to graduate studies to pick up their masters and PhDs, so they can in turn reinvest their energy into new students and expand the base. He's basically saying, much like a farmer would say: you can't eat your seed grain over the winter: you have to plant it, wait for a new crop, and

harvest that. He has a longer term view. I think the agricultural analogy fits well. The point that the president of Bell-Northern labs in Canada is making is that we have a shortage of people. We have only about 180 people teaching electrical engineering in western Canada, and we have a tremendous demand for that area of discipline.

Mr. Speaker, we have a shortage of teaching staff and a shortage of students at the University of Alberta. That's the university I'm most familiar with, so I'll use these statistics as my source. Last year at the University of Alberta, 85 students applied to electrical engineering, were qualified to be admitted, and could not be admitted — 85 students who could go on and take high-quality jobs here in the province. There is no shortage of job opportunities for them, and they were turned away. And there will be 85 students or more turned away next year. If they were to get the education they demand and are able to receive or could absorb, they would be contributing to Alberta in a new and exciting technology field. Last year 120 students were turned away in computer science, and they too were qualified, had the ability, and could not be admitted because of shortages of space and staff.

At the University of Alberta, we have a high-quality program, relatively speaking, but the department chairman makes this case to me. They put through about 4,000 students who received courses in computer science last year with a staff of about 20 people. That's about 200 students to one professor; that's incredible. The student/staff ratio is so high that the professors cannot invest very much of their time in individual students. Consequently the quality of the education is lacking a little bit.

It's fair to point out that this problem is not unique to the University of Alberta; in fact it's right across North America. You go to any university, and there is such a worldwide shortage of trained people in this discipline that you will find this problem anywhere. But we're probably not doing as much as a lot of our competitors to increase that number of staff, much like the farmer would keep developing the seed grains so he would have a good crop maybe a year later.

Mr. Speaker, I think a lot of members might ask the question, why should we be concerned? Electrical engineering and computer science are some interesting but somewhat exotic technologies, and they're not really going to affect me. I don't think that's true. A revolution is taking place worldwide. In the galleries this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, we saw a group of management personnel taking part in a course offered by the University of Alberta, the petroleum industry development program. It is sponsored by the engineering department at the University of Alberta. It brings to this province people from all over the world who have drilling industry experience. They are managers in that industry. The Minister of International Trade introduced to us students, managers in the drilling industry, from Thailand, the Philippines, and China, just to mention a few countries. They've come to the University of Alberta because we have forefront technology. In this province we are on the cutting edge of technology in that area of expertise, and because of that people are coming from abroad to our province.

Mr. Speaker, the Dean of Engineering made the case to me that those people will go back home and will place orders with our industry to procure supplies, services, and personnel. These people are managers in their national oil companies or the oil companies active in their home countries. They will go back home and say: I took a course at the University of Alberta, and I know those guys in Alberta have the capability to do a certain job: I am going to pick up the phone or place a cable and get a supply or service. In fact that's happening. Dean Adams from the University of Alberta notes that a lot of orders have been



placed by graduates of this university. In fact they called the mineral engineering department and asked for some information — how do I get hold of so and so, because on one of our excursions I saw that that kind of technology is available; we have a problem back home, and I'd like you to solve it for me.

Mr. Speaker, in Calgary the energy industry relies increasingly on a very sophisticated geophysical resource base that requires vast amounts of knowledge. Vast amounts of data are gathered studying the geological structures, and they are pinpointing exploration opportunities for their oil companies. That requires trained computing science graduates to gather that data, process it, and interpret it.

Mr. Speaker, computing science and electrical engineering are important in the energy industry. We heard from my benchmate the hon. Member for Highwood how important computing science is now on the farmstead. Farmers are relying more and more on data bases and computers for the efficient application of pesticides and fertilizer. Mr. Speaker, the agricultural industry is developing a greater reliance. Why is that? It's because we have limited resources, and we're trying to use them in the most efficient way, be they fertilizer or pesticides in that case.

Mr. Speaker, I went through the offices of Chandler Kennedy, architects in Calgary, a little while ago. Gerry Kennedy was good enough to spend about an hour with me and he took me through his drafting department. By the way, I might make this note in passing. Chandler Kennedy is the largest architectural firm in Canada, and it is headquartered here in Alberta. Mr. Speaker, they have offices in London, England, and in the United States. They have a computing science requirement for their drafting.

He told me about a client in Denver who wanted to build a building. Gerry was in Calgary and the client was in Denver, and they had a conversation over the telephone and with a computer. The client would say: well, I think the building should be a little taller in this area, or I would like to change this feature. Gerry would say, fine, and would punch into the computer a few changes in the components, and the computer would graph out the changes right away. The client would say: yes, that looks pretty good; that's what I want. Then he would say, could you change another feature? And Gerry would punch into the computer the components, and right away it would be drafted.

Mr. Speaker, that company is competing in a worldwide market. He's providing services in Europe, he's selling his services in the United States, and he's selling his services abroad and in the rest of the country. He is competing against other architectural firms in the rest of the world, and he's doing it out of offices here in Edmonton and in Calgary, providing jobs for young Albertans. I think that's tremendously exciting. It gets around tariff barriers and national boundaries. You don't have to worry about importation quotas. You just pick up the phone and send the information to your office in Denver. No customs people are involved in that. Last year this province exported \$100 million worth of engineering services in precisely this kind of fashion. I get that statistic from the throne speech. It's a new industry we're developing, and we are competing worldwide. That's our market.

Mr. Speaker, what I'm trying to say is that computing science and electrical engineering are important to the energy industry, the agricultural industry, the construction and engineering industries, as well as the creation of a new technology that will provide other jobs in electronics. I think this kind of activity is absolutely vital for Alberta to stay at the forefront of technology.

What we are saying then is that in order to be in the forefront of technology in areas of existing strength — for example,

energy, agriculture, and engineering — we need to have universities in Alberta that are in the forefront of technology. We need young Albertans to become equipped with the skills to compete worldwide, just like Gerry Kennedy is doing in Denver or in London, just like our agricultural industry is doing so well with the efficient use of its scarce resources of pesticides, fertilizer, and energy in keeping their input costs down, just like our geophysical people are doing in the search for new oil and gas in the province. We're creating new technologies; we're selling those worldwide. On afternoons like today, we have guests in our galleries coming here to Alberta to learn about what we're doing, so they can go back home and place orders from Alberta supplies and Alberta companies, so they too can join the search for oil and gas worldwide. Mr. Speaker, that provides jobs.

I want to review a little bit of the rationale behind this motion. Mr. Speaker, I began my brief remarks by saying we have the development of an economic strategy paper in the works right now. The Minister of Advanced Education, the chairman of the economic planning committee of cabinet, and the Minister of Economic Development are a three-man team working on that paper with the Premier. That paper should be presented either to this Assembly or to the province in June. So it's timely that these considerations we're talking about this afternoon are put before the Assembly so they might be more fully considered in an economic strategy paper.

I noted that in Edmonton and Calgary, there are new industries and companies developing, like Bell-Northern labs. There are new job opportunities in an electronics and computing science industry. Thirdly, I noted that in order to remain competitive in existing areas of present strength, like agriculture, energy, geophysics, and the construction industries — I gave as the example the Chandler Kennedy Group in Alberta selling their products worldwide — we need a strong technical back-ground.

Mr. Speaker, I noted that at the University of Alberta, and the same is true of the University of Calgary, we have a shortage of staff. We don't have enough staff to teach all the people who are qualified to be admitted to computing science or electrical engineering. The staff we have are doing yeoman service. They're teaching many more students, on a per-staff basis, than any other department at the university. I'm a little bit worried about the quality of education that can be offered under those kinds of pressures. I noted that there was a high demand by students, that 85 students were turned away from electrical engineering last year, that new students will be again this year, and that 125 qualified students in computing science were turned away by that department. That is the case at only one university. It's being repeated at other universities.

Mr. Speaker, we've also noted that there's a high demand by employers for graduates in this kind of discipline. People who come out of computing science or electrical engineering do not face the same unemployment challenges that graduates of other fields do. In fact it's very much the reverse. Companies like Bell-Northern labs have a tough time finding qualified staff to do the research in their areas of operation. That means we've placed an artificial barrier on the development of new technologies in this province, because companies like Bell-Northern labs cannot expand, cannot sell their products worldwide, and cannot compete in a market and bring back dollars and jobs for Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, this is an industry I think is very exciting. It's clean industry; it's high-value industry. It's not something like trying to sell coal or grain or sulphur, where you have a very bulky product that's very difficult and very expensive to transport. What we're talking about is knowledge and high-value,

intensive industry that is easy to export. You're exporting ideas. We noted that when you're doing that kind of exporting, you don't run into the same barriers that you face in other areas of activity. If you're going to sell a set of architectural plans for a new building in Dallas or Denver, you don't have to go through the U.S. customs office. You pick up the phone, you have the computer at the other end answer the phone, and it takes down the set of blueprints. It's a way of getting a good industry — knowledge-intensive, very much labour-intensive — here for Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, it's also worth noting that we need to do more work in technology transfer. People in our areas of present strength, like agriculture or the energy industry, need more and more to become familiar with the technologies available to them to become more efficient. We don't have enough people to do that, to equip those companies with the expertise and the knowledge so they can become more competitive. There's a lot of research going on at universities that those companies are not aware of. But the universities don't have the time to say: you in geophysics, are you aware that this new idea is available to you? Technology transfer resources are not available.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are some other questions that we as legislators ought to be asking ourselves. Last night at dinner, the Premier made this case to some party supporters. The Premier said we have to examine the curriculums at Alberta universities and colleges and inject new courses and new technologies into the course of studies for our graduates. What did he mean? I'll give you the example of Stanford in California. In order to pick up a degree at Stanford — and now this is true of many universities in California — you must be computer literate. That means that if you're going to study French or English — just to give you a wild example of this — you must have a background in computer science. Because rapidly now, you are a functional illiterate in society if you're not able to use a computer.

If you're not able to access data banks in the securities industry — just to give an example for the Member for Edmonton Whitemud — if you don't know what's going on, you're going to have a tougher time trying to sell products to your clients. That knowledge is stored in data banks, perhaps in New York or Toronto, and if you want instant access to it, you can have it by picking up your telephone and plugging into it. But if you aren't able to do that, your client might find someone who is able to give him better information. If you can't keep up with this area of expertise, you are going to be functionally illiterate in the technological society we're rapidly creating. It's not something off in the future, Mr. Speaker; it's happening right now.

In Ontario we're seeing the development of a new Silicon Valley in the Ottawa valley, in the Kanata area just around Ottawa. Some of us who were at the Conservative leadership convention last year might have walked around Ottawa and said: holy cow, government is a growth industry; look at all these buildings. To a large measure, that's true. But a lot of those buildings in downtown Ottawa and in that area are being fuelled not by government tax dollars but by research dollars. In those centres there are computer software companies and computer chip manufacturing companies, and that activity is taking place in the Ottawa valley.

Mr. Speaker, another good example of that activity in Ontario is the Sir Wilfrid Laurier University. That university has developed a national and international reputation in the design of software. I'm not very knowledgeable about computer science, but software and hardware are buzzwords. Hardware simply means the actual equipment, the computer, and software is a set of instructions that makes the computer work in the

way that you want it to work. At Sir Wilfrid Laurier, they're teaching people how to program computers and how to sell those computer programs that have special application to industries like agriculture or geophysics or perhaps forestry. So a graduate of that university can instruct a computer to follow a certain process, gathering data, filing it, organizing it, and then manipulating it so the geophysicist can get data that's worthwhile to him or her.

Mr. Speaker, Japan graduates three times as many engineers per capita as we do. In this country we graduate almost as many lawyers as engineers. [interjection] More, the hon. Member for Cardston notes. I think lawyers are like beavers; they just dam things up and prevent the flow of information or activity. I don't want to offend any lawyers in the audience, but that's their principal function — delay. When you think about it, surely that's not a very productive function. I think we should be turning that around. With due respect to the legal profession, we should be educating and graduating many more engineers than lawyers. Japan is our principal competitor in this area, and they're graduating three times as many engineers as we do. I think our record really bears serious examination.

In the remarks to this point, I've tried to argue that we have a need and an opportunity and we have the people and skills to do something about it. I want to talk about that third part, what we can do. Mr. Speaker, I think the conclusions are fairly self-evident. Briefly, I think we need to increase the number of professors on staff at our computer science and electrical engineering departments at the University of Alberta and the University of Calgary. We also need to provide other trained staff for our technical schools and colleges so they too can begin to share that knowledge with people going to agricultural colleges at Olds, Lakeland, or wherever students may go, because they are going to need this knowledge.

We need to increase the amount of support for our graduate students. Right now a grad student can qualify for about \$8,000 a year. If they're married — and a lot of them are, because they've gone through school, picked up a bachelor's degree at the outset, and then they've gone on and acquired a family and probably have a youngster or two. They realize all of a sudden that they could do a whole lot more if they could get a little more training. They go back to school, but they're encumbered with some extra pressures. Mr. Speaker, we don't provide the support for our graduate students that most other places do.

I'll give you a quick example of that. I went down to the University of Washington a month ago. They have 25,000 students, exactly the same size as our University of Alberta. Out of that population we have 3,000 graduate students; the University of Washington has 8,000, almost three times as many. In the student mix they have three times as many graduate students as we do. Why is that? In Washington state they are working hard on things like aircraft technology, electronics for defence industries, and activities like that. They need those trained, very highly skilled people. We just haven't appreciated that yet. We have to get those very same kinds of people.

If you go to a university in the United States and go into grad studies, you're going to find that you're eligible for a lot more financial support from companies or from the government than you can get here. [interjection] It's because tuition fees are very high, as the hon. Member for Cypress notes. But if you're a grad student, those same fees are rolled back, because you're often teaching. The university does not charge tuition fees to grad students, in lieu of that grad student providing teaching duties to the university. On top of that, the university will provide a small salary. In Canada it's very small; in the United States it's much larger. That difference is the difference between the 2,000 or 3,000 students we have in grad studies

at the University of Alberta and almost three times the number at the University of Washington. Mr. Speaker, we need to increase the number of professors, and we need to increase the aid to graduate students.

We also need to increase the number of undergraduate students. As we noted earlier, 85 electrical engineering students that were qualified were turned away, and 125 computing science students that were qualified to be admitted into that program were turned away. We also noted that graduates of those programs do not have trouble getting jobs. We are in effect cutting off our nose to spite our face, because we're denying people the opportunity to get the education to get the jobs that are available.

Mr. Speaker, we also need to increase the space at all three universities in Alberta. I hate to lay on hon. members the bill that might be involved in that, but I'll give you an idea of what we're talking about. The electrical engineering department at the University of Alberta has a proposal before the board of governors to build a \$40 million building. That's what's going to be required to provide the space to house the staff and students at current levels, and that would admit all the students that were qualified. To do the same thing for computing science, to provide the space for the staff and all the students that were qualified to go into computing science, would require another \$40 million capital investment. We're talking about an \$80 million investment at one university to provide the staff and space for the students that are qualified. As I noted, I think our failure to do this is going to mean that our industries of agriculture, energy, and construction, among others, are going to suffer, because they're not going to be in the forefront of technology, keeping their industries efficient compared to their competitors.

Mr. Speaker, more than just training those specialists we've been talking about, I think we have to do what Stanford is doing. I think we have to do what the universities in California are doing. We have to say to every student coming into the universities: at the end of four years, you must have taken several courses in computing science in your course of studies; you must be able to use a computer, because if you're an agrologist or an engineer, you're going to need that expertise.

Mr. Speaker, my time has run out. I simply want to conclude by saying this is a very timely resolution. I ask for the support of hon. members. I think it's important for the long-range future of the province.

Thank you.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this motion today, I'd like to deal with it in two parts. Unfortunately the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry has stolen most of my material, but I do have some comments I'd like to make.

There's no question that the electrical engineering and computing [science] departments are important basic elements for micro-electronics and software knowledge in Alberta. In 1982 electronic industry sales in Alberta were \$350 million, in 1983 \$410 million, and in 1984 are projected to be between \$550 million and \$600 million. We do have a strong base of talent in these disciplines in Alberta. We have 39 professors at the University of Alberta and 14 professors at the University of Calgary. More important, at our universities there is now an increasing number of scientists with world-famous reputations. For example, at the University of Alberta we have Dr. Henry Baltes, a Henry Marshall Tory professor, and Dr. David Hill, who's a Killam resident fellow at the University of Calgary. Our universities are hoping they will have a strong commitment to establish education and research programs of

international stature that will relate closely to the industrial needs of the province.

Earlier this year the province brought to Alberta the secretary of state for science, Dr. Berlinquist; the president of the National Research Council, Dr. Kerwin; the president of the Science Council of Canada, Dr. Smith; and Dr. McNabb, president of NSERC, who makes grants to our universities for research programs and projects. Some of the MLAs were able to meet with these gentlemen while they were visiting here. The purpose of their visit was primarily to educate them as to what Alberta was doing in the area of research and development. It also helped us learn about areas where they thought federal help and objectives of national interest could be achieved with our support.

As the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry said, it is apparent that high-technology development needs a strong university sector sympathetic to industrial development. As he mentioned, areas such as California or Boston come to mind. I'd like to quote from an article written by Warren T. Brookes in a magazine called *Imprimis*. The article is headed *Mind, Not Money, Drives the Economy*. He's speaking about the state of Massachusetts. Ten years ago Massachusetts was in a stagnant position. It was one of the poorest states in the nation. Now it employs "64 per cent of its adult population (the highest of any state or nation in the world)". Its unemployment rate is 5.8 percent, and in the so-called high-tech area, the unemployment rate runs between 2 and 4 percent. Their state's personal income, after stagnating down to the 47th lowest growing in the United States in 1978, "is now among the top 10".

And, significantly, our greatest economic and employment growth is not in industrial production, or even in the hardware side of the computer business, but in the software, or information . . . side.

What is important about the Massachusetts experience of course is that it is the result not of raw materials or physical resources, of which we have pathetically (little), but wholly a function of our knowledge industry, our university and research centres.

Mr. Speaker, just to return to the Alberta scene briefly, we in Alberta have taken up the challenge. We have established a Microelectronics Centre at the University of Alberta, which is funded by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce for approximately \$200,000 a year for live years. As the hon. member mentioned, we know all about student requirements that exceed the supply of professors in our computing science and electrical engineering departments. Canada and our province are behind in establishing a micro-electronic software industry. But again, under the guidance of the Alberta Research Council and in co-operation with the Department of Economic Development, we have prepared a proposal for the establishment of a microchip foundry in Alberta, because many people in our province are seriously concerned about the availability of chips. Some people have even had to go to New Zealand to obtain them. The Department of Economic Development is developing a business plan to determine whether or not we could create a foundry in the province. These are just some of the highlights of what can happen in our province.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to deal with the second part of my remarks. This is on the national scene and is where I will differ slightly from the previous speaker. Much of what I have to say was said by Mr. Walter Light, chairman and chief executive officer of Northern Telecom, at the annual meeting of their company on April 26, 1984. In his opinion, the shortage of trained people could do more in the long run to undermine the future of the North American economy than the activities of our international competitors, the size of the deficit in both

countries, or the level of interest rates. In his opinion, you could combine all these things together.

The emerging source of basic economic strength for any society is not capital investment or natural resources. It is brain power. Our industrial society is brain-intensive. It centres on knowledge which creates sophisticated products and manufacturing processes while framing the technique of management itself. In his opinion, the industrial future of Canada, as with any other country, will depend upon the quality of its management in industry and government. The quality of management in turn depends upon the quality of education available. Yet some of our greatest schools are faced with inadequate or obsolete facilities and equipment, particularly in the key science and engineering disciplines.

There is an increasing, and increasingly critical, shortage of the brightest young minds choosing to become teachers and researchers. Universities face the constant threat of declining revenues and financial support from government, business, and alumni to further exacerbate an already desperate situation. Many universities in Canada are operating beyond maximum capacity and turning students away. Engineering facilities and classes are grossly overcrowded at the undergraduate level. There is a continuing shortage of qualified engineering professors and still a low enrollment at the graduate level. Right now there are a hundred unfilled faculty positions on the staffs of engineering schools in Canada.

Almost everything that can be said about Canada's engineering schools — overcrowding, poor equipment, lack of staff, and lack of funding — can be said about the country's business schools. At last count there were more than 200 approved faculty positions in Canadian business schools going begging for the same reasons. Bright people are not going into teaching. There are not enough PhDs being graduated, not enough funds, and poor facilities. As with our engineering schools, business schools are reaping the harvest of a decade of neglect. Many of them have teaching classes of 150 to 200 persons. Every school has quotas and often accepts less than 20 percent of the applicants. The most recent figures indicate that less than 20 doctorates a year are being granted by our business schools.

What can be said about the engineering and business schools can probably be said, to a greater or lesser degree, about almost every discipline being taught in Canada. And that is the real problem: Canada is not just short of engineers. It is facing a potentially crippling shortage in almost every body of knowledge we will need in the next two decades. And the next two decades could decide whether Canada survives as a modern, viable, international, industrial power in the information age.

Almost all the discussion we have heard in public and in the House has been about the shortage of engineers. We heard more of it this afternoon. This has created the impression that if we just produce more and better-trained engineers, we will have solved our major industrial crisis in human resources. In the opinion of Mr. Light, who heads one of the most successful companies in the western world, nothing could be further from the truth. It is not only the quality and quantity of our engineers that is crucial to our future success; it is also the quality and quantity of our writers, philosophers, social scientists, political scientists, psychologists, historians, mathematicians, accountants, and many others. All disciplines are important to the future, even if some are more important than others at a given time. While engineers predominate in Northern Telecom's central research laboratories, they have representatives of 78 disciplines from more than 350 universities. The problem is not a shortage of graduates from any particular discipline. Canada simply has a crisis. One could go further and say it is a crisis

in its education system. These are problems that have to be solved.

Mr. Light puts the blame on business in general, because it has largely chosen the comfortable route of supporting, mainly quite uncritically, university financial appeals and assuming it is government's responsibility to tackle the larger problem. The universities are to blame also, for they blithely assume that each has a divine right of growth and glory in all disciplines. Each is pursuing its individual growth objective with little, if any, acknowledgment of the national interest or the national ability to financially support their individual and collective ambitions. It is not apparent to me that universities are establishing priorities within their own walls, let alone between and with other universities.

Finally, we as parents also have to shoulder some of the blame, because we feel that paying less than one-fourth of the cost of university instruction is a fair share of the cost of maintaining world-class universities. We should know that even in the most socialistic of societies, you get only what you pay for, either when you pay as a direct fee or through taxes.

Obviously the problem doesn't leave itself to an easy, quick solution. It involves the fact that education — and this is where we come to that old Canadian stumbling block — is a provincial responsibility. This alone tends to balkanize the thought process of Canadian university leaders who are more or less forced to act on a province-first basis, except on those occasions. Mr. Speaker, when they are making national appeals for financial support. The problem involves the concept of so-called universal higher education, including hometown universities, all at less than cost. It concerns the quality of university administration and the throttling stranglehold that faculty tenure has placed on the quality of university teaching.

As a businessman, it was questionable to Mr. Light that 26 million people can continue to afford 10 different provincial educational systems defined and administered by 10 different educational authorities in 10 different provinces. In his opinion, we simply are not that rich. Such a condition may well have been a proper environment in 1867, when knowledge was developing at a leisurely pace in a smaller, primarily agrarian, society. But in 1984, when knowledge is doubling every seven years and our future welfare as a nation depends upon our success as a technologically-advanced international trader — and our Premier was very clear about this point earlier this week — it is self-defeating. We cannot continue to trade and compete as 10 provinces. We must compete as one nation.

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

Success in world trade, trendsetting innovations in technology, and new concepts in international marketing do not arise phoenix-like from the ashes of academic mediocrity. They come from the minds of the brightest and most creative people, who in turn gravitate to the educational institutions that challenge them. The schools in turn must lead and not be led by business and government. We seem to have forgotten the simple but compelling truths in our search for universal education. All minds are not created equal, and all minds do not develop equally. Therefore we must develop a university system that provides for and develops the intellectual elite, as well as the rest of us.

When we look at our universities, we often do not see their administration; we tend to look past them to the faculties. This is a great mistake. University administrations are, in many parts, causes of the total problem. For too long, university administrations have been temporary parking spots for tenured staff for whom there was no immediate faculty role. This has

meant short-term service from nonprofessionals with little, if any, interest or incentive to perform in a key function.

Mr. Light mentioned that he had never heard of a business executive who inquired after the quality of the administration of a university before handing over the corporation's funds. It just didn't seem the right thing to do. However, such an executive would not invest money in a company without first studying and approving its management. Nor does it seem the right thing to do to speak critically of tenure in the universities, yet in the opinion of many, tenure is at the root of our universities' problems. Since the end of World War II, university tenure has generated into an academic job security problem. It is no longer an incentive to innovation and new knowledge. It is a millstone dragging the country's schools down to universal mediocrity.

Today, in the name of tenure, at least 44 of the country's 70 degree-granting colleges and universities have faculty collective bargaining units. Some of us would call them unions. Because of them, many faculties have teachers who are not familiar with modern developments in their fields, and who are a block to the introduction of younger and more competent teachers. We will not be able to attract to our universities the best brains in the field, and we will continue to lose our best brains to greener fields, unless we replace tenure with a risk reward compensation program that recognizes the good teacher over the bad and the mediocre.

If some university faculty members are not first-class or world-class, neither are many of the students they are asked to teach. Very few first-year students today can write their own language without serious errors. In many Canadian universities, remedial English classes of 40 percent or more of a freshman year are not unusual. I can hear the teachers beside me coughing and sputtering; I guess the truth is penetrating. According to Mr. Light, that is a flagrant form of double taxation. We have already paid taxes at one level, the high schools, and to provide each student in the remedial class with a level of competence in his native tongue is, in the opinion of Mr. Light, paying taxation twice for the same service.

Students, and apparently many teachers — and I do not include the hon. Member for Ponoka in this group — do not seem to understand that without an extensive command of the language, there can be no serious thinking. Without the fundamental skills of thinking, there can be no serious improvement in our scientific and business environments. We must establish priorities and allocate future investments for maximum effectiveness. In concert with the universities, we must select where our centres of excellence shall be. We must decide which schools will specialize in computers, which in law, which in medicine, which in engineering, and which in agriculture. We cannot afford to dissipate our capital, human or financial, in trying to make all schools all things to all people.

At present we spend an average of \$5,500 a year for each university student, ranging from a high of \$7,400 in Alberta to a low of \$4,500 in Ontario, one of our richest provinces. That figure alone would indicate ...

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member. I believe it's established practice in this House that members not read verbatim from speeches delivered elsewhere in Canada.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not reading verbatim.

If we can spend \$1 billion or more in a month to defend the Canadian dollar, surely we can find several more billions of dollars to rebuild and revitalize our universities over the next

decade. In the long run, our universities are the best defence our dollar has. The ills of our universities can be cured if we are determined to do so. They can be cured if we're prepared to make changes in the way in which we allocate our national financial resources, if we concentrate on faculty renewal, and if we are politically prepared to agree that what was good for the 19th century is not necessarily the best for the 21st century. It cannot be done by any single part of our society. It can only be done by the principal elements working in concert with a single objective to recreate a world-class university structure in our nation. If we do not restore our universities and improve the educational infrastructure in Canada, we will be unilaterally withdrawing from the future.

Thank you.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to speak with respect to Motion 214, as proposed by the Member for Edmonton Glengarry. I commend him on bringing the motion forward, because it obviously deals with an issue which could be styled as "crunch time" in the education system within all of North America as well as within the province of Alberta.

When any person picks up almost any magazine today or any kind of nonfiction document, we're dealing with the results of the computer revolution, because so many of the printing techniques have radically altered in a very rapid fashion. So much of what we deal with in the print media, as part of its own background, really has been seen in terms of microcomputer revolution. We indeed are perched — actually we're not on the edge of a transformation in society; we're already past the cutting edge. Many of us really haven't begun to comprehend the impact upon ourselves, let alone the impact that will take place with respect to our children and grandchildren.

Sitting here listening with great interest to the debate, I suddenly realized that, my goodness, I've got three computers — one at home, one here in my apartment in Edmonton, and one in the constituency office. Yet my biggest problem is trying to find enough time to learn some more about this type technology and to try to come to some kind of minimal grips with what really has happened in terms of this explosion. So it is that the motion is indeed very timely.

With your kind permission, Mr. Speaker, one book I would briefly like to quote from is called *Megatrends*. It was written by John Naisbitt. A brief, seven-line quote is this:

A 1980 report by the [United States] Department of Education and the National Science Foundation stated that most Americans are moving toward "virtual scientific and technological illiteracy". It concluded that science and math programs in [United States] schools lag behind the U.S.S.R., Japan, and Germany. Part of the problem is the shortage of qualified high school science and math teachers. But there is an even worse shortage of college-level computer science and engineering teachers.

I bring that into the debate because this book has only been published within the last six to seven weeks. It brings home a 1980 report. Goodness, what kind of impact is there with respect to North America in terms of the last four years? What ramifications are there in terms of this province of Alberta? Because we as Canadians lag behind the impact of technological revolution which has taken place not only in Japan but certainly within the United States.

So it is that once again, in terms of any debate related to this type of motion, one has to commend the Minister of Education for having gone out on a limb — or gone out on some kind of electronic cord, I suppose — to deal with the issue of putting microcomputers into the education system in this province. But no matter how much we've done, it's still too little

too late, because this whole kind of revolution is indeed upon us.

Moving along from there, Mr. Speaker, I was interested that earlier today I received a letter from the president of the University of Calgary inviting me, together with a few other members of the Assembly and some other persons from industry and government, to a half-day presentation which deals with certain advanced technologies. The University of Calgary in particular has been cited internationally, given international acclaim, for some of the work that has been done in the computer science department. So it is that on June 15, there will be this presentation, and I know some of the members will be able to be present. It deals with this kind of vocabulary: the JADE project — I can't begin to imagine what the JADE project is, but I know it doesn't deal with the mineral — document preparation and access with respect to software technology; graphics and animation; artificial intelligence and expert systems; micro-electronics and VLSI design. It's interesting that one of our universities is receiving international note in this area, and I'm certain it also applies to other universities within the province. But I'm also pleased that this particular university has seen fit to make some approach with respect to trying to educate some of us who are elected representatives of the people.

The matter of dollars and funding — I appreciate the comments which the Member for Edmonton Glengarry put into the debate with respect to the need for additional facilities, funding, and staff. All of us know we are in difficult economic times. We seem to have bottomed out of that, but the challenges are there. But with respect — through you, Mr. Speaker, to the member — he knows as well as I do that Alberta universities are being funded better than other universities within this country. Having said that, I still agree with him that there is still this need to assemble the dollars, the facilities, and the personnel.

Perhaps in that respect, we should still be challenging the boards of governors of the various universities and colleges in this province to sit down and reallocate the resources they have. This challenge to reallocate our resources is there for all of us, and it should also be incumbent upon the universities not to believe that these will be add-on dollars and add-on programs. It may well be, in terms of the impact of the microtechnological revolution, that they themselves have to do away with various ways they have been spending their own dollars in terms of the university pie at the moment. I offer that as being one way, and a very real challenge of course, back to the universities and colleges within this province.

With respect to the precise wording of Motion 214, from my knowledge of the Member for Edmonton Glengarry, I realize that he has zeroed in on a specific here, in terms of supporting the new and growing electronics industry in the province. He knows as well as anyone in this Assembly that the ramifications, the positive spin-off effects, really go far beyond the electronics industry in the province.

Again, I'm pleased that the motion gives me an opportunity to speak, because on the Order Paper I have Motion No. 217, which will come back to other ramifications and further developments of this type of motion with its implications, and also with respect to Motion 215, which deals with ways to attract the headquarters for the long baseline array radio telescope network to Alberta. One of the key functions with respect to trying to attract that very important project to this province is computer capability.

I'm given to understand, from consultations I've had this last weekend in Calgary, that the computer capability within the Calgary area is second in the world only to Houston.

ton is number one in terms of computer capability and computer servicing, and Calgary is number two. That really is an incredible piece of information to come up with. Therefore, within Alberta it's a world-class thing. I don't want my hon. colleagues who come from Edmonton to get all upset about it. Perhaps I'm casting an aspersion upon Edmonton. After all, they've got another computer outfit known as the Edmonton Oilers, who are going to win the Stanley Cup.

in terms of supercomputers — because now we're into this kind of technology and are not only talking about microcomputers, computers in the home, and all the rest of it, but supercomputer capability such as an instrument produced known as the CYBER 205, which deals in megaflops. Hopefully I'll have the definition of all that by the time we get to next week's motion dealing with these kinds of things. A megaflop would be what happens if the Oilers lose the Stanley Cup.

The whole matter of computer capability brings back the issue of personnel, as well as sufficient funding to deal with that kind of a system. In that regard, we indeed have to look at training more personnel here in the province and, as pointed out, training even more personnel with respect to those who train others.

The whole matter of micro-electronic technology is obviously one of the most important technologies in industry today, and it's going to be here for the foreseeable future. Obviously, advances in micro-electronics produce significant improvements, not only in the electronics industry but in other industries as well, and help improve productivity in other industries. So there is that real kind of spin-off. It has been estimated that 44 percent of all productivity gains stem from innovation and new knowledge. Growth is obviously a function of the presence of strong research at the universities and a good supply of trained people. In that sense, it's almost a catch-22 situation that we really have to deal with and give all our support to.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have about five pieces of information for which I wish to express my thanks to the Minister of Economic Development and the Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications for sharing with me. They certainly have important input with respect to Motion 214 this afternoon. I'm given to understand that a request for a decision is going forward regarding the development of micro-electronics design and fabrication capabilities, otherwise known as a chip foundry, and that this proposal is going forward within the next week or so. Again, another request for a decision is going forward regarding an electronic industry information service. Another request for a decision regarding a telecommunications research institute is expected to be ready for submission within the next month. Another request for a decision is going forward regarding a supercomputing facility to be located in the province. This is hopefully going to become a reality before the end of 1984. Finally, as other members have alluded to, the government has indeed prepared a discussion paper regarding science and technology development in Alberta. The government is indeed only too willing to elicit, to study, and to deal with responses to the paper.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WOO: Mr. Speaker, in view of the time left, I request leave to adjourn debate.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it agreed that the hon. member has leave to adjourn debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

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

**Bill 201  
An Act to Amend the Hospitals Act**

[Adjourned debate March 22: Mr. Nelson]

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to be able to stand in my place to briefly discuss the Bill at hand, and I commend the hon. Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park for again presenting this to the Legislature.

Palliative care is a program that needs in-depth consideration based on facts and some emotion. Firstly, Mr. Speaker, the facts are that it is not an extremely costly program, as is suggested in many arenas. In fact a palliative care program can be developed that can be done in a person's home. Training and assistance to family members is the key ingredient. We should remember that an endeavour to keep people at home but to provide support to the family in dealing with an extremely emotional event is very important. There are people with special skills able to assist those who are terminally ill. These skills could be offered or made available to assist people in dealing with those who could and would rather spend their remaining time at home. Certainly not all people will have the emotional ability to deal with this, even with professional assistance. However, that option should remain, with the consideration of in-home service by a professional.

Today we take up many beds in our acute care hospitals for patients who may not need or wish to be there. We must be mindful, however, that many of these patients do require some form of auxiliary care which can be done at much less cost yet still maintain the dignity and needs of the patient.

A question that might be asked is: is it better to prolong a life by a few hours or days in an institutional setting, or would a person better spend their last days with their family and friends? Historically, Canadians have spent their last days at home with family and friends. However, during the last few years, more people have been placed in institutions in an effort to prolong life.

Although the intent is a compassionate one, the long-term impact on the family or even that individual who may be terminally ill could be questionable. The possibility of prolonging life fits well with a physician's mandate to diagnose and treat diseases and to cure patients. When a physician faces terminally ill patients for whom a cure is no longer a real possibility, life prolongation for its own sake may not be a viable goal. At this time, quality of the remaining days may well be what the patient and family would choose if given the opportunity, at least according to some palliative care proponents.

Mr. Speaker, much concern has been addressed with regard to cost. Costs are certainly a factor and should be considered. Let's deal with these costs through the process we have available to us. How much does it cost to keep a patient in an acute care bed? Alternatively, how much is it to keep a person in an auxiliary bed or, for that matter, in the home? It doesn't take a great expert to answer the questions. Firstly, we need to ensure the comfort of the patient and the family. What are their requirements? What is best for them? Is the need then met

compassionately and in a dignified manner? Certainly the degree of care required is for the patient, the doctor, and the family to determine.

Inadequacies in the health care system's treatment of the terminally ill have been researched for many years. Instead of controlling pain and making a patient's last days as comfortable as possible, the cure orientation of staff in acute care settings leads to an emphasis on treatment geared toward extending life. We must be mindful that the extension of life is important in this day of changing technology. A life-saving cure could be just around the corner. At the same time, there must be a realistic examination of the case to ensure that false hope is not given to anyone during a time of emotional upset or possible grief.

We must examine these areas of cost and the whole issue of palliative care. Cost savings utilizing auxiliary and home care should be made and should probably be made quickly. We have people in Alberta who are experts in the field of palliative care. Let's have a consultative process immediately so development of a complete policy to ensure the dignity and the emotional needs of the patient and the family can be looked after, not only at minimal cost but to ensure each is as comfortable as possible in their needs.

We have the resources to do this and more. Let's show our human qualities, especially to those who may not be with us for long and to those families who have to suffer that loss. I ask support for this Bill or for a separate palliative care Act that may stand on its own. Mr. Speaker, this is an important issue, in both an emotional sense and a practical sense. People who have terminally ill family or friends need our assistance to ensure that the emotional environment they go through is looked after. Let us show some compassion.

Thank you.

MR. ALGER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to participate in this debate this afternoon, both as a member of this Assembly and as chairman of the senior citizen caucus committee. Bill 201, An Act to Amend the Hospitals Act, introduced by the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park, brings to our attention an important concept in health care services, that being palliative care.

While no one is particularly overjoyed at the prospect of dying, the fact is that it is the only inevitable thing the good Lord blessed us with. The care of our dying has now become a public concern, a concern that must be approached with a great deal of sincerity and honesty.

Dying in an institution, separated from one's home and familiar surroundings, is a relatively new phenomenon. When over 70 percent of all deaths occur in our hospitals, nursing homes, and other health care institutions, the problems must be addressed with some haste. As our population ages, which it will, the situation will only worsen. Palliative care appears to be a practical initiative, especially given the fact that the population is aging and that there is a decreasing amount of family support for the terminally ill.

That brings up a point that I think should be brought before this Assembly. In yesteryear, a family remained a family throughout the years. When parents or grandparents became unable to cope for themselves, they always had the option of going to live with the kids. While I'm not saying that this always worked out for the best. I am saying that it was an available alternative. Society has changed all that. With the increasing number of divorced or separated parents, senior citizens do not always have that option anymore. This means that more and more seniors are forced to enter institutionalized surroundings, often unfamiliar and certainly very confining.

The family structure as it existed even 20 years ago is rapidly changing, and I think it is time this disintegration process was brought to a screeching halt. One way to achieve this could be palliative care programs conducted in the confines of one's own home. The responsibilities this type of program would bring to the family are immense but would no doubt be satisfying. Knowing that a loved one passes away gracefully, surrounded by friends and family, would help ease the pain that accompanies death. I caution you that palliative care isn't confined to senior citizens alone. Indeed, terminally ill people in all age groups from infancy on can require the care of which I speak.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

There is always a problem of financing when we talk about introducing or expanding programs. Again, a moral judgment is needed, but there must also be a rational reason for the moral judgment. It has been proven that the adoption of a palliative care program would lead to substantial savings in health care in the long term. It has been estimated that an integrated national palliative care program would save over \$700 million a year in hospital costs. The potential savings are indeed very large but so are the initial input costs. Given the call for restraint, I can foresee a great deal of problems if huge sums of money are funnelled into new palliative care programs.

Nevertheless I feel the positives vastly outweigh the negatives, and it is the proper time to act on this Bill. Therefore I support the immediate passage of this Bill, and I urge the Assembly to do the same. I want to thank the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park for introducing the Bill and providing us an opportunity to address this very timely topic.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, it's always a pleasure to listen to and follow the Member for Highwood, the chairman of the senior citizen caucus committee. As vice-chairman of that caucus committee, I have learned a tremendous amount about seniors, their needs and their wants, from the hon. member.

In rising to speak in support of Bill 201, I would like to begin by commending the hon. Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park for taking the initiative in bringing this issue before the Assembly and for his persistent advocacy of palliative care. Palliative care, as far as I'm concerned, is an idea whose time has come, and I thank the hon. member for providing this opportunity to speak on it today.

Mr. Speaker, the compassionate care of the dying must be an item of highest priority for our health care system today. Death of course is an inevitable fact of human existence and has always been with us. The care of the dying in hospitals is hardly a new issue. However, as more and more of our citizens are dying in hospitals rather than at home or elsewhere, we must come to grips with the proper institutional care of these particular patients.

The key to the establishment of palliative care units in our hospitals is the recognition that hospitals exist to alleviate the suffering of those in pain. Until very recently, this function has been interpreted solely in terms of restoring patients to good health, where that was possible. That, of course, must remain the primary role of hospitals. However, our duty to alleviate suffering does not stop for those patients who will never recover. These patients are not only in physical pain but are facing the extreme emotional turmoil of preparing themselves for impending and certain death. Our health care system must respond to the needs of these patients in a compassionate and sensitive way.

The most effective response to these needs will come through the creation in our major hospitals of units especially designed, equipped, and staffed to ease the burdens of the dying. In Canada we have seen the establishment of these units in Winnipeg, Toronto, Saskatoon, Quebec City, Victoria, Vancouver, St. John's, and Montreal. In Alberta the only existing palliative care unit is at the Youville Memorial hospital in Edmonton. Clearly a nationwide recognition is developing that palliative care units provide the best means of caring for the dying.

Mr. Speaker, the question to be addressed today is twofold: whether these programs should be established in major hospitals across Alberta, and what form any of these programs should take. Since the establishment of the unit as part of the Youville Memorial hospital in 1982, it has become clear that considerable public demand for such facilities exists and that the current 16 beds are grossly inadequate to meet the demand. This is not for one minute to derogate the fine work that Dr. Helen Hays and her staff do at the Youville. They should be fully commended not only for the service they provide but also for the fact that they have kept this unit alive strictly through private donations.

However, the Youville alone cannot meet the provincial demand for institutional palliative care. To meet this demand we must greatly increase the number of beds available and must make them available throughout the province. Some people might ask: why do we not simply create large units in Edmonton or Calgary and meet the provincial demand by bringing people from outlying regions into the major cities; in this way we could consolidate our resources and expertise and perhaps use them most efficiently. Mr. Speaker, the response to this can be summarized in one word, and that word is "compassion". A dying person needs not only first-class medical and psychological treatment but also support, support that will come primarily from family and friends. To move an individual long distances from his or her own community, thus making it difficult for family and friends to be there precisely when they are needed, would be cruel in the extreme, as far as I'm concerned.

On the other hand, we must also recognize that not every hospital in Alberta has the space or indeed the resources to offer palliative care. The Bill before us, presented by the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park, strikes a commendable balance by specifying that only those hospitals with at least 100 beds will be eligible for special funding for palliative units. In this way regional population centres will be able to provide palliative care, and patients from these regions will be spared the ordeal of a transfer to the cities of Edmonton or Calgary.

Mr. Speaker, what must now be addressed is the type of palliative care program we wish to see established throughout this province, in debate on a motion on the topic of palliative care in this Assembly last May, the hon. Member for Calgary North West outlined the basics of such a program. I believe her sage comments bear reiteration today. At that time the hon. member described a multidisciplinary treatment team that would deal with the individual needs of each patient and their families. Such a team would include doctors, nurses, psychologists, and social workers — all specially trained in the care of the dying — and would be concerned with alleviating the social, psychological, and spiritual stress as well as the physical discomfort associated with dying. Where requested by the patient and/or his family, a clergyman would be part of this team as well. Mr. Speaker, the object of this approach would be the treatment of the whole person. Such an approach would also allow the flexibility needed to design a program specific to each individual. As the illness progresses and the physical and/or emotional state of a patient changes, the team would be



able to modify their treatment accordingly. Because of the different kinds of professionals working together with each patient, maximum flexibility would be maintained in responding to these changing conditions.

It must be emphasized that in addition to working directly with the terminally ill patient, a palliative care unit could provide services to the families and close friends of these particular patients. Families could be advised as to the best way to deal with the dying person. They could be helped in preparing themselves for the death of that person, and indeed bereavement counselling could be made available for those that need it following the death. We cannot ignore the needs of those who are most closely affected by the death, Mr. Speaker. Not only could we be alleviating the stress suffered by family members at the time of death but we could avoid some of the medical problems associated with untreated stress.

Mr. Speaker, one common fallacy exists about palliative care that must be discussed; that is, it is not designed primarily for the elderly. It is certainly true that the average life span is somewhere in the range of 75 years and that most people are elderly when they die. However, when one looks at the ages of cancer victims or those who suffer cardiac disease, it quickly becomes apparent that a great many of those who would be best served by palliative care are indeed below the age of 65. It is interesting to note that between 1975 and 1980, the palliative care unit of the Royal Victoria hospital in Montreal found that over 30 percent of its patients were between 50 and 60 years old. Almost 75 percent of their patients were under 70 years old. Palliative care units must not be viewed as specialized geriatric units. There is no reason why they cannot serve every age group, from small children to the elderly.

When discussing the needs of the dying, it seems crass and heartless to start discussing the costs of their particular care. However, we as legislators charged with administering the public purse must evaluate the cost effectiveness of any proposal put before us. Fortunately palliative care can bear any such evaluation when compared with the cost of keeping these patients in acute care units or active treatment hospitals. Terminally ill patients have no need of the highly technical and costly equipment required for curative care. To keep a terminally ill patient in an active treatment unit would involve considerable overhead costs that are indeed unnecessary. While it is difficult to pin down the exact amount of money that could be saved through the expansion of palliative care units, experience in Canada and the United States indicates that that saving would indeed be substantial. For example, a 1982 study by Health and Welfare Canada estimated — and the Member for Highwood indicated this — that over \$700 million could be saved annually if there were an expansion of palliative care units across this land. While some initial capital costs will clearly be involved in establishing these units in Alberta, we must not let that deter us. The long-term cost savings will be substantial, and the quality of our health care system will have been increased immeasurably.

Ultimately the debate over the establishment of palliative care units in Alberta hospitals must deal with the area of compassion. How do we provide the best quality and most compassionate care to terminally ill Albertans and their families? It is my firm belief that we as legislators and as the primary source of funds for the health care system in this province must ensure that palliative care is expanded as far as is feasible. By evaluating the proposals for palliative care units on a hospital-by-hospital basis with an eye to ensuring that proposed programs are both cost effective and high quality, the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, under this Bill, will be able to ensure that terminally ill patients will receive appropriate care.

Mr. Speaker, we must move to establish these programs now. Albertans deserve nothing less. I urge all members in this Assembly to support this Bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, at this point I guess it's hard not to be repetitive. The mover of the motion has been duly recognized and commended many times, and there have been a lot of good and needful things said on the motion concerning palliative care.

One of the questions that's arisen here is that of priority when we're thinking of health care and serving those who are sick in one way or another. It's been indicated that there aren't enough dollars around right now to serve the setting up of palliative care units in our hospitals, even in the formula put forth by the hon. Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park. As I look at this, I would have to say that if you're looking at priorities, obviously the first thing to do is help the living stay alive and healthy. That, I suppose, is what's involved in the Hippocratic oath; it's to preserve life. So one has to say that when there is a choice between dollars, obviously that's where our priority comes in.

However, in spite of all our medical and technical advantages over the last decades, indeed centuries, it's been mentioned that the averages are about the same. While we have prolonged life, perhaps improved it, the average of those who are born and those who die remains pretty well the same — one for one. We haven't yet banished the scourge of death, and it's not likely that we will. What are we to do then? Are we to say: well, they're hopeless, and therefore we'll try to ease their pain but otherwise largely ignore them. The fact is that one way or another all of us are going to face this experience one day.

Death has been something I've been pretty close to for a number of years because of my professional involvement. I've stood by the beds of those who were expiring, held their hands and watched as they slowly eased out of this life. You can only go with them so far, and then they go alone. I think what is most important and least expensive, if you will — it's not costly at all — is that somebody be with the person when he passes from this world so he has the sense of community and caring. It doesn't have to be professional people. It just has to be somebody who's there, who's willing to touch and whose presence is recognized. It doesn't take a lot of words; it just has to be there. So I don't necessarily think the answer here is one of professionalism, but that's not to say that professionalism shouldn't be there. I don't think it has to be elaborate. I suspect that if we had one trained person in charge of the dying in each hospital — it wouldn't have to be a large unit; it may not have to be a specialized unit at all. But somebody should be there who's making sure that the terminally ill person's need is being taken care of.

It's already been mentioned that these needs are physical, emotional, and spiritual. I'm not sure what's happening in our medical schools today, Mr. Speaker, but I've been surprised at how many doctors are ill-prepared to confront and support the emotional needs of the terminally ill. I suppose it's not pleasant for any of us to do that, but I would suggest that if it's not being done in our medical schools — and I confess some ignorance here; I know it wasn't in certain times — there ought to be a course for doctors, not an elective course but a required course, on how to treat the terminally ill patient.

Secondly, when I mentioned that there was one person, that person would not have to be a physician; simply one who has taken some training on the needs of the terminally ill. I don't know where such a course is being offered. I do know there

is much to be learned, and it could be combined to be offered. The Member for Edmonton Kingsway mentioned palliative care in Edmonton. I must remind him that there's more than one in the province. There's also one in Calgary, working out of the Tom Baker cancer clinic at the Foothills hospital. It's a voluntary group, not supported by the government as such, doing really very great work. If you had that one person there, they could make sure the person's needs were being taken care of, because there are in the community those who can be called in — they don't have to be there all the time — to take care of the medical, to make sure the physical needs are being taken care of and that pain is being relieved. That can certainly be done in a very effective way today.

There is the need for those who will take care of the emotional trauma that's gone through. I think one of the great needs is the ability to face death with realism. Sometimes doctors, certainly sometimes families, say: don't mention that he's going to die; we don't want him to know he's going to die. In all likelihood he knows he's going to die. I would say that in 99 percent of cases, the patient knows his days are numbered. But I've seen so many artificial situations where families sit in the chairs and talk about the weather and how nice it is, and the patient is sitting there and kind of joins in. It's an artificial conversation when the real issue is being masked.

Generally speaking, when they're facing death, people need to face it and talk about it. Exposure oftentimes does away with fear. It's like people you don't like. We politicians are good at that, and we fight against opposite opinions through the press. Sometimes when you sit down with people at the same table and begin to talk, you realize that the differences aren't nearly as great, nor need the fears be so great, as you thought. I'm not saying that one can always be comfortable in the face of death, but certainly I've seen where people needed to talk, where arrangements needed to be made, where the tension was lifted, and emotional support was able to be given between close members of the family, loved ones, simply because they were encouraged to do so. When that's withheld when one most needs it, I think that's a tragedy.

What we need is somebody who just needs to be able to lead people into that kind of relationship, a person who is well experienced and trained. As I say, it may be just one person. That's maybe the greatest need there is, to make sure the person who is dying has a will, maybe has his wishes fulfilled with regard to his funeral. It's not really all that difficult in the sense of knowledge. It's simply that it needs to be done by somebody who has the touch to do it.

There is also the need of spiritual counsel, and it was mentioned. It's pretty obvious. Someone has said that there aren't very many atheists in foxholes. Again I find that many people who had very little concern with regard to their spiritual welfare during life, suddenly faced with death become concerned. I'm not here to comment one way or another on that, except that I think it's a need that's often felt and ought to be met. That's why I think it's very, very important, whether as a member who can be called on or as an integral member of the team, that the clergyman be involved in setting up any kind of palliative care unit. He may not, and perhaps should not, be there as a full-time employee. But I think that obviously clergymen, whether one or a series, ought to be closely involved. Most of our hospitals, if they're large enough, usually have full-time clergymen on staff. If a person doesn't want spiritual counselling, naturally one would not force that on someone. But if he wants it ... And here's the other thing: sometimes people may want it but may not express that. Therefore perhaps a neutral person should be the person who asks, would you like to talk to your pastor or your clergyman? Some people have

great need; all of us probably do at that point. If it's wanted, it should be there and be ministered to.

It's amazing how hard it is for some of us to break down those barriers, whether by way of pride, and admit to needs. I won't go into personal experiences. It's not just the elderly. The elderly have learned a bit and tend to be a little more honest. But I can remember some terminally ill people. I think of one particular fellow in his 30s who was so robust, physically strong, proud, and independent. And yet I remember when finally he faced the moment of truth that cancer was going to get him, he grabbed my hand in desperation and asked for prayer and concern, and needed to know there was somebody there to support him — people-centred, heart-centred ministry.

One more thing which is pretty close to that has been mentioned, but I think we need to again. Someone, I forget which member, mentioned that years ago people tended to die not in hospitals but more often at home. Home is the natural place, isn't it? When I've had a tough day, I want to go home. I don't want to be bothered by anybody. I want to be quiet. I want some people around me who are familiar, familiar circumstances. When a person is dying, when he's facing that ultimate moment of life, can you think of a more needy situation when he should be in familiar surroundings with his loved ones? Sometimes that's difficult for the family, but ultimately I think it's a more healing experience. I therefore think that where it's physically possible at all, we ought to put more emphasis — it may require a visiting nurse, but if you're talking about costs, obviously it's much, much cheaper to send a nurse to a home for half an hour a day than it is to keep a person in hospital for 24 hours. I would urge that those who are involved in this kind of thing with the hospitals look more and more at our patients being allowed, if possible, to expire in those surroundings where they're most comfortable.

Mr. Speaker, the sum here is that there's an awful lot that can be done without spending an awful lot of money. I think every hospital ought to be setting up some kind of palliative ministry. I don't think it has to cost them a lot of money. Sometimes it can be done with volunteers. But it should be done, so those who are dying don't feel they've been left alone.

Thank you very much.

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I don't suppose one should say it's a pleasure to get into a debate on a subject like this, but in many ways it is. When we talk about palliative care, we are essentially talking about attitudes. The Member for Calgary North Hill just mentioned one of those attitudes: the change in attitude to where people should die. It's historically true that the vast majority of people used to die at home, unless indeed they died on the battlefield. There has been a change in modern society, and we have to look to some extent at why those changes have occurred.

I suppose in some ways we've been fortunate and in other ways unfortunate to live in the so-called modern, scientific age. In the day of scientific medicine and modern technology. As a result, everybody in society has developed a belief in the capability of science to do anything. I remember when John F. Kennedy said they would put men on the moon within the decade. A lot of people didn't believe it, but it did happen. Unfortunately I don't think there is any possibility of science ever doing away with the fact of death, and death affects everybody who's involved with it. It's not just the patient; it's the family and relatives, the friends, and also — and this is often forgotten — the staff of the health care facility who have looked after these people.

Palliative care is involved not with sudden deaths but with the longer deaths, where the dying process takes some time.

In sudden deaths there isn't time for palliative care. It's the response in families, friends, and patients to terminal illness that has resulted in people looking once more at the concept of caring instead of just treating.

It's been a difficult decision for some people, and I think it's particularly difficult for the younger doctors — younger than myself — and nurses who do not remember that pre-critical care/intensive care era in health care. I think those people who've been brought up with and educated in the health care system in the era of intensive scientific development — the technological advances that have occurred in many fields, which have been applied to health care — really do tend to develop an attitude to start with, in their younger years in their practice, that they can do anything for anybody. Of course they have to learn by bitter experience that it isn't true. To start with, whether they're a nurse or a doctor, in many cases I think they regard the death of a patient as somehow being a defeat for themselves.

I was fortunate to go to a medical school where some very feeling staff taught us. I've mentioned his name once before in this Legislature, the head of the department of cancer, Jimmy Phillips. He came off a northeastern Scotland farm, so he came from the basics of life. He knew what it was all about before he ever got to medical school. At our first lecture, Jimmy Phillips described the aims of his cancer department: to cure when possible, to relieve pain when incurable, and not to prolong the act of dying. It's a very human approach to patients.

For a time I think society, as well as health care systems, forgot the importance of that last one. In the battle to avoid theoretical defeat, we lost all the dignity of humanity in the dying process. We developed the critical care areas, which are extremely important when one has a survivable disease like a heart attack, a head injury, or some types of strokes. But when death is inevitable in the relatively near future, the application of the critical care concept has in many ways removed the individual person from our right as individuals to choose to some extent how and where we will die.

I doubt if many people who have died of advanced cancer, with tubes in every available orifice plus some artificial orifices, appreciated it. I doubt if it had any effect upon relieving their pain. It certainly did not aid the relatives and friends who had to deal with the situation after the patient died. The last memories of relatives and friends can be significant to our own attitudes to life and death. If those last memories are in a critical care unit, with intravenous running and all the other appurtenances of a critical care unit, those who survive, the relatives and friends, live with those memories.

I'm not going to mention people by name, because I shouldn't; but I have two instances of patients of mine that I would like to talk about. One was a woman. She was a nurse, and she had cancer of the breast. When she developed secondary disease in her bones and she knew that it was incurable, she asked only one thing of me and the people at the cancer hospital: that, if possible, she live long enough to see her children out of school. She put up with the chemotherapy, the radiation, and the cobalt treatment. She bought a wig. She did all those things, and she indeed survived until her youngest child was out of the school system. I think she enjoyed their growing up just as all parents do.

When the time came that she felt she had done what she had to do — and by that time she had had operations to remove her pituitary and adrenal glands and her ovaries to decrease her hormone output; she was therefore on replacement therapy with cortisone to enable her to survive. When she felt her job had been done, she said to me: Ian, when the time comes, when I stop these pills, will you give me intravenouses? I made a

promise to her that I would not. When the time came, she stopped her pills one morning, and she was dead by midnight — at home. Mr. Speaker, as you can tell by my reaction, she was a good friend.

Another instance was a much younger man. We thought he had appendicitis. When we opened up his abdomen, we found he did not have appendicitis; he had fairly advanced cancer. It was spread all over. Subsequent to that, once he was over the initial operation, I had to spend some time talking to him and his wife about the outlook. He was a very cheerful man of Welsh extraction. He was a joy to know. He had much younger children, and he knew he was not going to survive until they reached adulthood. He again faced it. We talked about the approximate length of time he could have with all the modern treatments and how short it might be without that. For business and financial reasons, he decided to go a reasonable length of time. He had further surgery, chemotherapy, and radiation. But he also decided there was a limit to this.

We came to an agreement that he would always have a bed available in the hospital. He lived just two blocks away and stayed at home. When things got too much, he would come to the hospital, sometimes for one night, sometimes for three nights. He stayed at home, and we gave him some stuff called Brompton cocktail. There are many recipes for it. The one that has traditionally been used is vodka or gin with cocaine, morphine — heroin in Britain — largactil, and some honey. This gentleman would sip at this stuff when the pain got too much. He would remain remarkably conscious and able to talk to relatives, friends, and other people. Of course when he was getting to the latter stages of it, he was spending more nights at the hospital than at home. One particular night he said, do you think I could make it home for supper? I said, I'm sure you can, knowing you. So he went home, had supper at home, put his two children to bed, came back to the hospital, and died at two in the morning.

In both of those instances, I think you could honestly say that those people died at peace with themselves and their families were at peace with themselves. They certainly died with dignity. But they died without a palliative care unit, because we only had 23 beds in that hospital. They died without a formal system, but they died that way because individual people cared. They weren't all doctors and nurses; they were friends, business acquaintances, and families.

I wholeheartedly back the Bill that has been put forward by the Member for Edmonton Sherwood Park. What I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is that it is not the systems; it is the people who are involved that make palliative care.

Thank you.

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Speaker, I consider [inaudible] part in the discussion this afternoon on palliative care. Like the Member for Edson, I am going to make reference to two or three personal experiences, because in my case I was the one who learned from it, and I thought that was good. In fact I am going to make the observation that working with terminally ill people is something like working in this Legislature. It's an experience that you have to have to understand and feel for it, because you really can't explain or describe it to somebody else in a manner that would probably be very well understood.

My first experience with the palliative care situation was many years ago in what we will call a small rural hospital. There was a need for friends and family to sit together with a gentleman in the evenings. It soon became a 24-hour basis, and the family could not keep up with it. This gentleman had many friends in the community. At that particular moment, I happened to be associated with the executive of a lodge organ-

ization. One of my close associates was associated with the Canadian Legion. The two of us organized a group of people who sat with this person constantly — 24 hours, around the clock — in the small hospital in our hometown. I'm convinced we were of considerable assistance to the family and to the gentleman who needed somebody to sit with him. The interesting thing is what it did to all of us who became involved in the exercise. We kept that up for three weeks. It was indeed a very touching experience, and I think we all grew and matured considerably from it.

Mr. Speaker, that is palliative care in a small rural hospital, like the story the Member for Edson just related to us. The Member for Calgary North Hill and, in an earlier debate, the Member for Calgary Egmont also told us the importance of being with a person at that particular moment.

With reference to my own personal experiences, we'll now advance to the last six weeks. During the last six weeks, I've had two additional experiences which brought home to me the meaning of the words "palliative care". A very close friend was in the Youville pavilion here in Edmonton, and I had an opportunity to observe the kind of care, service, and facilities we have for this particular concern. The family was very impressed with the facilities and the way in which their father and husband was being cared for.

At the particular moment he passed away, I happened to be in Calgary with family. A gentleman with what I understand is called Alzheimer's disease had been admitted to the unit in Calgary that was referred to by an earlier speaker, the Tom Baker cancer clinic in that centre. The important thing was that the staff at that unit was holding what they called a patient conference on this particular patient. Of course the family was invited. My aunt didn't really feel comfortable going alone and asked if I could make myself available to be with her. Of course I agreed. There again, a new experience for me. We sat around that conference table with two doctors, a head nurse, a unit nurse, a recreation director, a social worker, and an intern. What started out to be a 30-minute conference on this particular patient turned out to be an hour and a half discussion.

The important thing is, it was mostly for the benefit of the wife. I had not understood until that moment how important that dimension of palliative care was. Not only did they have the facilities at the hospital, but in Calgary this woman is also getting the support of a community organization which I understand is an Alzheimer's society or association. It's performing an excellent service. In this particular case, it was determined that the next conference would be held on a certain date, and we would all be there again.

I think the impact of experiences like this not only tells us the importance, beauty, joy, and value of life but, as the Member for Edson said, they tell us something about the real meaning of death, the importance of death to those of us who are living, and the importance of being able to die with some dignity and comfort when each of us has our turn. Bill 201 clearly demonstrates the responsiveness of this Legislature to a concern with which I'm sure most or all of us have some very close association. I encourage the establishment of any program which will maintain a higher degree of awareness among the policymakers and planners of this province, of the importance of this tender and loving requirement.

Thank you.

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Speaker, in view of the hour, I move that we adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is proposed that the Committee of Supply continue this evening with consideration of the estimates of the departments of Housing, Labour, and Municipal Affairs, in that order, and if not completed this evening, continue tomorrow morning in the same order following question period.

[The House recessed at 5:25 p.m.]

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

#### head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

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

#### Department of Housing

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are on Vote 2, policy development and financial assistance for housing.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, before we finished yesterday, I think we still had a couple of outstanding questions on Vote 1; at least I did. I could ask them under vote and preamble, but I thought we were still on Vote 1. My colleague had asked the question about the 34.2 percent increase in departmental services. We had several reasons outlined, but perhaps we might take a moment and explore that in a little more detailed way.

For example, Mr. Minister, under public affairs we have a 313 percent increase to \$41,300. I wonder what we need that kind of increase for. I understand that part of this increase is due to the consolidation of Alberta Housing and Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation. But again, I wonder why we need quite such a large increase, given the government's apparent commitment to try to reduce or to downsize, as my colleague cited the other day.

So perhaps before we move on, Mr. Chairman, we might just explore a couple of those questions before we get to the next vote.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, I responded in some detail as to the factors that enter into that increase in Vote 1. I indicated that there is an increased cost in data processing. There was an additional man-year in the minister's office.

Public affairs — that percentage is deceptive. The increase from \$10,000 to \$41,000 is really a part of the result of the split of the Department of Housing from the Department of Housing and Public Works when Public Works and Government Services were put together. That occurred in the latter part of the '82-83 budget year, and during the course of the '83-84 budget year the comparison is not for a complete year. It's about the equivalent of three-quarters of a year. So by the time the new Department of Housing was operational, these were the additions required in order to make it function as a department.

So that, Mr. Chairman, accounts for the percentage difference in those various subvotes in Vote 1.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just on that, we're dealing with Alberta Housing and Alberta Home Mortgage, soon to be consolidated, that do their own advertising, as I understand it. Why would the Minister of Housing need a public affairs budget of \$41,000? Most of the social housing programs are advertised by Alberta Housing, as I understand it. What particular public affairs budget has to come under the department as opposed to the agencies for which the minister has responsibility?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of very important programs that are operated by the Department of Housing in addition to those that are provided through either of the two Crown corporations. For example, the senior citizen home improvement program is one of the key programs of the department, providing program services to over 50,000 seniors, as well as the mortgage interest reduction program, that has provided mortgage interest protection to about 155,000 families. As well, the rural home assistance program is a very important program, particularly in northern Alberta. Just those programs, which have extensive involvement with the citizens of the province, require the services of a communications and public affairs area, that we work on with the minister responsible for the Public Affairs Bureau.

Mr. Chairman, we also have the award of excellence program, and I alluded to it in my earlier comments. We believe that's a very important program, where we have developed a program of awards to builders who provide new and outstanding innovative design in economical housing for Albertans. That program has involved and will involve considerable communication with builders and citizens throughout the province in terms of awareness.

Another program we have that requires this sort of service is our innovative grant program, which I also referred to. We receive many, many proposals by industry, individuals, planners, builders, and architects to access our innovative grant program. The objective of that program is to improve housing for Albertans by innovative design, in subdivisions, housing design, or energy efficiency.

For those reasons, it's essential that this department has the service in that public affairs area that is generally required and, in terms of the dollars, is not an extraordinary expense.

MR. NOTLEY: With respect to Vote 1.0.3, I gather that that is where the study came in, or whatever funds were necessary, to lead the government to the conclusion that there should be a consolidation of Alberta Home Mortgage and Alberta Housing. I would like to know what specific costs would be attributed to that review from that \$1,103,810, representing a 31 percent increase, and what the rest of that appropriation was for.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before we continue, for the information of the hockey fans it's 1 to 0 Oilers.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, in Vote 1.0.3, I think I responded to that on the previous occasion, but maybe I can be more precise in terms of the dollar amount and the difference. Twenty-two percent of the increase, or \$155,000, is attributable to the full-year costs of the department, which I explained in response to the very first question this evening, of a full-year versus nine-month comparison. The additional \$109,000 that makes up the difference from the previous year is for rental equipment, including consulting costs and electronic data pro-

cessing. Those two amounts represent the difference from the previous year.

MR. NOTLEY: What particular costs? As I recollect the minister's answer on a previous day, he indicated certain consulting fees with respect to the consolidation of Alberta Home Mortgage and Alberta Housing Corporation. What was the cost of that report, and was that report fully assumed under Vote 1 or would it also be picked up in other estimates or in the budgets of the agencies?

MR. SHABEN: I believe the total cost to date for the consulting services that are related to the reorganization are approximately \$40,000. I can't be certain of the precise amount that is attributable to last year's budget and to this year's budget. I'd have to check through the records, and I can let the hon. member know. The final costs are still undetermined because the process is continuing in terms of the implementation of the plan.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, with respect to Vote 1.0.4, and again I am going from memory from the discussion the other day, there was one extra position in the minister's office — perhaps the minister could be specific and tell us what that position encompasses — and one extra, I believe, in the Deputy Minister's office. There has been a 74.4 percent increase in personnel administration. Perhaps the minister could outline specifically what that represents as well as who the extra person in the minister's office is and what the duties are.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, in Vote 1.0.1, the person in the minister's office is an additional secretary. The increase in costs in the deputy minister's office is as a result of the reclassification that resulted from the reorganization and the splitting of the departments. In personnel administration, there is an addition of one year during '83-84, and that is attributable as well to the results of splitting off the Department of Housing from Public Works and then combining Public Works with Supply and Services. I think that details where the people are, in response to the question by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Vote 2.1, policy and program [development], \$1,896,000. Are you agreed?

MR. NOTLEY: Just a minute now. Not quite so enthusiastic, Mr. Chairman, on the question of Vote 2. I'd like to deal with several specific questions, and perhaps the minister could respond to them. First of all we have the reduction in the log housing grants; perhaps the minister could identify that. I see Metis settlement housing, \$1,145,000; perhaps the minister could outline to the committee how many homes that represents and where among the settlements, and to what extent that particular program may be influenced by the jurisdiction question that we talked about the other day. But I'd like to specifically know what we're doing with the \$1,145,000 this year.

I notice, Mr. Chairman, that we have senior citizen unique home. I'm not quite sure what that means. I'd like the minister to outline what that represents in terms of a program. I see that the home conversion program is down substantially, 98.5 percent. Perhaps the minister could tell us why.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, up to March 31, 1984, under the Metis settlement housing program, the government provided some 289 units on Metis settlements that are complete as of March 31. We propose that 84 new units be built during 1984-85. That, of course, is contingent upon the Metis settlements being able to work through the program and build that

number of houses. That also includes the cost for electrical hookup. I earlier responded to the question of how our programs would be impacted as a result of a determination of the jurisdictional question, so don't propose to repeat my answer.

The senior citizen unique home program — upgrading of lodges — is a special program we support under extraordinary circumstances, and those dollars are budgeted for nine that we plan to assist with.

In the home conversion program, there have been only 18 applications approved to date. In terms of applications, we have determined and have announced that the program ended at the end of March 1984. So we have budgeted a limited amount to handle those applications.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the 84 units in the Metis settlement housing program, are those units going to be dispersed equally among the settlements, or what is the yardstick for determining who gets the 84 homes? What specific consultation is made with the settlement councils on the determination of who gets the 84 units?

With respect to the unique home, I'm still not quite clear in my mind. Are we talking about a program which offers a number of facilities? Are we talking about an experimental program? I wasn't quite clear, from the minister's answer, basically what that \$850,000 represents.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, I erred; I'd like to apologize to the members of the committee. The number of housing units under the Metis settlement housing program is 53 units for the eight settlements. Those numbers are determined in consultation with the settlement councils and the Waskayigun Associations on the settlements. The determining factors are principally two in number. One is the capacity of the community to produce a certain number of houses — that's the most important — secondly, the labour that is available in that community and the prioritizing of the families who have asked and the local community responds to.

In terms of how they're distributed, it varies from settlement to settlement. As I indicated, there are eight Metis settlements in the province. Some are larger than others, so there's an allocation of more units. From time to time there are other ways that we respond, and part of the budget would be included to respond to those situations. For example, about two and a half years ago Gift Lake Metis settlement purchased 19 abandoned homes that were in Atikameg, and so we used this program as well as program assistance from the Department of Municipal Affairs to move the houses into the settlement. This program was used to develop the foundations. As a result of that, Gift Lake had more homes in one year, so there was a gap in terms of the allocation of homes the following year. So the determination of when and how is one that's made after consultation with the Metis settlement Waskayigun Associations.

Mr. Chairman, I may not have made myself clear on the senior citizen unique homes program. That's a program for senior citizen lodges, where under extraordinary circumstances there are design problems or problems where they need upgrading. Although the homes are owned by the member municipalities in the foundation, we are able to obtain some financing through the Provincial Treasurer and are able to respond to a limited number of requests. We expect to be able to respond to eight requests in the '84-85 year.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just one final question on the Metis housing program. I notice, Mr. Minister, that if we're looking at 83 units, the total works out to about \$22,000 a

home. The minister has indicated that in some cases that has meant taking abandoned homes from one community to another. What is the breakdown? Normally it costs more than \$22,000 to build a home. To what extent is sweat equity a part of it? How much do the people in the communities have to put up? What is the arrangement with respect to the funding of these homes?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, we provide a basic grant to the local housing committee or Waskayigun Association. For example, if there is a determination that a settlement is going to build four homes in a year, we provide a grant of approximately \$19,500 per housing unit to the Waskayigun Association. That grant is for the use of the Waskayigun Association in purchasing materials. Then the local association takes advantage of other provincial programs — such as the Opportunity Corps, the priority employment programs, or last year the joint federal/provincial NEED program, or federal programs such as Canada Works or similar programs — to arrange for labour. That is the way the homes are built. Individual contributions are made by the family who is to receive the home, in terms of their contribution toward the construction. But often that individual is receiving compensation through one of the programs I have described.

In addition to the grants that are provided to the community for the material, we assist in the electricity hookups and other assistance. Through the branch, we of course provide consultative services, design advice, and support to the community.

It's an outstanding program. It's the only one of its kind in Canada, Mr. Chairman. Other jurisdictions have tried it: it hasn't worked. The reason it works in Alberta and hasn't worked in other jurisdictions is because the community association runs it. The government doesn't run it. We support the community in the ways I've described. It's just an excellent program. In 35 communities, including the Metis settlements, it has provided just wonderful opportunities for individual families to have very, very good housing, probably the best that is attainable in any province in Canada for northern peoples.

Agreed to:

|  |              |
|--|--------------|
| 2.1 — Policy and Program Development   | \$ 1,896,000 |
| 2.2 — Housing Assistance               | \$ 4,157,000 |
| 2.3 — Financial Assistance for Housing | \$84,043,000 |

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before we get through this one, there's No. 4. There are several questions I have on this particular appropriation. Perhaps we could begin by asking the minister to give us an updated report on the situation with respect to staff housing, particularly subsidized staff housing for employees in northern areas. I say that in light of the obvious bargaining position now of the government with respect to salary/benefit increases. Where do things now stand on that particular issue?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, there is no change since I reported earlier to members of the Assembly. At that time we announced to staff members a change in policy, with a gradual increase toward average market rents where staff housing was provided for employees of line departments. It should be noted that Alberta Housing Corporation, not the Department of Housing, responds to requests by line departments. In terms of provision of staff housing, we are simply a delivery or service agency for the requests by the line departments.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a couple of comments on that issue, and then there are several other

questions. I suppose a government that's going to be able to get away with, if I can use that expression not in a pejorative way, the policy on phasing out, if you like, the subsidies in northern or remote areas of the province at this stage of the game, with an army of 150,000 people out of work — I suppose it won't be difficult to find people to work under almost any condition. I suppose we'll have a chance to discuss that in more detail when we get to the Minister of Labour's estimates a little later tonight. But I think one has to look at the future. We had a policy in place with respect to assistance subsidies for people moving to remote areas of the province. There were good reasons for that policy. It had been in place for a long period of time. I would simply offer to members of the committee the submission that the short-term advantage we can gain by phasing this program out — and getting away with it, because employees don't have other options with 150,000 out of work — may be highly doubtful if we ever find ourselves again in a competitive labour market.

Mr. Chairman, it wasn't so long ago that I recall, as a member of the Members' Services Committee of this House, listening to the plea of some of the officers of this Legislature, one of whom had attempted without success to recruit people in Alberta for his department and had to bring people in to staff a department who were aggrieved by the language legislation in Quebec. That seems light-years ago, given the current unemployment situation. It seems like a totally different world, but it was only three or four years go. I know it's difficult on occasion encouraging specialized and competent people to come to some of the remote areas of the province. I would just say to the minister that the policy he previously identified in the House may work in the short run, but I think we're setting ourselves up for long-term trouble down road. That's an observation, and I suppose he may be proven right. I suspect that I may be proven right, but at this stage I would simply ask the government to consider what is in store for us should economic conditions change.

However, I want to move from there, if I may, and deal with the increases under 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, 4.3.5, and 4.3.6.1 notice that in 4.3.7 and 4.3.8 there's a reduction. Since some of those increases are fairly substantial — and I suspect I would agree with the reasons — I'd like to at least know the reasons for each of the increases, one by one: 95 percent in rural and native housing, 54 percent in community housing, 34 percent senior citizen lodges, 71.6 percent in self-contained, 45.3 percent in transitional housing, 58.1 percent in Metis housing. I'm sure there are sensible reasons. Perhaps we might have a rundown by the minister as to what the reasons are for those increases, vote by vote, from 4.3.1 through 4.3.6.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, just before moving to respond to those questions, I want to clarify the support under the unique housing program. It is for lodges but those are for private, nonprofit foundation lodges as opposed to the foundations. Under the foundations, we have another program that comes under the Alberta Housing Corporation, under Vote 4. I want to make that clear.

With respect to the items in Vote 3, and 4.3 in particular, the principal reason for the increase under the rural and native housing program is the increase in subsidy costs. As members are aware, that program is a cost-shared program between the federal and provincial governments. We are responsible for subsidizing a portion of the amortization costs of the mortgages above that portion that the homeowner is able to pay with the 25 percent ceiling, bearing in mind that the families who access the rural and native housing program are low-income families. As more units are placed on the market, there is an increase

in the subsidy costs. A similar situation occurs in the subsidy costs attributable to other housing programs under Vote 4 and Vote 3 as well.

With respect to community housing, where there's a 54 percent increase — precisely the same answer. We had a large number of units completed in 1983 that fell into the previous fiscal year, where the subsidies catch up to us in '84-85 in terms of the cost. All the programs identified in Vote 4.3 are subsidized housing, whether it is Metis housing, the rural mobile home program, or the transitional housing. Those are heavily subsidized for families in transition who move into these houses that are provided in certain communities. As more units are added, Mr. Chairman, the subsidy costs increase dramatically.

If hon. members are interested, I could go through the total numbers of housing units, which I think I may have covered in my comments the previous evening when we dealt with the estimates.

MR. NOTLEY: Just on the issue of the senior citizen self-contained, though, I realize there is some subsidy, but that's not a cost-shared program, is it? Is that not something we deal with specifically as the Alberta government?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, each year Canada Mortgage and Housing allocates a certain number of units to each province. Historically, Alberta has provided more housing units than the allocation made available to the province of Alberta. As a result of that, there are some 5,700 out of the total of 10,900 senior self-contained units where the deficits are not cost-shared. So the majority of the senior self-contained units are fully subsidized by the province, in addition to the province providing all the capital.

MR. NOTLEY: So, Mr. Chairman, that 71.6 percent is almost exclusively attributable to more units which have come on stream in this budget year that we must pick up the costs for in total. How much of it is in fact due to increased costs on all 10,000-odd units?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member repeat the question?

MR. NOTLEY: Yes, I can understand the increase from \$31 million to \$51 million in terms of, we have more units that we have to pick up the subsidy for; that's fair enough. And if there's a difference between 5,700 and 10,000-odd units, that's significant. However, is part of this due to an increase in the average subsidy on each of the units itself; that is, the per-unit subsidy? What has happened to it in the last year? I'm not talking about what the government of Alberta is having to pick up, but the average figure as to the difference between what the senior citizens pay in a self-contained unit and the actual costs of operation over the global divided by the number of units.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, I don't have a precise breakdown. I can probably help the hon. member by indicating that the rent on the self-contained that the seniors pay, based on 25 percent of minimum income, generally handles the operating costs, the maintenance costs, and the management costs. The principal costs of the subsidies to the provincial taxpayer are related to the amortization costs of the cost of building them. But generally our experience has been that the rent payment covers the costs other than the cost of the money.

In terms of what those amortization costs are per unit, I could obtain it simply by dividing the total cost by the number of units. It would vary depending on the year in which they were built, what the capital cost of a unit was compared to the current cost, and what the interest rates were. But with a little arithmetic I think it could be calculated as to what the cost is per unit when you divide 10,900 units by the subsidy costs. I don't have a calculator with me.

MR. NOTLEY: I don't expect the minister to give that to us tonight. I would gather that this \$51 million, since we're dealing with amortization costs, most of which is covered by the province — on those units which are CMHC, there is a partial sharing with the federal government. However, am I not correct in my assumption that many of these units have been built specifically by Alberta Housing, and the money used to build them has been borrowed from the heritage trust fund? So would it not be a correct assessment that at least part of this \$51 million would be money that is owing by Alberta Housing to the heritage trust fund for various debentures that the trust fund has bought from Alberta Housing over the last number of years?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, clearly the Alberta Housing Corporation obtains all its funds by way of debenture borrowing from the heritage fund, including the capital requirements for the senior citizen self-contained program. The subsidy costs reflected here are those costs that are attributable to payments on the cost of servicing those debenture borrowings from the heritage fund.

Agreed to:

|  |               |
|--|---------------|
| Total Vote 2 — Policy Development and Financial Assistance for Housing   | \$ 90,096,000 |
| 3.1 — Program Support  | \$ 5,017,603  |
| 3.2 — Financial Assistance   | \$ 60,100,000 |
| Total Vote 3 — Alberta Heritage Fund Mortgage Interest Reduction Program | \$ 65,117,603 |
| 4.1 — Program Support  | \$ 16,857,000 |
| 4.2 — Staff Housing  | \$ 35,000     |
| 4.3 — Subsidized Housing for Low Income Albertans                        | \$ 97,509,000 |
| 4.4 — Land Assembly and Development                                      | \$ 4,874,000  |
| Total Vote 4 — Housing for Albertans                                     | \$119,275,000 |

#### **Vote 5 — Mortgage Assistance**

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of quick questions. In Vote 5 it's somewhat similar, although not quite as glaring as what we ended up in the last day, in terms of administrative support. My question is a relatively simple one. I notice a small increase, 2.8 percent, in the administrative support for program support under 5.1.1. In a time of restraint, when the rest of the department — and we all know why it has to go down; there's a significant decline in terms of the programs, which we expect. But it seems that wherever there is administrative support, there is no cutback. This is marginal, admittedly, but I would have expected a cutback similar to what is being cut back in the department as a whole. Maybe the minister could indicate — I wasn't able to be here at the start — a similar sort of philosophy, if you like, in Vote 5, of why there wouldn't be a cutback of at least 10 percent or whatever; I think it was 20- some overall. Why not a 24 percent cut in administrative support? That may be oversimplistic, but I would expect at

least some cutback in the administrative part of it. I'll just leave that with the minister.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, first of all with respect to manpower for the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation, at April 1, 1984, the manpower was 259. That's down 29 from 1983-84. So in terms of manpower, it's down. The principal area in program support is that it has been a very difficult year for the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation, particularly in the area of loans administration. We have had, as all lenders have had, a very difficult time managing the portfolio. The portfolio in the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation is about \$2.7 billion, one of the largest mortgage portfolios in Canada. In order to manage it well, in a very, very difficult period, in this upcoming year it's essential that we have the capability of responding to current conditions. One of the major reasons there is a virtual maintenance of the program support dollar amount is for that reason; it's the necessity of managing the portfolio very well. Another reason is that though the total manpower is down, as a result of the salary settlements from the previous year you see a small percentage increase in the dollars that are required.

While I'm on my feet, the final score in the game tonight is Edmonton — 1, New York — 0.

MR. NOTLEY: There had to be some good news in that report.

MR. MARTIN: Just to go into 5.2, could the minister explain basically what that is, specifically where it says Net Loss (Profit) on Mortgage Lending Before Subsidies. I notice there is a 17.8 percent increase. Could the minister explain exactly what it means a little more fully?

MR. SHABEN: The Minister of Transportation said that that score that was announced was the best news of the evening, and I concur.

The 17.8 percent is an increase in profits on the operations of the Home Mortgage company prior to subsidies. We do our accounting in a way that the calculations of the operations of the Home Mortgage Corporation are done on a businesslike basis. If we were a conventional mortgage lender that did not provide subsidies, our profit for the year would have been \$41 million, which is a significant increase over the previous year, principally as a result of an increase in the portfolio size. That of course corresponds to the reduction in subsidies. If the subsidies are offset by a greater profit, the net subsidy is reduced. That's what we project for the upcoming year in terms of our budget. As to whether or not we will achieve this sort of performance, it remains to be seen, because it's a very volatile market. But with sound management in the corporation and reasonable market conditions, we expect those numbers will be achieved.

Agreed to:

|                                    |                 |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 5.1 — Program Support              | \$12,457,000    |
|                                    | (\$ 41,000,000) |
| 5.2 — Mortgage Lending             |                 |
| 5.3 — Subsidies                    | \$128,863,000   |
| Total Vote 5 — Mortgage Assistance | \$100,320,000   |
| Department Total                   | \$376,536,603   |

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the estimates of the Department of Housing be reported.

[Motion carried]



**Department of Labour**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has the minister any opening comments? [some applause]

MR. YOUNG: Thank you. That's for the completion of the comments, is it?

Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to touch on a few points. First of all, proceeding in the manner in which the estimates appear in the estimates book, touching on labour relations I will only make the brief observation that 1984 is a very different year than was 1983. It is a year of considerable change in perspective on the part of many people. The numbers of work disruptions are very much reduced. In the circumstances, we are finding that the parties tend to concentrate more vigorously upon the matters at hand. At the same time, I should indicate that there has been a fair degree of involvement of the mediation services and also indicate that it appears that in certain types of bargaining, there is a fair amount of what I will call drift; that is, before coming to any conclusions, the two parties wait to see what else, which they deem relevant to them, is going to happen.

In general safety services, I would like to mention that the change in the economy has produced some difference of impact upon the demand for those services. Interestingly enough, the boilers branch, which relates to and ties to some of our manufacturing, especially that geared to the chemical industry and to export of pressure vessels, has remained reasonably constant. It's a very positive phenomenon to observe that, because I think it does mean that we're exporting more than most would expect.

With respect to other areas of that aspect of general safety services, it is a little more closely tied to the construction industry. The consequence is that the proportion of inspections of all the work that comes on stream is increasing.

The one area I really want to single out for some special comment is fire protection. First of all, the fire training school was completed. That has resulted in a refocussing of programming toward the preparation of higher skilled fire department staff, especially focussing on management. It has also provided us with the capacity to provide training in the industrial fire-fighting area, which is important. The result is that we are now putting more resources into support of local fire departments for basic skills training and training trainers, if you will, at a local level from the schools so that they can go back to their own fire departments, and then training management personnel and industrial fire fighters in specialty areas at the fire school.

I'd also like to mention that with the adoption, effective August 1, of the Alberta fire code, we now have a companion document for the Alberta Uniform Building Standards Act and code, and two advisory councils which also function as appeal councils. The effect of that is to provide provincewide standards for building construction and provincewide standards for fire prevention. We've been very careful to try to eliminate any overlap between the two codes. Also, with the appointments of the respective councils, the uniform building standards council and the fire prevention council, we have tried to ensure that on those councils there is a balance on the side of the private sector and the people who are building and maintaining buildings.

Mr. Chairman, I think I should mention that the department is focussing in the direction of what we call quality assurance: less reliance upon inspection, more reliance hopefully upon the professionals in the field in the private sector who are carrying out work, and trying through our programming to provide expert advice, to provide some inspection as a check, and to force the responsibility to those who have it in the first place;

that is, the ones who are designing and the ones who are building.

My final comment has to do with the private pension area. All members of the Assembly should receive tomorrow, because it was mailed out to them, a copy of some proposals relative to the private pension policies. Meetings have been scheduled in a variety of locations in the province during the month of June. If those meetings are inadequate to handle all the interest generated by way of dialogue and obtaining advice from the people impacted, we will lay on some additional meetings. That has been programmed, and I just mention it by way of information. It very obviously ties to some of the initiatives across Canada to deal with the reform of private pension policies. It's very important that that occur on a uniform basis across Canada, because it is possible for one employer to be administering plans under legislation in each one of the provinces and have to contend with a batch of different arrangements from province to province. That is not beneficial to the employer, nor is it beneficial to employees.

Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate any comments or questions anyone cares to offer.

MR. NOTLEY: With an invitation of that nature, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure it would be less than courteous of the opposition not to oblige the good minister, and we certainly shall for the next two or three hours or so.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to startle the minister by starting my remarks tonight with a small offer of congratulations ... [some applause]

MR. MARTIN: Just small, though. Make it small.

MR. NOTLEY: ... with respect to the excellent advertising campaign conducted by the Human Rights Commission on racial tolerance. I would be less than forthright if I didn't say that the ads I've watched on television have been excellent. I think they get across the message of understanding in a first-class way. I commend the Human Rights Commission for that package of advertising.

However, Mr. Chairman, it is not the responsibility of the opposition to pat the government on the back, as members may have noticed. Not too long ago I received in a brown paper envelope some rather — it's not risqué material, but is a set of notes distributed by one Les Young, Minister of Labour, at the Clover Bar constituency annual meeting. April 3, 1984. I'm sorry the Member for Clover Bar isn't here. [interjection] I see it must have been written by the Member for Edmonton Glengarry. I wondered why it was so confused, but now I know.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, there are a number of observations in it. Because they relate to the Department of Labour, the estimates the minister wants us to approve tonight, I thought I might just make a few references with respect to this document. I'd then be glad to table it for hon. members, although I have a sneaking suspicion, having heard most of the arguments before, that what we have here is a compilation of speaker's notes for backbenchers. Nevertheless ...

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could save the member some time. Those are notes used not only there but also when I spoke to more than 300 plumbers and pipefitters in Calgary. They were supplied to the plumbers and pipefitters in Calgary for their usage, as they were supplied at the meeting in Clover Bar. So I think they've had quite a wide circulation. I've also attached them to correspondence to union members in the con-

struction industry. I'm actually quite pleased with them, but go ahead.

MR. NOTLEY: I'm delighted with the minister's answer. I wondered why it was that I received such an excellent response when I followed the minister at the meeting he's referring to. It's obvious the members had had an opportunity to read this document.

Mr. Chairman, here we have the sort of paranoia that I see in this government. On page 4, with respect to public-sector bargaining:

Given the very high, almost total, unionization of the public sector which has translated into more vigorous and persistent demands, an ability to embarrass.

Isn't that awful?

to focus reaction through opposition political parties.

Oh, perish the thought.

no wonder governments have reacted to the pressures.

Small wonder that the plumbers didn't think much of the minister's speech.

Mr. Chairman, I really wonder at the minister sending this kind of information to union members. I might see him sending it out to hard-core supporters of the government, though there are fewer of those these days, by quite a few, than there used to be. Nevertheless, I can't imagine the government sending this kind of material to other people.

MR. MARTIN: They believe their own rhetoric after a while.

MR. NOTLEY: They have to: nobody else does.

On the last page, page 6, we have a number of observations that I'd like to respond to, not in jest but rather seriously. I think they are serious differences of opinion that might perhaps focus some of the discussion this evening.

BARGAINING IN 1984

Bargainers in 1984 should keep in mind that:

(i) above all, we need jobs;

No one argues that point.

MR. MARTIN: Tell the Minister of Manpower.

MR. NOTLEY:

... jobs come from investment

No one argues that point either. But, Mr. Chairman, jobs also come from investment as a result of demand. Demand is very much related to wages. I think one of the problems with this kind of supply-side approach to economics is that we forget the importance in the economy of people having full paycheques so they can buy goods and services. I say that, quite frankly, because what we have seen on the part of this government is a whole series of measures which cut back on the purchasing power of ordinary men and women. Whether it's the increase in medicare premiums, the increase in personal income tax that the government rammed through the Legislature last fall, the likelihood of user fees being brought in this year as hospital boards, pressed against the wall, have no choice but to increase user fees: all these things take away purchasing power.

One of the observations the Conference Board of Canada has already made — and we cited it the other day during estimates: we'll no doubt cite it many more times — is that the outlook this year will be worse than last year, and one of the reasons is because of the fiscal measures of this government. So while no one argues that we shouldn't be making investments, the fact of the matter is that anyone who overlooks the consumption side of the equation is taking a rather simplistic approach.

Mr. Chairman, it's the second observation from the Minister of Labour that I'm a little concerned about. He's suggesting that

(ii) Canada has one of the poorest productivity performances in the industrialized world.

Basically the old argument.

We are price takers now, not price makers.

Isn't that nice.

If we insist on wages, working conditions or profits which are out of line, we will lose those jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know where this minister has been, but even the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, which is not noted for its radical left-wing views, has admitted that this year and over the last several years productivity gains have been substantial and that wage rates are not at all a factor in losing markets in the world. If the Canadian Manufacturers' Association is making that admission, and they take into account membership in those areas of the country where you have a much higher wage part of the final end product than we do in Alberta — no one could seriously argue, for example, that wages would be even a factor of significance in the end competitive position of Alberta oil or petrochemical products. It's a very, very tiny portion of the cost. The minister knows that. The fact of the matter is that when you get the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, that looks at those areas of the Canadian economy where you have a high labour component, admitting that that isn't the problem, why in heaven's name do we have this government, led by the Minister of Labour, putting out information which even the business community — at least, the most articulate and vocal of the business community — says is no longer the case?

MR. COOK: Tell us about [inaudible].

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I really wonder why the government of Alberta is doing that;

I raise those points because I think it's really quite unsatisfactory for us to have this kind of information being put out by the minister.

MR. COOK: Tell us about Burns.

MR. NOTLEY: If it was put out by the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, that's fine.

MR. MARTIN: You exercised him. What'd you say?

MR. NOTLEY: That sort of right to freedom of expression is something I've always supported. I always look forward to comments by the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry. They certainly help those of us who oppose the government.

Nevertheless, if I can move on:

(iv) Those who had high wage gains in recent years have a moral and economic responsibility to others less fortunate — where is equity?

Fair enough, Mr. Chairman. I think that that's not an unreasonable position to take. If we had a government that said, all right, we're going to ban extra billing by doctors: we are going to be dealing with corporate profits and where there have been excess profits, we're going to take a look at that. I could see the government saying "where is equity?" But to zero in on working people, the vast majority of whom do not earn anything like the income some people over coffee or tea and crumpets think they earn — the average weekly paycheque even at the boom, while it had risen substantially, and no one denies that, the fact of the matter is that those people who own for a living

as opposed to those people who work for a living were doing considerably better during the boom. We all know that.

The other day we talked in this committee about some of the enormous gains that people made in land speculation during the boom. When I think of the criticism I hear, and too often have to listen to, being focussed on working people, it really makes me rather angry. During the boom, we had a situation in our little town of Fairview where some of our most competent teachers were being told by people who were speculating and selling real estate: what are you teaching for? You're a fool. Don't teach; you can make far more money selling real estate. And well they could. But nobody was giving them 30 and 40 percent increases in those times.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to stand in my place and say that notwithstanding the fact that I represent a rural riding, there are a lot of working people in that riding. I resent the suggestion that somehow working people in this province or this country are to blame for the economic malaise we're in. I think there's been a lot of mismanagement by politicians. I think there have been errors in terms of industrial strategy. I think there have been investment errors in the country. But I do not think that the suggestion that somehow we can say: okay, here's the bogeyman, and we'll hang him, or we'll bring in antilabour legislation that restricts his rights to organize, or we'll send out this kind of document that suggests we'd better watch those public employees because they have the power through the opposition to embarrass the government. I'm amazed. I wasn't aware that this little opposition of four members had that kind of ability to embarrass anybody. But I see on page 4 that somehow we can embarrass this great big government, with 75 members and a \$10 billion budget. They're simply quaking in their boots, worried about the next assault from a four-member opposition. I suggest that that is a little hard to swallow.

I want to move from those general comments on this little piece of literature to deal with what I think are some serious problems as far as labour management matters go in Alberta. Number one — the construction industry. Today my colleague and I met with various representatives from the construction industry. I was quite shocked, Mr. Minister, because I know that we have serious unemployment. We're all aware of that. But these representatives told us that by this summer, in certain areas they're going to have as many as 75 percent of their members out of work; 75 percent unemployment. That is a deadly situation. I don't hold the Minister of Labour personally responsible for unemployment on the part of people in the construction industry, but I do think that what we have seen is a lackluster approach by this entire government in terms of projects.

We can talk about that capital budget all we like, and we've heard it over and over again. Now is the time to bridge the investment gap the minister referred to in his little handout, with enough public capital to do some of the things we need to do — now, when we can get competitive bids and we can provide jobs.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

Mr. Chairman, we've argued this before; we argue it again. The issue doesn't mean that suddenly you pick out certain of these projects the government likes to talk about, such as Government House South or Mount Allan or some of these projects that are questionable and dubious. The fact of the matter is that the minister, the opposition members, or the government members sitting down could identify a large number of public projects, riding by riding, where there would be

no difference of opinion, no difference of opinion at all, and where there would be almost universal consensus on proceeding. With the current unemployment situation faced by construction workers and Albertans generally, I say let's get on with some of these projects.

I want to deal with Bill 110. Last fall, when we had our friendly little debate in the Legislature, the opposition, including the two Independent members, suggested it might be wise to wait and not ram this legislation through the fall session. It might be wise to wait until such time as we had the report of this blue ribbon committee that the minister indicated the government was going to set up. Of course the government was not prepared to accept that sort of proposal, and so we rammed the thing through anyway. Then we didn't proclaim it.

It's interesting, Mr. Chairman, as one looks at the minister's handout, that he has a long, rather confused version as to why Bill 110 wasn't proclaimed. I want to make it clear that I think Bill 110 was so bad that I for one am glad it wasn't proclaimed. But the fact of the matter is, why did we pass it in the first place? [interjection] Why did we spend all this time — one of the little members in the back is trying to say something. He will have a chance in a moment. Why did we ram the thing through the Legislature? Then we have this observation:

Because of the widespread misinterpretation of the Bill which led to confusion which, in turn, deflected attention from the real problems or provided a handy excuse to evade facing the real problems, it was decided not to proclaim the Bill.

I recall saying to the government last fall — and certainly other members in the opposition did — why proceed with it, for the very reasons the minister has cited. So, Mr. Chairman, tonight we'd better have some indication what this government is proposing with respect to repairing the damage caused by Bill 110.

I don't think there is any doubt, Mr. Minister, that the relationship that had been developed in past years — I have to give the government credit. In the past, I think they had developed a good working relationship, especially with the construction trades in this province. But why that relationship, that bond, was broken, especially when the government proceeded not to proclaim Bill 110 . . . While I am pleased that proclamation has not occurred, I really wonder at the exercise we went through in November of 1983.

I want to deal with the question of the ILO and the whole sad situation of having labour legislation which has been passed by this Legislature at least being appealed to the ILO. I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that I for one make it very clear, both here and in my own riding, that I believe the legislation we pass in this House should meet the tests of the highest International standards, whether that is the test of the Charter of Rights federally or of the International Labour Organization with respect to labour legislation. I don't think it's good enough for us to say: no, we're paddling our own little canoe here and, quite apart from the standards set internationally, we're going to do what we choose.

Mr. Chairman, I say that because after the debate on Bill 44 some years ago, I raised questions in this House. I think it was in 1977 or 1978; I forget the exact year. But I recall vividly the desk-thumping applause when the Premier said, it really didn't make much difference; this government was going to proceed in its area of jurisdiction notwithstanding the ILO. I think that's wrong.

I realize that in the minister's letter of March 29, the government has attempted to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, which is our labour legislation and its violation of the principles contained in the International Labour Organization.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that we are even forced into the situation where people in this country drag our legislation before the ILO, that we would even get into that kind of situation. Quite apart from what the final resolution of it may be, in my judgment it is an admission of this government's failure to develop, if you like, a co-operative, conciliatory attitude with working people.

I was equally surprised last year when we discovered that notwithstanding the Charter of Rights — it didn't make any difference what the ultimate judgment would be of the learned justices in terms of applying the Charter of Rights; it came as a result of a decision in Ontario — this government was prepared to pass "notwithstanding" legislation to take away rights which may be set out in the Charter of Rights.

Mr. Chairman, this kind of bull-in-a-china-shop approach to labour relations is wrong in principle because it leads to confrontation. It's wrong in principle because it's unfair. It's wrong in principle because it applies double standards. But in addition to being wrong in principle, what it is doing is creating in the province the feeling of animosity, of distrust, of lack of co-operation, which can only lead either you, Mr. Minister, or your successor to have to face a heck of a lot of headache in the years ahead, especially if there is any economic recovery.

Mr. Chairman, tonight I think we should talk about that ILO challenge. In his response, I'd like the minister to be quite detailed in responding to the challenge before the ILO, perhaps going over his letter of March 29 in some detail, because my colleague and I will have specific questions dealing with that response.

Mr. Chairman, there are several other areas I want to touch on. I mentioned when I began my remarks that I was pleased with the advertising campaign conducted by the Human Rights Commission. However, I suggest we're going to have to be on guard in this province, even more so; I think, because of the difficult times. I think racism is always ugly and continually has to be challenged by people of good will, but I would say that it is more dangerous and more threatening in a time of economic trouble than it is when times are good. When people see that their jobs are perhaps being threatened, especially by others that they perceive will work for less, there is a tendency to jump to the conclusion that it is because of race or creed or what have you. So I think we're going to be looking with some interest at the final report of the Ghitter commission.

I just simply say, Mr. Chairman, that while my colleague and I have been fairly quick to look at increases in budget, I suspect that proper funding of the Human Rights Commission is one area that should be protected. Perhaps as a result of — I don't want to prejudge recommendations from the Ghitter commission, but perhaps we may need to beef up that commission in the years ahead.

With those general observations, most of them very friendly, always co-operative, I just want to bring my remarks to a close by saying that ... [some applause]

MR. MARTIN: That's just a start, Rollie.

MR. NOTLEY: Yes. As a matter of fact the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry has just encouraged me to speak a little longer. However, maybe he will be educated in the process. That would certainly be desirable.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, I do want to say that this whole approach that we saw in labour legislation last spring and last fall, an approach which limits free collective bargaining and which imposes compulsory arbitration, in our judgment is a dangerous course to take. It may be politically fashionable to take it: the government may be able to get away with it. The

hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry can put out a little survey and get the majority of people saying, sure, take away the right to strike.

The fact of the matter is that some of these rights are not always popular to defend, but they are rights that should be defended because they should exist, not because they may be the most popular rights in the world. I'm sure many of the things the Ghitter commission is going to deal with and many of the things the Human Rights Commission has to handle are not popular causes. You don't need civil rights legislation or human rights legislation to protect either people who are strong or causes that are popular, because those people or those causes will flourish if they have popular support. The strength of popular opinion will be their best defence. But you need legislation to protect those people who aren't so strong and those causes which may have just as much right to exist and that aren't as popular.

So when we look at rights, and one of those rights is the right of free collective bargaining, I simply say that, in my judgment anyway, any effort to qualify that must only be done under the most careful circumstances: clearly drawn rules, not the kind of wide, sweeping legislation which takes away the right of people to withdraw their services and then places them in what? A substitute form of compulsory arbitration where — where what, Mr. Chairman? Where the arbitrators have to follow a set of guidelines, and one of those guidelines is fiscal policy as determined by the Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the difference is between the kind of situation we have in a completely undemocratic society — talk about Solidarity in Poland, where people don't have rights. They don't, and they should have rights. But how can we justify legislation passed by this Assembly which takes away the rights of people to withdraw their labour and then imposes on them a system of arbitrary — and I say "arbitrary" deliberately — compulsory arbitration that has to include the policy of the government, as determined by the government, as one of the guides in making an award?

It's one thing to have compulsory arbitration. When I talk to some of my farmers who don't like strikes and they say, have a third party handle it, they mean a third party that is able to look at the pluses and minuses and say, this is what the award should be. They don't mean a third party where the rules have been so written that they have to take into account the position of the government as a major factor. The fiscal policy of the government is determined by the Provincial Treasurer. Small wonder that we have — you know, it takes a lot to unite the unions. I suspect you would even get the CLC and the Canadian Federation of Labour working together on this one. Small wonder that you have these people appealing legislation of this ilk to the International Labour Organization.

I have read over the minister's response, and I don't think he's effectively responding to any of the concerns. I say to members of the committee that this is the opportunity for members on both sides of the House. Before we find ourselves caught with more legislation of this nature or with an unfavourable ruling by a respected international organization, maybe it's time for us to pause for thought, and maybe it's time for us to look at the repeal of legislation which is clearly offensive and doesn't contribute to industrial and labour peace in this province.

Mr. Chairman, those are some opening observations. I look forward to the specific questions which, over the next several days, my colleague and I will be able to pose to the minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vote 1, departmental support services ...

MR. MARTIN: No, no. I was just waiting. I thought the Member for Cardston was going to leap into the fray and talk about

labour, because I understand it's quite a burning issue in Cardston these days.

MR. YOUNG: I wish [inaudible].

MR. MARTIN: I even got the Minister of Labour talking. We'll give him a chance again.

I have a few comments and a number of questions at some point. I think we have to review. I'm not going to go over exactly the same issues. It's rather calm this session by comparison since I've been here, in terms of this Minister of Labour and the legislation he brought in. Bill 41 is long in history but still grates on a number of people, as the minister is well aware. But I was unfortunate enough to have to watch the debate on Bill 44 and of course last fall, when the construction unions thought they were friends of the government, to watch Bill 110 come in. As I said at the time to the minister, maybe he was attempting to become the minister of unorganized workers, by some of these Bills. But I think the minister has something to his credit. He seems to be uniting the labour movement in Alberta and perhaps, over and above it, making it strong.

Frankly it dismays me very much when I look at some of the Bills. I don't see the necessity. I know the minister and I argued in the election. We met before in debates on television about Bill 41 and about the ILO interpretation. But there are certainly parts of it — I am sure the minister would admit that Bill 41 said clearly that you had to lay out the essential services. The government said they could take essential services, but they would have to clarify them. But you shouldn't have a blanket right not to strike.

When I look through the new Bill 44, which went even further, where we are sending our responses through the federal government to the ILO, I say through the chairman to you, Mr. Minister, I don't think we really expect to win that. But what is more dismaying to me is the attitude of the government, that they don't give a hoot one way or the other what the ILO says. I remind the minister that when we agreed to go to the ILO and sign that charter of the things we believed in, all provincial governments signed it. Now, because it doesn't suit our particular way and we seem to be in this sort of right-wing labour-bashing mood, we basically don't care what the ILO says. To me, that is really quite wrong.

Maybe I'm misjudging the minister. If I go by the attitude that I heard when we asked certain questions here — maybe it wasn't the minister's attitude, Mr. Chairman, but it seemed to be: well, who cares, that's the United Nations; they only deal with human rights around the world; who cares about it? But I guess I would say to the minister — I doubt if it will come up until the fall. Maybe the minister can fill me in, but I don't think this will be debated at the ILO until the fall. But if — and this is a question I would come back to — at least parts of Bill 44 are ruled by the ILO to be against the ILO code, if you like, will the government move to change some of those laws? Or are we going to say, well, we in Alberta are a little fortress; what the rest of the world says doesn't matter at all? I think it's a bad Act. That wouldn't come as a surprise to the minister; we've certainly had that debate before. If the ILO rules against certain sections of it, my question to the minister is, is that going to have any weight with this government, or are we just going to say, well, it doesn't matter at all? That's the question I would ask the minister.

The Member for Edmonton Glengarry looks a little exercised tonight. Maybe he didn't get his afternoon nap; I'm not sure. But just settle down, and we'll get you out of here early enough for your nap.

The point I'd come to is in the construction industry a little more, because it's more recent. My colleague has talked about Bill 110, Mr. Chairman. But I think we have to take a serious look at what is happening in the construction industry. The minister has said that he cares and that he actually wants a strong union movement — maybe those aren't his exact words, but it's the impression that he leaves in some of the speeches I've heard in the House — that he's not against the union movement and he certainly wasn't against the construction unions. That was the impression he left. I expect the reason that Bill 110 has not been proclaimed is that in fact we do not need Bill 110 now, because the spin-offs are going on, as the minister well knows. Most of the major — the big six construction companies all have spin-off companies, so in fact Bill 110 is being accomplished. It seems that the Labour Relations Board has basically turned a blind eye to spin-offs through section 133. So we in fact have spin-offs now. I gather that's probably one of the reasons we didn't get into Bill 110, because that has in fact been accomplished.

The minister may say that's not true, but the people we've talked to — as my colleague said, we had a meeting with the building trades today. If you sit down and talk to them, this is what is happening in their industry. They know their industry, Mr. Minister. They know what's happening. They know it well. This is what we're told. The sad part about it is that I think it's very shortsighted to allow spin-off companies, because the trade union movement here — and I think the minister and I would agree that we had some of the most skilled tradesmen in the world right here in this province. One of the reasons was that the labour movement itself was involved in upgrading their members. I don't know if the minister has gone through the electrical workers, where they take their people in and have courses and all the rest of it.

What they are saying — and I think it is the point we're trying to make, and it's happening — is that it's all right to say that those people were too well paid, they were making too much, and all the rest of it, but there's a certain point where they are losing purchasing power. I am told by people that there now are boilermakers working in this area at \$7 an hour. I know that's probably exceptional and probably an extreme, but I also know that those wages have come down significantly. People can argue, I suppose philosophically, that they should come down. This government was not saying that, though. In the good times, when they needed those construction people, those tradespeople, they were not saying that. The sky was the limit, because we needed them to get on with those massive projects.

It's rather shortsighted by companies — and I agree it's not all the minister's fault — to allow these spin-offs and think we can keep lowering and lowering wages. But we are going to pay the cost for that eventually. We're going to pay the cost in terms of shoddy workmanship, because how many people are going to get trained as tradespeople and spend the amount of time to become expert tradespeople when they're getting wages such that they can get more by just walking into any other job? They're just not going to do it, so ultimately we're going to pay the price.

This is where I think the minister's responsibility comes in. We have a very serious problem in this province. My colleague has talked about unemployment. I know that in the construction area it ranges from as low as 30 percent to as high as 80 percent in some of the trades. They really feel the pressure. When people get that desperate, sure, they're going to work for a lot less. But I'll tell you that a lot of them are going to leave the field too, and we won't pick them up. One of the things this government did right was that they did have, in the '70s, the

best tradespeople in Canada, and I would compare them with anywhere in the world. We had very qualified people, and we're going to lose that. It's not good enough just to say we have to bring the wages down. There's a lack of purchasing power, and we've talked about this.

To most unions, free collective bargaining always reflects the economic climate of the day. The unions are not bogeymen. They recognize very clearly that we're in a recession, but they're not prepared to go out and lose \$8 or \$9 an hour. None of us would be. We were all patting ourselves on the back here when we froze our wages, and were saying, aren't we as legislators wonderful because we froze our wages — along, I might point out, with some other perks that we have had since then.

That's all the trade union was asking. At best, they would say, we'll freeze our wages. There wasn't one union I've talked to that wanted an increase in the construction area. They were quite prepared to freeze their wages and set the example we were supposed to have set here in freezing our wages. But in some cases they are being asked to take half off their purchasing power. I don't care who that is, Mr. Chairman, they're just not going to be able to do that. It's not that simple. As a result, because the Labour Relations Board is interpreting rather loosely, I believe, the spin-off companies that Bill 110 would have legitimized, it is happening anyhow. That's what is dragging that down. I'm saying we will pay the price, especially if this economy ever rebounds. Maybe this government is so sure that because of their policies it will never rebound that they're not worried about it. The fact is that we will pay the price later. At some point there will not be those skilled tradespeople around.

I saw the minister shaking his head. So one of the questions I'd like to ask in terms of Bill 110 — I don't think we need it now, because the spin-offs are already there. But if we're not going to proclaim it, what are we going to do with it? Just sit there as a sort of hammer over the heads of people, or are we going to repeal it? Is it part of government strategy in the next little while to repeal 110?

I've talked briefly about the Labour Relations Board. I know the minister and I had an exchange in question period about the Labour Relations Board, and the minister said there are no real problems. We'll be finding out more about it, and I'm sure the minister will. I think there are going to be more complaints there, and I think the minister is aware of this. Certainly he knows about the one example I quoted. The minister said, well, it just happened one time. How do we know that? That was a very serious breach, because we're dealing with a quasi-judicial body. They're sitting around discussing a case and have a preconceived notion how the case is going to go. If that had been in a court of law, the minister is well aware of what would have happened. To me, they may have had their hands slapped by somebody; we don't even know if that was the case. It was a very serious breach. If that's happening — and there are other examples of people who are complaining about the board.

I don't think what the mine workers were asking for was unreasonable. I always wonder why this government and this minister wouldn't reflect — they can't be involved in everything. Why are they so reluctant to check it out in a public inquiry? If people do not have faith in that board, Mr. Minister, then the system is not going to work very well. It seems to me, talking to many people and certainly talking to the mine workers, that they don't have. This breach that we know about was an extremely serious breach, and I don't think it's good enough just to shovel it under and say, well, that was just an isolated case. Who knows? That's one we know about, anyhow.

The other area I would like to go into is more of a question. I'm told, and maybe the minister can clarify it — I expect this

falls in the minister's area — that section 24 in the Employment Standards Act has been interpreted to mean that time off by provincial employees in place of overtime pay will be equal to the number of overtime hours worked. For example, if an employee works two hours overtime, he or she gets two hours off in place of pay. Yet if he or she got paid for two hours overtime, he or she would be paid time and a half, which is equivalent to three hours. It's my understanding that there is a difference between the provincial government and the federal government interpretation, and that if it were two hours overtime, the federal government would give them three hours off in lieu, but the provincial government interprets it two to two. I would just check that. I'm asking the minister if this is true, and if it is true, I would ask the minister why this is the case. It seems to me that that probably is not a fair interpretation.

There are a number of other areas that I think are probably better off in terms of questions — individually when we get into the votes, but a general question in human rights. My colleague talked about the Human Rights Commission and, as I think AADAC has some excellent advertising on television, I too am impressed by the advertising being done there. The question I have — it's been somewhat in the news — is the whole Individual's Rights Protection Act. It seems that pregnant women do not have protection there. I guess it has to do with the Court of Queen's Bench ruling, but this is something that could be changed. I wonder if the minister at this point is looking into any legislation that might give protection to pregnant women, in view of the controversy that has been created recently.

With those general comments, Mr. Chairman, I would just say again to the minister that over the long haul — when I talk to businessmen, at least the businessmen we talked to today, they're not afraid of labour, and they say they can compete with unionized labour. They said to me today that they usually get better work done by unionized labour and there's some stability there. I know this is not necessarily the opinion of a lot of people. Mind you, these are some of the businessmen that are still involved in doing well in this industry, better than other ones. I'm of course talking about the West Edmonton Mall people; they're not afraid of unionized labour. The point I'm making, though, is that over the long haul — I'll just come back to it, Mr. Minister, and say to you that Bills like Bills 41, 44, and 110 have the potential ... If you recall, Mr. Chairman, when we debated Bill 44 or 110. I didn't say it would happen overnight, but I said the potential is there for a lot of friction that none of us wants in the future.

I know the government went ahead, but I think there are things they can do; there's an out. They didn't proclaim Bill 110. All right, if they don't want 110, take it away and let's see if we can deal with the spin-off problem through the relations board, because I think they'd be doing a favour. And if Bill 44 — I know they're not going to change that. But again I say seriously to the minister that if the ILO takes a serious look — and I guess I won't have any talking point if they come back in the government's favour; I'd be very surprised and I think the minister would, if they did. But if they come back with certain parts of it, I think it would make this minister and the government look good if they took that into consideration rather than just saying, it's ILO; it's not important. I'm not saying this minister would say that, but that's some of the attitude I heard from other members in this House. I think that's a wrong attitude, and I hope the Minister of Labour recognizes that that is not a proper attitude.

With those few comments to begin, with a number of other questions. I'll leave it for the minister's response.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, quite a variety of issues have been touched upon, and perhaps I should deal first with the

question of my propensity to leave notes around. Tomorrow morning I will arrange to have delivered to the hon. member's office the speech I delivered today to the Canadian Federation of Labour, which was put on the desk of Mr. Liepert for public release at noon today. I'll also deliver to him an April 18 speech delivered to the construction owners, which is essentially, but in somewhat more polished form, the brown paper bag notes that he's received, although they were circulated in first-class envelopes to all kinds of people across the province as well as distributed widely at meetings.

MR. NOTLEY: I thought it was a second-class speech.

MR. HYNDMAN: It was a very good speech; you should read it.

MR. YOUNG: But I think it would be helpful to the hon. member if he had the speeches in their full, flowing terms. It might be easier for him to understand.

MR. MARTIN: The Thoughts of Les.

MR. HYNDMAN: They might learn something.

MR. NOTLEY: [inaudible] the Blues tomorrow.

MR. YOUNG: I also would like to remind the hon. member that I say essentially the same themes whether I'm speaking with unions, construction owners, contractors, or anybody else, because I think there is only one approach to take to a matter of very high public interest. I don't want to be found to be going around and saying one thing to union members and another thing to employers, even if that is the suggestion the hon. member seems to have made.

MR. NOTLEY: No one said that, Les.

MR. YOUNG: Well, you should check the Blues tomorrow, hon. leader, and see what in fact was said.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a wide variety of other comments made, and perhaps I should deal first with unionization. I'll use that as a jumping-off point. Perhaps I can be most concise if I read this paragraph from my speech. In Alberta, approximately 29 percent of nonagricultural employees are represented by unions. The vast majority of employees in the province, approximately 71 percent, rely on a direct employer/employee relationship. Overall, approximately 16 percent of employees in the private sector belong to unions. Half of these employees are employed in the construction trades. In contrast, the public sector employs approximately 170,000 employees, 79 percent of whom belong to unions. Hon. members, I think 79 percent is a figure roughly consistent across Canada for the degree of unionization in public-sector employment.

I have made several speeches in which I have indicated that collective bargaining in the public sector is very much at a crossroads and that we in Alberta have chosen the route of trying to maintain decision-making in public-sector wages and benefits on a decentralized basis, so that the two parties directly involved should be the ones to make the decision. It is their responsibility in the first instance. However, I also have indicated that in many provinces that is not so. In fact, one of the reasons public-sector bargaining is at a crossroads is that if one examines the last eight years of collective bargaining, one will find that in four of those years in Ontario, Quebec, the federal public service, British Columbia — at least those provinces — the wage rates have been legislated. I say to you, as I've said

to others, that if people think a collective bargaining system is working effectively and remark that in half the duration of the last eight years it has been legislated settlements, and can then argue that public-sector bargaining is in good order, I think they should examine the arguments they're making.

I referred to a *Reader's Digest* article. I don't agree completely with it, but it was brought to my attention because it does provide some kind of insight in layman's terms to challenges of public-sector bargaining. I think it's for the month of November 1983; the hon. leader might have his research staff find it.

MR. NOTLEY: I could read it on the plane, Les.

MR. YOUNG: You could read it doing all kinds of things, hon. leader. It's easy to understand.

But my point is that the notes he's reading from refer broadly to what I see as a major challenge to public-sector bargaining across Canada. I don't want the hon. leader to get a swelled head over the notion that this government is concerned about the opposition. I simply wanted to generally express concerns that were attributed as general concerns to the public. He can find those in the *Reader's Digest* article if he wishes to look there.

The final observation I make on public-sector bargaining, having said that it is unionized — in Alberta the public sector would be five times the proportion of unionization that there is in the private sector, and a much higher proportion of unionization elsewhere in Canada than is so in the private sector, and the fact that in the public sector we've had legislative wage rates for four out of eight years; in British Columbia they have a capacity for a wage stabilization review situation which can roll back any settlement if it is excessive by the terms of their mandate — is that public-sector bargaining as it is generally thought of is nonexistent. It is a major and very important question.

If the hon. member wants further evidence, he can read the notes of the speech of the Hon. Marc Lalonde, to whom I listened today, or he can read Mr. Lalonde's budget speech notes, which will indicate that while Mr. Lalonde said the federal government is moving away from the six and five program and allowing free collective bargaining to work in the public sector, he also said "but". It's a major "but" and one of the clearest "buts" I have seen as to the concern of the federal government about where public-sector bargaining is going. It is a serious concern, and it's one which can be redressed by attitudinal changes, by understanding — several different ways. But I believe that public-sector bargaining is at the crossroads. In Alberta, we didn't go the legislated route in terms of the exact wage rate. We have gone a different route. We will determine how effective it is, in the time to come.

Mr. Chairman, there is so much that can be said about the hon. member's allusion to supply-side economics. But to suggest, as he has done, that the cost of any given factor to the end product is irrelevant is clearly nonsensical. That's really what he's saying when said that wages don't matter; they aren't going to affect our competitive position. I can tell you, hon. leader, that if you have had the opportunity to chat with the sheet metal workers, you've found that the reason they rolled back their wages last fall was because of sheet metal workers in Quebec working at lower rates. Their employers were laying product into Alberta at costs which could not be met in Alberta, and they simply were not going to have jobs unless they rolled back the wages. They proceeded to do it for that reason, and they were quite specific.

On the question of productivity, because it is fresh in my mind, having addressed the matter this morning before the Canadian Federation of Labour, at which time I also complimented them for their policy of political nonalignment . . .

MR. MARTIN: But they said the NDP was the best, Les.

MR. YOUNG: I think I have the comments of the speech of the president of the Canadian Federation of Labour. If I do, perhaps I can get them duplicated and provide them to the hon. member so you know exactly what was said.

MR. MARTIN: He said both the old-line parties were . . . [inaudible].

MR. YOUNG: Before the hon. member starts attributing comments, I think he should read the exact speech Mr. McCambly made.

MR. NOTLEY: Have you read it?

MR. YOUNG: I've read a portion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the remarks could be addressed through the Chair.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, on the question of productivity and the great recovery we've made, if I may I will make a brief quote from Peter Cornell, who is the senior economist with the Economic Council of Canada. He summarized his view of productivity in Canada this way:

Canada's productivity performance in recent years has been dismal. No matter how it's measured. It has been one of the worst, if not the worst, of all the major industrial countries. The deterioration has been apparent across a wide range of Canadian industries. If we don't do something about it this country faces very slow, even zero, growth in real incomes and living standards and far more severe choices among competing claims for our always limited resources — the claims of consumers, of investment, of programs for health, education and various forms of social assistance. That is what productivity improvement is really all about — increasing real incomes and living standards.

That's from Peter Cornell, chief economist with the Economic Council of Canada.

The only reason that Canada's productivity has gone up in the last short statistical time frame is because we have had so much underutilization of capacity that we were bound to get a blip in the productivity curve. The problem is that we had negative productivity before this started. We have got to have a blip just to get up to zero productivity.

MR. NOTLEY: [Inaudible] the capital part of that equation.

MR. YOUNG: Pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again I remind hon. members to pass their remarks through the Chair, please.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, we can get into an extensive economic debate and I'm quite prepared to do it, having done it frequently. But I don't think we should do it this evening, unless the hon. leader wishes.

There are some comments, though, that I should make. With respect to the unemployment rates of 75 percent and 80

percent that have been quoted, I think it's fair to say that that is the unemployment rate as given concerning the number of people in the hiring hall of certain unions. I have no reason to question those rates. I have been given very high unemployment rates in the hiring halls. However, let's not confuse hiring hall with the unemployment rate for persons in a given occupation. What is happening is that many union members are putting their card in their shoe, going to work non-union, and leaving their name on the list in the hiring hall, because if they can find work under the hiring hall direction, in many instances they get a much higher salary for it. I think that's an intelligent action for them to take, if they hope they can get a job in that manner. But let's not confuse the real unemployment statistic for employees or potential employees in a particular occupation with the employment rate as reported out of a union hiring hall. They are two very different things. That's not to say that we shouldn't be concerned about unemployment. Indeed we should be concerned about unemployment. My colleague the Hon. Ernie Isley has reported, on quite a number of different occasions, the number and types of initiatives this government has undertaken.

With respect to Bill 110 and what the government proposes to do with it, I have indicated — and I might say I gave a very firm commitment in front of over 300 plumbers and pipefitters in Calgary, on the occasion the hon. leader speaks of — that the government would propose to leave the Bill as it now is until we see the report from the advisory committee. It is probable that no action would then occur either, because my anticipation is that the advisory committee will suggest a major discussion review of labour relations legislation for the construction industry prior to any legislative action. If they suggest that, unless there are developments, which I frankly don't foresee, I would be quite willing to accept that approach. In the meantime the legislation would stay as it is.

With respect to the International Labour Organization, Bill 44, my correspondence in response to certain allegations, I'd be quite happy to entertain specific questions. But we've been through all that debate before, and I see no point in getting into it unless there are specifics which deserve to be addressed. I remind all hon. members, however, that the United States of America is not a member of the International Labour Organization in the sense of having signed those conventions, so they are not bound by those conventions in any respect. I presume we will give due consideration to whatever answer or decision is taken by the International Labour Organization. I have no idea when they will have some idea. I believe it will be next fall, but I can't be sure when the International Labour Organization will consider the complaints that have been lodged before it.

With respect to spin-off in section 133, the Labour Relations Board, and the allegation that there is some form of union busting, I would advise all hon. members that to the end of the first quarter of 1984 — in fact even longer than that — of all the cases brought before the Labour Relations Board during that time frame, only two related to spin-offs. I believe that is a lower percentage than normal. So I think it's fair to say that since unions can bring those matters before the board if they wish, both parties recognize that's not a useful way to go, nor is it a solution to their particular problems. That's why it isn't happening.

In connection with the comment or question raised about the Employment Standards Act, I would have to have section 24 before me to be certain of what the hon. member is referring to. I don't have that statute before me, but my understanding is that an employer and employees can make an agreement that should overtime be worked in, for instance, this particular



week, they can arrange to take overtime off in a subsequent time frame within some parameters, which have to be established. There has to be an agreement to that effect, and in fact the hours worked which could have qualified for overtime pay rates are in fact taken off in the same number of hours as were worked overtime. While the federal government may administer theirs differently, that's up to the federal government. But in Alberta, if such an arrangement is worked out, that is the system that applies, to the best of my information based on my knowledge of the background to the question the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood has raised.

Mr. Chairman, there was a question relative to advertising by the Alberta Human Rights Commission. I want to indicate that I agree with the observations made about the advertising or promotional program relative to tolerance and understanding. As a matter of fact, I think it was more effective than we had dared hope it could be. There is a question as to whether repetitions of those programs could have the same effect and whether there is some threshold beyond which there may be a reaction of a different type. It's fair to say that not everybody agreed with that advertising. Some additional people, while they agreed with the advertising in the substantive sense, raised questions about the use of public funds of a magnitude to do that form of advertising. So given those two sensitivities of which I am aware, I think one would have to be cautious about whether a renewal of that kind of advertising would be that much more productive than — at least a renewal for some considerable length of time. That's a judgment call, and before any such considerations were undertaken I, and I'm sure the commission, would want to review it with some experts.

With respect to pregnancy and the individual's Rights Protection Act, about which I think the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood inquired, it was originally thought — and the commission did handle a number of cases dealing with pregnancy, on the assumption that the characteristic of sex included pregnancy. The courts made a different interpretation, and the court's ruling became the law. The commission had to terminate the handling of those particular complaints. It's interesting that this was done about six months ago, elicited no comment until some few weeks back, and then somebody got excited about it. It is a concern on which I have asked the commission to reflect to me its views so that, probably over the summer period, although I hold out no commitments — perhaps in time for fall consideration — that might be one of the items which could come before the Legislature, depending upon what decisions are made. But relative to the Individual's Rights Protection Act, I think we also have to examine some implications of the Charter of Rights coming into force in February, I believe — I've forgotten the date — and what implications that Charter may have for changes. We would want to try to put that all together in one package. At least that would be the preferred way of going.

Mr. Chairman, I think I've touched on a good number of the questions. I'll try to refrain from commenting further upon central planning, supply-side and demand-side economics, and things of that nature, which are really an exciting topic for debate.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, surely we'll leave economics alone, because I wouldn't want to argue with the minister when he gets his economic theories from the *Reader's Digest*. It'd be pretty tough slogging to debate that.

The point, though, coming back to the unemployment in the construction industry, the minister alluded to the fact that we're just looking at hiring halls and the fact that a person could — I expect what the minister is saying has happened in

the odd case, where they have their name in the hiring hall and are working in a non-union company. I'm not saying that doesn't happen, but I don't think that's the norm. If they're doing that, of course, they're breaking the law if they're collecting unemployment insurance.

If we look through the unemployment insurance figures, there are some rather interesting figures. June through November is usually the peak season, Mr. Chairman. From 1980 to 1982, the July unemployment in construction was 6.2 percent. July 1983, its unemployment rate was 20 percent. The number of union construction workers on unemployment insurance in July 1983 was more than double that of July 1982. When we look at specifics — because the minister is aware it varies depending on the trade. I mentioned that some go from 30 to 80. The number of boilermakers on unemployment insurance has increased tenfold — those are people that can't fall into the category the minister was talking about — plumbers, sixfold; ironworkers, fivefold. We're told that the unemployment rate in the construction unions now is somewhere around 60 percent.

The other area I would like to talk to the minister about is in terms of section 133. The minister indicated that there were only — I'm just trying to get the minister's eye; it's rather a penetrating question, Mr. Attorney General, and he wants to be right on his toes. I believe you said there had been only two applications by unions through section 133 in the Labour Relations Board. I believe that's what the minister said.

MR. YOUNG: In the first quarter of 1984.

MR. MARTIN: Right. I throw this out to the minister. As he well knows, we talk to a number of construction unions, as he does. They have said to me very clearly, Mr. Chairman, that after looking at those two, they thought there was no point in appealing it. They thought the system was rigged against them. That's a perception, whether that's true or not. If that is the perception, then we have a serious problem. If the minister is saying to me — and I will certainly relay this, and I hope the minister will — that with all the new spin-off companies coming out, if the unions were to appeal this more often he thinks they'd win, I'm sure that would be interesting news to them. But their perception is that it is hopeless, and that's why they haven't bothered. It takes time, money, and effort. I'm sure the minister is aware of it. They think the system is meant to allow spin-off industries. If that's not the case, then I hope the minister will talk to them about it.

The other area I want to talk about again is the Employment Standards Act. As I understand it, if you are paid overtime or have to work overtime you are supposed to be paid time and a half. Is the minister saying that if you take time off, you do not get time and a half, that the provincial government's interpretation is that if you take time in lieu of money, but you're working overtime, you should not get time and a half; you should get equal time? I want to know if that is the interpretation of the provincial government.

If that's the case, Mr. Chairman, I think that's wrong. By the nature of saying overtime, that's what is meant. For many years in modern labour relations, we've recognized that time and a half means time and a half for overtime. If you decide you want to take time off in lieu, but you're asked to work overtime, it seems to me, being consistent — if you're going to do it for money, you get time and a half. If you're going to do it for days, it seems to me the same principle should follow, that it should be time and a half.

Maybe I misinterpreted what the minister is saying. That's what I'm asking. If it's not the case, that we're just trading

time, then I say that's wrong. If it is overtime, people are asked to work overtime and are doing it in terms of days off rather than money, the same principle should follow. If that's the case, I guess I'd ask the minister if he would look into that. Or does he not believe that people who work overtime should get time and a half, whether it's days or money? It seems to me it's the same principle.

Just to follow up with those three general comments, Mr. Chairman, I await the answers of the Minister of Labour.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, the minister will undoubtedly have the opportunity to respond in due course. In light of the hour and the perceived need on the part of hon. members to celebrate a little bit tonight — when I mention that, I should say it's not in regard to any of the speeches but in respect to the Oilers' victory.

MR. MARTIN: I thought you were congratulating us.

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

For the Department of Housing: \$1,728,000 for departmental support services, \$90,096,000 for policy development and financial assistance for housing, \$65,117,603 for the Alberta heritage fund mortgage interest reduction program. \$119,275,000 for housing for Albertans. \$100,320,000 for mortgage assistance.

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

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Assembly will be in Committee of Supply once again, in the estimates of the Department of Labour, and if there's time, would continue with the Department of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the Assembly now adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 10:18 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]