

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: Wednesday, May 23, 1984 2:30 p.m.

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, permit me to rise on a matter of personal privilege.

The hon. Dr. Joseph Donovan Ross, a longtime member of this Legislature and a distinguished physician and surgeon, passed away Tuesday, after a lengthy illness, in his home near Fallis. He was 73 years of age.

Dr. Ross was born in Waldo, British Columbia, on March 13, 1911. He moved to Edmonton in 1926 and obtained his Bachelor of Arts and medical degrees from the University of Alberta. A general practitioner from 1938 to 1941, Dr. Ross served in the Royal Canadian Navy for four and a half years as principal medical officer, retiring with the rank of surgeon commander.

A charter member of the College of General Practice, Dr. Ross was first elected Member of the Legislative Assembly for Strathcona constituency in August 1952 and was re-elected in 1955, 1959, 1963, and 1967. He was appointed Minister of Health in September 1957 and served as minister until May 1969. During his term as Minister of Health, Dr. Ross initiated the Alberta health plan. Mr. Speaker, this program was an innovative development designed to ensure that low-income Albertans would benefit from the medical coverage provided through MSI.

Dr. Ross was recognized for his assistance in the development of the division of alcoholism, and for several years was president of the organization. In 1967 he was named honorary fellow of the American College of Hospital Administrators. In May 1969, Dr. Ross was appointed Minister of Lands and Forests.

Dr. Ross was instrumental in bringing about the reappointment of the medical board at the Stony Plain Municipal hospital. Following the dissolution of the board, the doctor was appointed external medical chief of staff in 1981. His services over the next two years saw the hospital back on its feet once again.

In paying our respects to Dr. Ross, I would like to quote the former premier, Ernest Manning.

He was a great humanitarian. The community will bear a great loss with his passing. He was the old-style country doctor, always friendly to everybody and willing to work all the time.

Mr. Speaker, in the presence of the immediate family of Dr. Ross, seated in your gallery this afternoon, permit me to add a few personal observations. My first encounter of memory with Dr. Ross was behind a white sheet in a polling booth. His name was on the ballot I was about to mark. Our families lived in the same block in old Strathcona. Years later, during the 1971 election campaign, I faced a worthy and formidable opponent. As a newcomer to politics, I was pictured as little David going to battle against Dr. Ross, pictured as Goliath. Mr. Speaker, during that campaign and subsequently, I indeed admired Dr. Ross as a Goliath. He was not a large man in build, but a giant of a man in stature and in spirit. He was

principled with strong convictions. By his actions in this very House, he showed the courage of those convictions.

Mr. Speaker, the thoughts of all members of this House go out today to the family and friends of Dr. J. Donovan Ross, an outstanding Albertan and a great parliamentarian.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I rise to offer my condolences to the family and to pay tribute to the memory of the late Dr. Donovan Ross.

Although I did not have the opportunity of sitting in the House with Dr. Ross, as a person who observed the political process, naturally one could not help but be impressed by this man's grasp of the issues and his obvious sincere commitment to public service. However, I did have an opportunity to get to know Dr. Ross at least a little bit in 1972, when he undertook yet another political adventure — and I say "adventure" in the highest sense. He sought election to Parliament.

Too often, Mr. Speaker, we think of people only in terms of their successful pursuits, rather than their commitment to the ideas they consider important. Dr. Ross was a man who had very strong views about monetary and economic reform. Those views led him to seek elected office in 1972. While he wasn't successful in the Peace River country in that campaign, I think those of us who campaigned against him can share with the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs our respect for a man who in every possible way was a worthy opponent, understood what he believed, and was passionately committed to what he believed. Albertans as a whole are in his debt, and we all have lost at least something with the passing of a very good person.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague and a former cabinet colleague, the hon. Member for Little Bow, I'd like to say to the family that we too offer our condolences.

I think I could sum up J.D. Ross by saying that he was crusty and feisty. The story I'd like to tell exemplifies that he was a doer; he got things done. In our area we were having a little difference of opinion as to where a senior citizens' home should go. Should it go in Andrew, Lamont, or Mundare? This thing had been kicked around for many months, and eventually many years. Finally I said to J.D.: when are you going to get that senior citizens' home into Lamont? He said: isn't it done yet? I said: no, they're still fighting about whether it should be Mundare, Lamont, or Andrew. He said: you know bloody well it should be in Lamont; let's get it built. And that's the way he did things, Mr. Speaker. He was a doer, and he was one of the nicest, hardest working gentlemen this Legislature has ever had.

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

MR. STILES: Mr. Speaker, the Private Bills Committee has had under consideration the following Bills and recommends to the Assembly that they be proceeded with: Bill Pr. 3, the Foothills Christian College Act; Bill Pr. 6, the Concordia Lutheran Seminary Act; and Bill Pr. 12, the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties Amendment Act, 1984. The Private Bills Committee has also had under consideration the following Bill and recommends to the Assembly that it be proceeded with, with certain amendments: Bill Pr. 4, the Dino Alberto Knott Adoption Termination Act. I request the concurrence of the Assembly in this recommendation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have heard the recommendation by the hon. member. Is it agreed that the recommendation be accepted?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

Bill 20

Universities Amendment Act, 1984

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 20, the Universities Amendment Act, 1984.

The purpose of this Bill is to deal with the powers given to the Universities Co-ordinating Council by the Universities Act. This legislation essentially extends the powers given to the Universities Co-ordinating Council by amendments to other professional legislation passed by this House.

[Leave granted: Bill 20 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the 1983 annual report of the Environment Council of Alberta.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file with the library the financial statement of the Legal Aid Society of Alberta for the year ended March 31, 1984.

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file with the Legislature Library a report of the chairman of the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices for the period March 10, 1983, to March 2, 1984.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. ALGER: Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure this afternoon in presenting to you, and through you to Members of the Legislative Assembly, three very important, distinguished, and dedicated people from the Highwood constituency. The High River General and the auxiliary hospital and nursing home is in a fairly central location in our constituency and serves a vast number of people in a most hygienic manner. I'm proud to introduce the executive director, in the person of Lorence Myggland, the chairman of the board, Gwen Miller, and past chairman of the board and longtime servant of the board, Wilson Sutherland. They are now standing in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the Assembly to give them a hearty welcome.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Member for Taber-Warner, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and to the Assembly 49 grades 5 and 6 students from St. Josephs school in Coaldale. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Allen Sorge and Mr. Phil Peard, and by parents Mrs. Sheila Heck and Mrs. Betty Hogg. Their bus driver is Mr. Abe Enz. They're in the members gallery, and I ask that they rise and receive the traditional welcome of the House.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege today to introduce a class of 15 young Albertans from the Reed Ranch school in the constituency of Three Hills. These young Albertans are in grades 7 and 8, and they attend a school that is truly rural in nature. It's out in the middle of the constituency, surrounded by good farmland, and I think most of them reside with families right around the location of the school. There are

not very many of these country schools left in Alberta, and this form of school has certainly been thriving for a long time.

The special thing about these students is that they're attending various places in Edmonton for several days and raised most of the money to make this trip themselves, by roadside cleanup and other activities. They're accompanied today by their principal Gary Woodruff and by parents Joan Engman and Audrey Imbery. Hopefully Anita Abra, who is their bus driver, has arrived; Anita is up there. I ask them all to rise now and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 48 energetic grade 6 students from Ponoka elementary. They are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Colleen Schayes and Mrs. Marilyn Watson. They are the second group to come in from Ponoka elementary. They visited the Art Gallery this morning, and they are going on to a few other stops of interest this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, they are seated in the public gallery, and I ask them to stand and receive the traditional welcome of the House.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, it's an honour for me to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 27 bright, energetic, lively, and happy students attending the Edmonton Christian Academy, situated in the constituency of Edmonton Kingsway. They are accompanied by their teachers Miss Kathy Foster and Mr. Jim Riske, their principal Mr. Henry Hiebert, and parent Mr. Lloyd Cope. They are also accompanied by board member and former Member of Parliament for Edmonton East, Mr. Orvis Kennedy. They are seated in the public gallery. I ask them to please rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and to other members the mother and sister of one of the pages. As luck has it, that page has just escaped from the Assembly; I don't know whether on duty or on purpose. The name of the page is Miss Van Le. I believe her mother, Mrs. Nhan Le, and sister Cindy are in your gallery. I ask that they rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly a lady for whom I have a great deal of admiration. In 1975 the government of Alberta introduced a program known as the special placement program. It's a program that provides assistance for disabled Albertans to find employment with the government of Alberta. I've known this lady since 1979. Her name is Mrs. Joy Young, and she is just retiring from this position. She has been a source of inspiration; she has brought sensitivity to this very special employment area and is supportive of the objectives. I'd like to ask Mrs. Joy Young to rise and the members to wish her well in her retirement.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Irrigation Tour — Lethbridge

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the hon. Minister of the Environment, and ask if he could explain the government's answer to Written Question 165 with respect to a meeting of the Water Resources Commission in Lethbridge on [August] 23, 1983. The answer was, there was no meeting.

Could the minister explain why, in the manifest of the government's King Air, the purpose of the trip dated August

23, 1983, at which the primary passenger was the Hon. Fred Bradley, was the Alberta Water Resources Commission meeting in Lethbridge?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, obviously there is an error in terms of the actual reason for my trip to Lethbridge, which was to address the northwest irrigators association.

MR. NOTLEY: Obviously there was an error.

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In the interests of accuracy, could the minister explain what input his department would have with respect to the Minister of Transportation, to ensure that manifests tabled in the Legislature accurately reflect the purpose of the trips?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I can only apologize. Obviously there was an error in terms of that filing. I'd have to check into that personally and ensure that it doesn't happen in the future.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Transportation. Given this obvious error, what review is undertaken to ensure the accuracy of this information with respect to the use of government aircraft, which is tabled annually by the government?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the matter of the use of government aircraft and the provision of government aircraft is the responsibility of the Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd be more than happy to direct the question to the hon. Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, the information is gathered from various departments and the people who operate the aircraft. In the nature of compiling a document of that size, I suppose it would be inevitable that there could be the occasional error. Any error that's pointed out to us, we'd be happy to correct.

MR. NOTLEY: We're always happy to oblige and point out the government's errors, although time doesn't permit us to really undertake that in any major way.

We've now established that the minister went down there for another reason, I gather to speak to an irrigation group and participate in an inspection tour. Because his executive assistant and his assistant deputy minister for water resources, Mr. Melnychuk, are shown on the manifest as passengers but were not on the tour, could the minister advise the Assembly what was the purpose for these gentlemen being in Lethbridge that day?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, they were invited to attend the function at which I spoke.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question. After the function at which the minister spoke, an inspection tour was held, according to this information, which we have to presume is as accurate as we get in this House. Could the minister tell the Assembly why it was deemed necessary to take along on this tour a total of 22 people, as well as an unspecified number of people from the three participating organizations?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, the importance of a tour such as this is in terms of the exchange of information which takes

place between people practising irrigation in different parts of North America. It's very useful to have the exchange of information, and this is what took place with regard to the activities over the period of time in which this conference took place.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I notice from the answer that the members of the Water Resources Commission were along, but the minister indicated that there were no meetings but that he met another organization and went on the tour. Were there any other meetings involving the members of the Water Resources Commission on August 23?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not responsible for the Water Resources Commission, and I cannot answer for them. But I'm not aware of any meetings.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I notice our friend the chairman is not here, so maybe we'll just save that until he comes back.

Power Rates

MR. NOTLEY: I'd like to ask my second question of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and it's a follow-up to questions my colleague raised yesterday. Given the desperate financial situation faced by many farmers, did the Minister of Agriculture have anything to do with, or any recommendation with respect to, the increase from \$2,500 to \$5,000, a doubling, of the part one loan portions that people pay for the installation of power through REAs?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, that question should best be referred to the Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I know what the position of the Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications may be. I'm interested in whether or not, given the desperate plight of farmers facing credit restrictions at this stage of the game, the Minister of Agriculture made any appraisal of the impact of this doubling of the part one loan as far as many of these farmers on the border line are concerned now.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that when the Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications was looking at the changes in the program, he did consult, of course, and take into consideration a number of pieces of information. I feel that question would best be addressed to him.

MR. NOTLEY: I guess the answer there is, no recommendation was made.

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General, also on the question of power rates and as they affect hard-pressed farmers. Given the government's position that there should be minimum salary increases in 1984, what is the position of the government of Alberta with respect to the request by TransAlta, a company whose profits have increased from \$188 million to \$215 million, for a 6.5 percent increase in their electrical utility rates?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader is asking about matters that either are or will be before the Public Utilities Board. I should say that I was not clear, from exactly the way the question was put, whether the application may already have been dealt with. But I gathered from the question that it has not been and is pending. I don't think I would venture to say to a quasi-judicial board such as the Public Utilities Board what

the government believes they should be doing with such an application.

Just to elaborate a little on that, Mr. Speaker, it may well be that there are numbers of legitimate viewpoints that should be brought before the Public Utilities Board with respect to economic difficulties of various sectors in the economy at the present time, including the farm sector of course. Those viewpoints expressed would be taken into account by the board. But as the minister through whom the board, in a rather technical and distant way, may report to the Assembly, it is not my position or intention to make representations directly to them.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. provincial Attorney General. Given the government's change in labour legislation last year, altering the basis of collective bargaining for public employees in the province, has the government given any consideration to changing the mandate of the PUB in terms of the way they compute whether or not a rate application is justifiable? For example, is it the position of the government that the coupon clippers of TransAlta and Alberta Power should have to take the same role in exercising restraint as everybody else?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, on some previous occasions, I've referred to the general areas the Public Utilities Board will look at in determining what rates should be set. They do indeed take into account the availability of capital and the need of the utility to raise a certain amount of capital. In calculating in these times what would be suitable with respect to rates and rates of return, I think that parties who are before the board, as the government is not, should surely make those representations and make sure they're taken into account.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Given the growing number of farm bankruptcies and certainly lower profits by most small-business men, has the government given any consideration to, or has it reviewed or commissioned any review of, whether or not the present rate structure is in fact reasonable, given the lower demand schedules which have even caused the ERCB to make significant changes in its forecast to Executive Council?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think we would be talking at that point about second-guessing a statutory agency.

The hon. leader asked about whether or not there is some process of review of what the board is doing. The whole intention of the legislation and of the existence of the Public Utilities Board is to be the watchdog, in effect, with respect to rates and to perform the very functions the Leader of the Opposition is asking about.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Given the fact that in arbitration the government has modified the ground rules, though — for example, put in government fiscal policy as one of the elements — has there been any consideration by the government, not of changing the quasi-judicial nature of the final decision-making process but clarifying the ground rules in a time of economic slowdown?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think I've responded to that in part by saying that as a formal process, no representations have been made to the board. The hon. leader wouldn't expect me or anyone else in the government to be giving direction to a quasi-judicial body, the responsibility of which is to hear evidence and come to certain determinations. But I would say

that in my view, it would certainly be entirely appropriate for the board to take into account any fiscal policies of the government and give them what application they are able to on the basis of the evidence. It would surely be within the proper scope of argument for any intervenors making representations before the Public Utilities Board to make those very arguments.

Rental Deposits

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is a follow-up to a question I asked last fall on damage deposits. Is the minister in a position to indicate if the department has taken any action on assuring people who paid damage deposits that they will get their money back when they move out?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the best of the department's ability, certainly the legislation that is in place is enforced. But if the hon. member is referring to the question whether the damage deposit should be held in trust, it is our view that the trust accounts do not guarantee the security of the damage deposit. We are talking about thousands and thousands of dollars, and numbers in terms of accounts, and that would be impossible to monitor.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate to the Assembly if there is a differentiation between a new owner taking over an apartment and an apartment that has gone into foreclosure? Is there any protection in one and not in the other?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, that particular matter is now before the courts. The department has challenged receivers in the province who are now operating tenancy situations. Their opinion is that they are not responsible for the damage deposits, of course, and that is now a matter before the courts.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Can the minister indicate to the Assembly what difference there is between the other jurisdictions that have the deposits held in trusts, which is working, and Alberta, where we have no protection for the tenant?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's accurate to say that there is no protection for the tenant. In fact the landlord is obliged to return the security deposit at the end of the tenancy, unless of course there has been damage, and would be in default, if you will, if that were not to occur. The problem certainly is where there is no damage deposit to be claimed.

Mr. Speaker, our analysis of the other jurisdictions indicates that they have no better record in terms of those damage deposits being held in trust than those that do not have that requirement.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, with regard to damage deposit accounts. Could the minister indicate whether the department collects all damage deposit accounts following a point in time when a welfare recipient leaves accommodation? Are those damage accounts that are unused returned to the government in all cases?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, subject to checking the matter out thoroughly. I believe damage deposits are supplied on the basis of repayment, so the social allowance recipient ends up having that money that has been paid on their behalf as their money that's in the hands of a landlord. When they leave a

particular rental accommodation, then that money would come back to them, provided no damages were done to the facilities. If there were damages, then obviously the landlord would use his judgment as to whether or not to provide that money back to the social allowance recipient. But the money belongs to the social allowance recipient.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the hon. minister saying that when the government takes on a commitment to pay the rent as necessary and no damage occurs, the welfare recipient receives that damage deposit as a bonus to use as he or she sees fit?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that when the damage deposit is initially paid on their behalf, there is a repayment process out of the social allowance benefits they receive. When they move from a rental accommodation, it's clear they would be moving somewhere else as well. Hopefully the money would be used for a damage deposit in that situation, if it's a rental situation.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. It has been brought to my attention that there are cases where the welfare recipient changed residences after one or two months, and time whereby the damage deposit could be repaid hasn't been allowed. What occurs in those situations? Is the damage deposit then taken back by the department?

DR. WEBBER: I would have to look into it further, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is that the damage deposit is payable back to the social allowance recipient regardless of the time period, whether it be one month, two months, or six months.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the minister check and see how many cases there are such as that and report back to the Legislature? don't know on what basis the welfare recipient would receive the funds when they have not made payment.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member could make a little clearer what he is requesting — or a motion for a return — I would be happy to provide him with the information. Maybe he could verbally indicate exactly what he wishes to have me follow up.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. The piece of information that has been brought to my attention is that a number of welfare recipients move from one residence to another, and in each residence a damage deposit is being made. The owner of the residence pays the damage deposit to the welfare recipient and, through that mechanism, they are accumulating a large amount of funds. I am saying, what check does the department have on matters such as that, which is really taking and securing money under false pretenses?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, one of the hon. members from Edmonton has brought to my attention the concern about landlords keeping damage deposits when they have no right to keep them, and we have been looking into that situation. We would be happy to follow up on this and look into what the hon. member has raised.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question, again to the minister of consumer affairs. Is the minister in a position to indicate or

has the department done any studies as to how prevalent it is that tenants are losing their damage deposits because the facility goes into receivership?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe I have that information. I would be pleased to provide it to the hon. member.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. speaker, a supplementary. Has the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs done any assessment of the scenario in Ontario, I believe, whereby the landlord collects the last month's rent as a security deposit, which would apparently assist in the circumstance of collecting these damage deposits? Has the minister done any assessment of the Ontario circumstance?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, we have looked at that particular situation. This subject was raised with the landlord and tenant advisory boards that operate throughout the province. Their recommendation to me was that no changes should be made at this time. They deal with these situations on an ongoing basis, and I have asked them to keep it under constant review and provide me with any advice they believe to be important on this matter.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. McPHERSON: Has the minister done any assessment of how many apartment owners in this marketplace are not charging any damage deposit at the moment, and how that would impact on collection of the last month's rent in lieu of a damage deposit?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't have any precise information, only to indicate to the hon. member that I received many, many calls from landlords who indicated that they're no longer charging a damage deposit and wondered why we still had that provision in legislation. Of course it's to cover situations where there still is a damage deposit required. But unfortunately I couldn't give any detail, nor do I have any mechanism whereby I could collect that detail for the hon. member.

Health Study — Southwestern Alberta

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. I understand the minister has sent letters to people in the Twin Butte, Hill Spring, Mountain View, and Glenwood communities, announcing the first meetings regarding the medical diagnostic review in that area. Could the minister report on the purpose of those meetings?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the meetings to be held around June 3 and 4 in the communities the hon. member referred to have two basic purposes. The first purpose is to introduce the chairman of the scientific advisory committee that will be meeting with the people in the community to determine what kind of study or review should be done. The chairman of the committee is Dr. Benjamin Burrows, a pulmonary disease specialist and professor from the University of Arizona. As I indicated, he's the person who will be chairing the scientific advisory body which we hope will oversee the health research to be done in the area.

The second reason for the meetings is to follow up the meetings the hon. Minister of the Environment and I had earlier this year to begin the process of formulating the terms of reference for the medical diagnostic review.

MR. THOMPSON: A supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister inform the House just when this scientific advisory body will be appointed and when the actual work will start in those communities?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of the Environment and I were in the area on April 12, I believe, we indicated to the people from the four communities that we wanted this medical diagnostic review to begin as soon as possible and that we wanted to approach a number of scientists to see if they were willing to be involved. We now have the agreement of Dr. Benjamin Burrows to chair this committee. He will be meeting along with two others: Dr. Rogers, from the government side, and Vern Millard, chairman of the ERCB. They will be meeting with the people in those communities.

Once we have established the entire scientific advisory committee, that committee will be meeting with residents in those same communities to further develop the terms of reference for the medical diagnostic review. Hopefully those meetings will occur sometime in July.

MR. THOMPSON: One more supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister give the House the criteria he used in choosing Dr. Burrows as chairman of the scientific advisory body?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may recall that in January this year the Acid Deposition Research Group met in Banff, and a number of scientists from across North America attended that particular meeting. Dr. Benjamin Burrows was one of those in attendance. He showed a great deal of interest in being involved in the study in southwestern Alberta and certainly has the medical expertise to be involved. The other people whom we hoped would be involved in the scientific advisory committee would also be among the 23 scientists, I believe, who attended the meeting in Banff in January.

Social Workers — Caseloads

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. It concerns the statement from the Cavanagh Board of Review report that within the Department of Social Services and Community Health, the average caseload per child care worker should be 35, and the target date to achieve that was April 1982. Could the minister update the Assembly on how well his department is doing in achieving this goal?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member must recognize, when reading the Cavanagh Board of Review, that that was a picture of the situation back at the time the hearings were taking place. There were a number of child welfare workers hired by the department between 1982 and 1983 or 1981 and 1983. I've forgotten the exact dates. Now that we have the Child Welfare Act before the Legislature, we intend to follow that up with establishing the policies within the department that would be necessary to work with the Act, including the issue of workload for child welfare workers. At this time I think it's also important to recognize the drop in the total number of children in care in the last year, from about 18,500 to 16,000. So I think that factor has to be taken into account in considering the workload for child welfare workers.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. The latest figures I have are from Motion for a Return 129, and that was information based on data collected September 30, 1983. At that time — and this is after the time the minister talked about — the provincial average was 48, ranging to a high of 60 in Medicine Hat. Since September 30, when the caseload average was 48, what steps has the minister's department taken to reduce that to an acceptable load of 35?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member indicated an "acceptable" load of 35. I guess one question that could be asked is: acceptable to whom?

Since we started the whole process of reviewing the Child Welfare Act, I've had meetings across the province with child welfare workers. Certainly I recognize the burden, the load, they have in dealing with child welfare matters in the province. We had discussions about follow-up to the Child Welfare Act in terms of the regulations, in terms of the policies that will go in place, and in terms of meeting the needs of children in this province. That process is ongoing. If the hon. member wants to interpret that as a follow-up to the question he asked, then he can think that.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you. I appreciate the minister allowing me to think what I want to think. It's very generous. [interjections]

The minister's department, under his predecessor, was the one that was shooting for a caseload of 35. It's not something I picked out of the air. My question to the minister: is there now a new figure the department considers acceptable as an average caseload per child care worker?

DR. WEBBER: I'm always willing to help the hon. member with his thinking, Mr. Speaker.

In terms of a criterion or a goal to reach, in the discussions we've had with the department, which involved the changing nature of the workload that child welfare workers are having and would have under the new Act, no definite number to shoot for has been established at this stage. The goal is to provide adequate manpower and adequate resources to meet the needs of the child welfare system in this province. That is the objective and the work we have ahead of us in the next year.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the minister keeps helping me, I think I'll be as fuzzy-thinking as he is. There are no numbers, just generalities. My question is: what review has the minister undertaken of the social workers under these heavy caseloads? I'm speaking specifically of the morale problems that we're hearing about. Is the minister taking a look at this, and what is his assessment?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know where the hon. member, in his fuzzy thinking, is hearing about morale problems. I've travelled this province from north to south, visiting child welfare workers and social workers, and they involve extremely hardworking, competent, able people. I hope the hon. member doesn't think otherwise. The conversations I've had with these people is that we want to work together as a team in meeting the needs of children and social allowance recipients in the province in the next few years.

MR. MARTIN: How nice. But the point is that the caseload, as you'll notice in the Cavanagh Board of Review, has a great deal to do with whether you can work well with these children, has something to do with it — money.

My supplementary question. Catholic Social Services, the Cavanagh board of inquiry, and Dr. Chris Bagley, who is a professor of child welfare at the University of Calgary, have all made submissions to this government that caseloads on social workers are excessive. When will the minister respond to these concerns by hiring social workers to reduce the caseloads? Specifically, does the minister have any immediate plans to hire more social workers to reduce the excessive burden on existing social workers?

DR. WEBBER: The hon. member used two different terms: social workers and child welfare workers. I don't know if he knows the difference; he keeps using them interchangeably. Child welfare workers deal with child welfare problems in this province, and social allowance workers deal with social allowance matters in this province. There are two different types of caseloads involved with each of them.

If the hon. member means social workers in terms of what he said, in view of the caseload the social workers had in the province a year ago, when it was at a high, a number of clerical staff were taken on to assist them during that time period. If the hon. member was following the social allowance caseload over the last year, he would find that we had approximately 45,000 social allowance cases during the past year, when originally it was expected that it could be up to as high as 57,000. We've had a significant reduction in what was expected to be the load for social workers. We are still providing some clerical assistance beyond the normal manpower requirements to social workers in this province for this current year, to assist them in dealing with the caseload we have forecast for the coming year.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Rather than playing semantics games, I would remind the minister that . . .

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

MR. MARTIN: [Inaudible] on child welfare matters also. I hope the minister is aware of that, in his overwhelming knowledge of his department.

My question: does the minister plan to hire more child care workers as needed for the proper implementation and functioning of the new Child Welfare Act when it comes into force in 1985?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would read further in the Cavanagh Board of Review, he would find that it recommended that if we implemented the recommendations he had, we would have a resulting decrease in the load for child welfare workers. It was the view of the board of review that those moneys should not go back to the hon. Provincial Treasurer but be used to deal with preventive services that we could use throughout the province, to try to work toward a reduced caseload for child welfare workers. If he is aware of what's happening in the department, the hon. member will know that extensive work is currently taking place in terms of meeting the needs for the new Child Welfare Act next year. [interjection]

Contaminated Milk Samples

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Is the minister aware of the loss of contaminated vials of milk, and is he taking steps to ensure that such irresponsible transportation of goods does not recur?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly am aware of the loss of the milk samples. The milk samples are the responsibility of Agriculture Canada until they're brought to Agriculture Alberta's food lab for testing.

While I'm on my feet, I might say that the samples have not yet turned up. They were lost sometime last Saturday in Beverly. There are some 72 samples, and each sample bottle contains less than two ounces of milk and has been treated with potassium dichromate to control bacterial growth. Anyone ingesting any of those samples could be poisoned. The potassium dichromate treated milk tastes and smells bad, and all the bottles are marked with a skull and crossbones. There is a card in each box warning that it is poison and that anyone who ingests it is to seek medical help immediately. Since they haven't turned up and since the police are checking, I hope whoever it is will turn in the samples so that the case can be cleared up.

MRS. CRIPPS: For the public protection, could the minister describe the containers?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't have a sample container or anything that I've seen, so I can't explain what kind of container it was. It was lost on Saturday morning and, as it's nearly a week now, we're disappointed that someone hasn't at least called and said, listen, this is what's happened to that container, or this is where it is, so at least the case could be cleared up and there is no hazard to people in the area.

MRS. CRIPPS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Just so I'm clear, the responsibility for transportation of the milk wasn't the Alberta Department of Agriculture but Agriculture Canada. Is there an extended period of time in which the vials could be a danger to the public?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: I think they are a danger until they are found, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, it is correct that it is the responsibility of Agriculture Canada until they're delivered to the food lab, and then they become the responsibility of Agriculture Alberta. It's just an unfortunate happening; I don't think it's irresponsible at all. The inspector picked up the samples on a Friday, took them home, and was taking them over there on a Saturday morning. It was just unfortunate that he happened to place them on the trunk of his car, forgot to put them in the trunk, and drove away. I don't expect that to occur again. Rather than saying it's irresponsible, I think it's just unfortunate.

MRS. CRIPPS: If I did that, it would be downright unfortunate. My husband would have my neck.

Why would such cartons be transported to the department? What's the purpose?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, it's part of the ROP program that is run by the Department of Agriculture on testing milk samples, and the potassium dichromate that is put in is to preserve the samples so they can be accurately checked.

Pollution Monitoring

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of the Environment regards a new proposal with regard to the public paying for pollution monitoring information. I wonder if the minister could indicate the status of that policy at the present time.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, a draft order was circulated to a number of interest groups in the province for their comments. We have received those comments and are reviewing them. One of the comments we received was with regard to a proposal

for a charge for information if it took a certain amount of time to compile. At this time we are considering the responses we've got, and I think we'll be coming forward with a different proposal on that matter.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the different proposal, is one of the changes with regard to the formation of a separate Crown agency to monitor pollution?

MR. BRADLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate what the changes will be, from the first proposal that was made public?

MR. BRADLEY: As I said, Mr. Speaker, there was concern with regard to the proposal to charge for compilation of information if it took a very long period of time to compile that information. What we are now looking at is a different format with regard to the request for information and whether or not there will be a charge for that information or whether it will be on a per page basis above a certain number of pages, et cetera. But we are considering the responses we've received, and in due course the ministerial order will be finalized.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate whether one of the items in the new policy will be with regard to a concern raised by the Attorney General with regard to the liability of the Department of the Environment in providing data?

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, the change in the legislation provides for the release of monitoring information, and that will be part of the ministerial order which will trigger the release of such information.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I believe the Minister of Agriculture wishes to supplement a previous answer.

Robotics in Public Service

MR. FJORDBOTEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday there was a question from the hon. Member for Little Bow with respect to robotics in the Department of Agriculture. I'd like to say that we are looking at robotics in meat packing and a number of other areas.

One of the specific areas he raised was the mailmobile. While I'm responding to this question, I'd like to state that a cost/benefit analysis was done with respect to Adam — Adam is his name: a contest was run in the department to choose the name — and Adam displaced no employees in the department. An assessment of the number of trips to the mail room was done, and it was found to be about 100. Considering that mail is delivered three times a day, and realizing that some things will have to be delivered and carried to the mail room many times, they took 75 percent of that. It takes 10 minutes per trip. Times three is about 12 and a half hours a day that were wasted going to and from the mail room. So when they looked at the cost/benefit analysis of Adam, they found they could recover that with more efficiency in about a three-year period.

He also asked the question, is there an Eve? I'm not aware that there is an Eve. I've done an assessment of Adam and found he has no ability to reproduce. In fact I had the inspection done this morning and found that Adam indeed does not have a rib, so the ability is not there. He doesn't seem to be complaining significantly, because the Farmers' Advocate has not

been asked to intervene. In addition, I'm aware of no Apple product named Eve.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that that's the nuts and bolts of the issue.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

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

Department of Treasury

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has the Provincial Treasurer any opening comments?

MR. HYNDMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a few brief comments. First, I'd like to give a brief overview of the activities of the various branches of the Department of Treasury. I'll also comment briefly on the privatization efforts we're making, and say a few words about manpower restraint.

Before doing that, though, insofar as there has been some recent interest and discussion with regard to economic indicators, I thought it might be useful to draw to the attention of the committee two recent indicators that are pertinent to the Alberta situation. One is the consumer price index. The figures which have been compiled by Statistics Canada across the country show that for the month of March, Alberta had the lowest percentage increase in the consumer price index of all the provinces, an average of about 2.4 percent in both Calgary and Edmonton. So that contributes towards stability and investment confidence.

As well, it's interesting to note a recent report in *The Globe and Mail*, which compared the various provincial budgets for the 1984-85 fiscal year and, in particular, outlined the changes in the deficits of each of the provinces. At that time the budget of the province of Quebec was not yet brought forward, but now it has been. What that reveals is that the percentage change is best in the province of Alberta, a minus 54 percent reduction in the deficit over the previous year. That holds true even with the Quebec budget tabled yesterday.

With regard to the activities of the various branches of the Department of Treasury, in order that members can get a brief outline of what has been, is now, and is foreseen as occurring, I'd like to briefly outline what has been going on in that regard. Firstly, in the office of the Controller there has been implementation of a new revenue accounting and reporting system. That will lead to an integrated accounting system, operated on a decentralized basis. The Controller's branch has been involved in the development of new pensions legislation, which has been tabled and is now under consideration by the House, and is also stressing simplification and improvement in the responsiveness of delivery of pension benefits to the many thousands who receive them. As well, there are efforts now under way to improve the timeliness of financial reporting even further.

With regard to the finance branch, they undertook the government's borrowing program, essentially under the provincial corporation loan fund and through other vehicles. The promissory note program was a new effort there. Also continued was the investment diversification program, in order to ensure

the continuation of high rates of return. That will continue in what is certainly an uncertain and continuously changing investment environment.

In budget and management, of course, the framework and options provided for the first decrease in government expenditure in 40 years, in the budget announced in March. As well, which I'll mention in connection with privatization, there was development, with the private sector, of a publicly accessible, computerized, Alberta statistical information system, which is novel and unique in Canada. The other aspects of budget and management related to setting the framework for managing better with less, which is the approach the government is taking this year and which is set forth in the budget.

In the fiscal policy and economics area, there was planning advice with regard to the budget, the analysis of various revenue-raising options, contributions to the Strength in Diversity document, which is receiving wide currency in the country, and assistance in drafting legislation. As well, the monitoring analysis of the Alberta economy throughout the year is completed by the fiscal policy and economics group.

In revenue, members will recall that last year there was the new Tobacco Tax Act. That, together with the new approach with regard to flexibility in terms of customers and agents of the Crown, was put into effect. Steps were taken to maintain the integrity of the royalty tax program, to which I've previously referred, and efforts continued to provide tax information services through personal contact with taxpayers in a way which I think is in very positive contrast to some other tax jurisdictions in the country. In that branch there were revisions to the Fuel Oil Administration Act as well.

In administration, the total approach was to maximize the efficiency of existing staff and operate with fewer positions than before. Corporate management services carried on with the AMFC debenture issues, which for the first time were successfully placed in the Canadian market, and implemented a new stop-loss settlement policy in the AMFC. That was a successful new initiative and is carried on with respect to AGT borrowings as well. For the first time, risk management and insurance arranged owner-controlled insurance for major construction programs, for the benefit of both the private sector and the public purse, and expanded their contract analysis activity.

Mr. Chairman, no mention of the department's activities would be complete without reference to the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation. Looking to process approximately \$650 million worth of loans to Alberta municipalities, hospitals and school boards in this year, it is again distributing probably the highest per capita moneys, at a very low administrative cost, through a municipal financing corporation of any province.

The pension boards are also a responsibility which I have, and they have been consulted and will be involved in the implementation of the legislation, part of which has been brought forward and the balance of which will be brought into first reading stage before the end of the session.

Another branch of the Department of Treasury is the treasury branches. Insofar as there has been some debate, discussion, and speculation, I'd like to briefly deal with the treasury branches as they are today, to make it very clear that they are not for sale, and also to outline a number of questions which are being addressed in terms of the updated mandate of the treasury branches for the next five or 10 years.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, it's very difficult to hear the minister. Do you have anything we could read from?

MR. HYNDMAN: I have a list of the questions which are being addressed in the review. I could distribute some copies

to hon. members. I don't have enough for everyone, but perhaps the pages could distribute them to those who are interested. I'll get to that in just a moment. I'd welcome comments on the points which will be brought up here.

In the last 12 years, the treasury branches have expanded their deposit base by a multiple of about 10, to \$3.3 billion. The number of deposit accounts has jumped from 148,000 in 1972 to about 506,000 this year. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I think the treasury branches of Alberta have a reputation as solid financial citizens in the province, a group that listens and responds. I believe they've had a unique record of performance since they were established. They fill gaps and provide competition. They're now very much a part of the Alberta scene and Alberta financial history.

I want to say again, and make it very clear, that the treasury branches will not be sold; they will stay as part of government. In fact I believe there are new avenues the treasury branches could explore and some fresh initiatives in supporting the provincial economic strategy which the treasury branches could take. I might mention some of those which are under review at the moment. The review involves me as minister and the senior management of the treasury branches.

Some of the questions which are being addressed — these are the ones on the list which has been distributed — and on which decisions will be taken in the weeks and short months ahead are these. In what new ways should the treasury branches reinforce the economic strategy of the province? What gaps in the province's financial services should be filled by the treasury branches? Should treasury branches explore ways to provide services to their customers who trade out of Alberta or out of Canada? Insofar as the North American trend is to a blurring of the distinction between financial institutions in Canada and towards what some call one-stop financial supermarkets, should the treasury branches be involved in this trend? Should the treasury branches' agricultural and small-business role be strengthened even further and, if so, how? What should be the extent and the pace of automation in the treasury branches? Should the deposit base be significantly enlarged by expanding the number of branches in urban areas? And should all treasury branch services be available in all branches, or should some specialized services be regionalized or centralized? Those are some of the questions which are being addressed and discussed now. In the weeks ahead I welcome, from members and others, comments with regard to these questions and opinions that may be volunteered or useful.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to review some aspects of privatization in the Department of Treasury, insofar as that's been one of the general thrusts of government and Treasury activities have been no exception to that general approach. One of the interesting areas of privatization has been a contract with the corporate tax group and Goodwill industries, which is a well-known social services agency, whereby they are now handling bulk mailings for the corporate tax group. We're saving about 18 cents per envelope by providing that group with the opportunity to handle those bulk mailings and paying them for it. As well, a Canadian trust company, Montreal Trust, has been engaged to transfer and register long-term debt securities rather than the Treasury Department. We've engaged a private-sector company to microfilm all the corporate tax records, and that reduces the need for storage areas and reduces the size of the department as well.

In the revenue administration area, all transportation and pickups of cash and money are now done by privately hired armoured car services. In Crown debt collections, we've expanded the use of private-sector collection agencies. Corporate tax has privately contracted out about a third of all their

electronic data processing maintenance work, which was previously done in-house. As well, the keypunch operation is increasingly being contracted out. We've contracted the company called Canadian Depository for Securities, to hold all the equity securities for the Treasury Department. That again is a method of privatization.

Finally, a unique dimension of privatization but also a partnership with the private sector is found with regard to the retrieval, by computer, of statistical information of the Alberta Bureau of Statistics. Announced some months ago, we have a joint operation whereby the private sector created and operates the computer system as a publicly accessible system, and the government — the public sector — ends up with a streamlined and consolidated information system. It's called ASIST, and the word of its being available is getting around. It is clearly one of the most sophisticated, easy to use, and comprehensive information systems in North America.

Finally, with regard to manpower restraint, Mr. Chairman, as with other departments, there has been a reduction in permanent positions in virtually all divisions of the department, a total of 16. Over 20 percent of those were in management.

I conclude, Mr. Chairman, by thanking the management and staff of the department and of my office for their efforts during a very different transition year. They are seeing and have entered into the exercise of understanding the need for new thinking and meeting the challenge of managing and working in a restraint environment. They've also done that with cheerfulness, imagination, and initiative. I want to congratulate them all and thank them in that regard. I'd be pleased to answer any questions with regard to the department.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the remarks of the hon. minister. But what I want to talk about for a few minutes is the general attitude of the minister toward his responsibility as Provincial Treasurer in this province and as a leader in terms of the economic growth in this province — the distortions by the actual minister that occur. I use that word reservedly, hopefully, but just as it is. [interjection]

As I reviewed the past few months of discussion in this Legislature, we had the Provincial Treasurer trying to tell Albertans about the beautiful growth that's going on, how things are great in Alberta. There's growth here and growth there, everything is great, and there are no problems. There aren't 150,000 people out in the streets without work. There aren't businesses that are going bankrupt. There aren't farmers in difficulty at the present time. There aren't any civil servants who are worried about their jobs. Everything is great, and we've got growth. At the same time as we have this kind of front being put on in the public arena, we have the Premier charging people in the city of Edmonton — was it \$225? — to go to a banquet. Two hundred dollars went toward the party, and 1,000 people. So they have \$200,000 for the next election's coffers, which they can supposedly use to bushwhack the people of Alberta again.

But what did the Premier say when he was asked the question about the future of the economy in Alberta? What did he say? Well, when you invite 1,000 people and many of them leave upset with the Premier's rather short and terse remarks, they're not going to maintain silence like the Premier hoped. They're going to come and tell some other people who may be their friends as well. The report is that the Premier said, we are in for tough times ahead. Why then doesn't the Provincial Treasurer admit that and say the very same thing in this Legislature? Why doesn't the Premier ever stand in his place and talk about the economy and the situation of Alberta as it is? Why doesn't he do that? Why don't they do that, rather than trying to create

a false impression that something great is happening? Just hang on in this plane that's in rough weather, and it's all going to be okay. It would be nice to be able to live in that bit of dreamland. But I don't think that's the responsibility of government, the Provincial Treasurer, or the Premier, if he ever comes in here — but maybe that's not going to be the case anyway — and makes a speech and tells us what he thinks about something. [interjection]

Mr. Chairman, as I review the Provincial Treasurer's record again in this Assembly — and I said this already, earlier in the session. In the present budget, we've required a 13 percent increase in personal income tax. The Provincial Treasurer didn't even have the courtesy to the people of Alberta to mention that in the budget, in terms of the fact that that money was necessary to work toward balancing the budget. And there are other items in the budget as well.

Now again we have the Provincial Treasurer introducing a document to the public: Notes re Alberta Economy, mid-May 1984. Again, it all sounds rosy: an upward, upbeat economy; everything is looking good in Alberta, and we have growth. Maybe in the Provincial Treasurer's mind that's a nice impression to leave with the public, so somebody might invest in Alberta. Maybe we're running down to get the New York money barons to come back and invest in Alberta.

But who we really should be talking to are the investors of Alberta; giving them confidence, not false impressions. They know where it's at. They know what the growth in the economy is. They know what the future is. They've looked at predictions from private consultants and private sources, and it's a kind of joke when the Provincial Treasurer gets up and tries to mislead them about some of the things that are happening in this province and in Canada as a whole. Mr. Chairman, I don't think that's good enough from the Provincial Treasurer.

As I said, we had this mid-May 1984 document, introduced at a press conference over at Government House; not introduced in the Legislature as a statement of the government's present position and attitude towards the economy, where the general media and the other members of the Legislature can hear, but somewhere remote from the Legislature. That's where the Provincial Treasurer likes to make those statements, so nobody can question him about the matter when it is raised.

But look at some of the statements that are made. The Provincial Treasurer used Informetrica Limited's monthly economic review as backup for his position. If we look a little further with regard to that review, pages 4, 5, and 6, on page 4 we see a table that indicates the percentage growth in gross domestic product. It's projected for all the different provinces in Canada, and in 1984-85 Alberta's growth is slightly below the national average and lower than all provinces except Newfoundland, Quebec, and British Columbia. Yet the Provincial Treasurer didn't include that in his projections of 1986 to 2005. That's a little negative toward Alberta. Why didn't the hon. minister include that to be honest in the presentation he was making?

Page 5: in 1983 all the provinces except Alberta began to grow again. Why didn't the Provincial Treasurer add that to his statement as part of the information that should be made available for the consideration of the private sector or the entrepreneurial community of Alberta? On page 6 there's a table that indicates the year of restoration of 1981, real output. It will take Alberta and British Columbia until 1985 to have the same real output as in 1981. Five of the provinces resumed 1981 levels in 1983 and three provinces in 1984. Why didn't the Provincial Treasurer add that to the statement? Maybe it doesn't paint that rosy picture, but it places Alberta in the correct perspective. The Provincial Treasurer doesn't like to

use all the statements or all the truth with regard to it, and I felt that's a shortcoming that had to be raised here at this time.

The Conference Board of Canada, in its statistics — the Provincial Treasurer cited in this mid-May release, "The Alberta economy will improve in 1984 over 1983". Now that's a true statement; nothing wrong with the statement as it stands. But what is accurate is that Alberta's economic output declined by 3 percent in 1983 and only by .6 percent in 1984. There's still a decline. Now why didn't the Provincial Treasurer tell all of us that, and tell Albertans that there really will be a continued decline? Why didn't we hear that in the statement? Because it really didn't paint the picture the Provincial Treasurer wanted.

Who is he painting the picture for? To make this government look good? Maybe they're down in the polls and need a rosy picture. Well, that won't do much good in terms of public impression, because the business community doesn't get misled by that kind of — I don't want to use the word "distortion"; let's say the neglect in terms of telling the whole story.

What about another quote in the Conference Board report?

... Alberta will show no economic expansion in 1984 and British Columbia very little, while other provinces will continue to recover ...

Now that's a comparison one to the other. Why wasn't that mentioned in the statement? I think it's incumbent upon the Provincial Treasurer to add that to the statement so the statement actually faces the facts and the government is up front in presenting the economic picture of this province, and hopefully, I would add, whenever the Minister of Advanced Education and whatever other minister is working on the economic policy of this government, they admit some of these difficulties Alberta is having. First of all, admit they have a problem; and secondly, put in place some of the solutions, long-term and short-term, that are going to hopefully solve some of the problems. That's what Albertans are asking, and I think the place to start with honesty in presentation is with the Provincial Treasurer of course.

If we follow on in terms of the information of the Conference Board of Canada, we find this statement on the information sheet: "In 1985, Alberta will grow at a rate faster than the nation." That's a very accurate statement in itself. But let's look at the rest of the facts. This is the rest of the facts that should have been added: there are other provinces with growth rates between 1.2 and 1.6 percent, which are higher than Alberta's projected growth rate of .9 percent. In other words, Alberta's growth rate is .9 percent. The national average is .6 percent. Certainly it's growing faster than the nation, but there are a number of other provinces in Canada that are growing at rates of 1.2 to 1.6 percent, which are faster growth rates.

The question the Provincial Treasurer should raise is, why? And what are they doing? Maybe there are some facts that could be laid before the public. But to lay out those kinds of details isn't to the benefit of the Provincial Treasurer, so what does he do? He leaves them out, and I certainly think the minister can be faulted for doing just that. We go on to point out that the economy of Alberta isn't as great as was placed before us by the Provincial Treasurer in his mid-May statement. Those are just some of the things done by the Provincial Treasurer.

I can't for my life understand why the Provincial Treasurer takes that approach. Nobody in the province is asking for that. All they are asking for is an honest, up-front assessment as to where we are in the economy, good or bad. Just tell us where we are. Don't try to create a picture that isn't real. That's what Albertans ask, and I'm sure that's what we ask here in this Legislature. When it doesn't happen, the only thing we in the

opposition can do is raise it and point out the other side, that there is a broader picture.

I'd love to be able to stand in my place as a member of the Legislature and talk about growth and expansion, multiple employment opportunities, millions of dollars of investment going on in Alberta, and people doing it with confidence, without hesitation, without worry about the future. But that's just not the way the picture is. Many people today that were going to invest a few months ago have backed off and said: we're not sure where the interest rates are going, and we just don't know what to do. That's unfortunate. That's not the fault of the provincial government. I'm not placing the blame at the door of the Provincial Treasurer with regard to that. The point I'm making is, let's try to be as honest as we can with the public. If there is a dark side to the story, let's tell it.

The Premier has tried to say to his most loyal supporters, who paid \$225, that we are in for rough times ahead. Let's put a little meat on that subject and lay it out before this Legislature. That's what we ask the Provincial Treasurer to do. If that's really what the government believes, I'm surprised the Premier hasn't asked the Provincial Treasurer to lay out that type of scenario before us in the Legislature. I can only believe that's the position of the government when the leader of the party and the province says that in private, not in public, because we haven't heard any statements at all for a long time with regard to his itinerary, what he spends, or what he's trying to do at the present time. We really don't know; hopefully his cabinet colleagues know what he's up to. The people of Alberta don't see any results in solving some of the employment problems or even recognizing that the problems are out there. I wonder if the Premier even knows there are soup lines in downtown Edmonton. I wonder if he's even aware of that kind of information. Every time I see him on TV and hear about him exporting 80 pounds of prime beef to the United States with my tax money and living it high on the beef hog down in New York, I wonder if he even cares about the 150,000 or the people that are getting food out of the soup lines in Edmonton.

Mr. Chairman, maybe that is the scenario of this government with regard to their concern about the economy. As long as they get paid and things are fine in terms of their own environment and they encourage each other that things are great and fine — we're doing a good job, buddies — maybe they just carry on. But I hear the voice from Albertans saying they don't feel the government understands the problem the way they do.

Mr. Chairman, just one point today is that from now on I hope the Provincial Treasurer would assess some of the press releases he presents to the public, assess the budgets he presents to the public, and be up front as to what is really happening. Every time we get a presentation from the Provincial Treasurer — the supposed leading economist, the person most knowledgeable about the economy of Alberta — when the picture is being placed out of phase and not as accurately as it should be, how in the world can people in Alberta have confidence in knowing where this government is going and what they really are going to do? So I call upon the Provincial Treasurer to maybe make a statement to this Legislature that he really didn't mean to mislead some of us here in this Assembly, that he will be more up front with his statistics, that Albertans will really know where he stands on the issue, and that he will tell the whole picture — not a picture painted for the Conservative Party's own use but a picture of the economy that can be used by the private sector that's going to make this economy turn around, lift its head again, and be respectable once more in our association with other provinces and certainly with other areas of North America.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity to participate this afternoon in the discussion of the Provincial Treasurer's estimates and to make some observations about fiscal policy. Unfortunately one wonders if we have any fiscal policy other than daydreaming and hoping things are going to get better, because frankly we've been hearing the story for some time that the economy is rounding the corner.

in 1982 we were told by this government that all they had to do was wipe out the opposition and they'd solve their problems. Fortunately four of us snuck back in, and I guess the four of us plus the national energy program must be responsible for the decline. In any event, in 1982 they went around the province saying the race was between the doers and the knockers, and all we had to do was elect all these Tories and conditions would improve. They had forecasts that indicated — and the Premier, in his most poetic way, would wax eloquent before groups of well-heeled Tories in the election campaign, saying: just put us back in, folks, and we're just rounding the corner.

Then, Mr. Chairman, we had the opening of the spring session in 1983. The Conference Board report came out, and it looked as if that corner was a little further than we were told in 1982. But the Provincial Treasurer told us not to worry about it, that things were going to get better. Then we had the fall session. The government decided, without any consultation — even with their own backbenchers, it appears — to increase personal income tax by 13 percent, but the Provincial Treasurer told us not to worry about it because things were going to get better. Then before the spring session opened, we had the Conference Board report that indicated things weren't getting better, that Alberta indeed was the only province in Canada that was going to suffer an increase in unemployment. But the Provincial Treasurer said: it's going to get better; we're rounding the corner.

Now this recent report of the Conference Board of Canada, with just a couple of exceptions, is uniformly gloomy. I should say almost uniformly gloomy. Let me be totally accurate, because it does suggest there may be a slight improvement in the energy picture.

MR. MARTIN: Don't want to hurt his feelings.

MR. NOTLEY: No, we wouldn't want to hurt the minister's feelings. But it does say:

Economic events of the last few years have been disconcerting to all Canadians, but particularly to Albertans. The 4.3 per cent decline in provincial output in 1982, while milder than the national setback, came as a shock to Alberta. Previous national recessions — those of 1975 and 1980 for instance — had passed virtually unnoticed in Alberta. The further 3 per cent contraction in the province's production last year compounded the shock, for it showed that Alberta was not responding like other provinces to the general economic recovery. Alberta was not merely suffering the effects of a temporary business cycle downturn, but was also undergoing an adjustment to a more fundamental shift in economic forces.

The 1984 forecast suggests that the adjustment is underway, but the progress is far from complete. The output decline will be less than in the past two years, but no increase in production is expected. Construction activity will decline for a [further] successive year as builders continue to respond to the surplus of residential and commercial space.

That of course is marked by one exception, Mr. Chairman; that is, the \$12 million we're going to spend, when we have office space

all over the city of Calgary, to renovate McDougall school.

AN HON. MEMBER: Jobs, Grant, jobs.

MR. NOTLEY: Then we get the call across the way: jobs, jobs. That's what a lot of people are saying, Mr. Chairman. But they are saying that what they want from this government are not a couple of very questionable projects as a substitute for jobs. What they are asking for is some clear idea of what strategy this government has in place for a program of economic recovery.

Mr. Chairman, what has happened since that election of 1982? First of all, we have shrunk some of the purchasing power by increasing medicare premiums, by increasing personal income tax by 13 percent, and by authorizing user fees. No one is paying user fees yet, but almost certainly by the end of this year hospitals are going to be forced, by the draconian restraint methods of this government, to bring in user fees. So we're going to have a contraction of consumer purchasing power. No one suggests that it isn't important to have some investor confidence, but you also have to have some consumer confidence. The minister can cite statistics all he likes. The fact of the matter is that the kind of consumer activity we need in this province to sustain anything like full employment has been shell-shocked by the events of the last two or three years. I just say to members of the government that the fiscal policy of this administration is not resolving or ameliorating the problem; it is compounding the problem. That's the first thing.

Mr. Chairman, the second thing is that there is a lot of desperation out there among little people. We see that with citizens in the two cities who are so desperate that they sell their homes for a dollar and take all kinds of risks in doing that. Yesterday we found that we had 30 or 40 farmers from central Alberta travelling to this city, threatening to occupy the office of the Minister of Agriculture because they are desperate. I don't happen to know the people who were here yesterday, except for Mr. Oberg with the National Farmers Union. I had not met the gentleman who organized the demonstration yesterday, but I know that the area of the province he comes from is not noted for its radicalism. It tends to be rock-ribbed Conservative country. But they are desperate to the point that they came to this city yesterday and some of the people were actually prepared — I understand anyway — to occupy the Minister of Agriculture's office.

If that were 30 or 40 farmers and that was the extent of the problem in Alberta, the government would be quite right in saying: look, the opposition is exaggerating it; we'll just knock them over with a quick vote, wrap up the estimates, and that will be the end of the story. But Mr. Minister, and through you, Mr. Chairman, to the members of the caucus, I don't think many of us from rural Alberta, if we represent our constituents properly at all, can stand in this House and say we have not had people come to us in the last few months expressing grave concern about the general economic climate for agriculture. I don't think I have ever witnessed quite as much general concern in the organized agricultural community, whether it be Unifarm, the NFU, or the Christian Farmers Federation, or in individuals, including individuals who traditionally support this government.

I remember the meeting of the Peace River stock growers' association. Mr. Chairman, the Peace River stock growers would not be what you could classify as a radical or left-of-centre organization. But I was surprised at the number of people who came to me and said: the difference between this year and a year ago is that a year ago I had some hope; this year I'm

not sure if I'm going to be able to continue in business. Mr. Chairman, whether you talk to the president of Unifarm, the director of the National Farmers Union, individual people across the province, or those people who, out of desperation, threaten the form, if you like, of civil disobedience, the fact of the matter is that we have a serious problem. There are a lot of little people who are hurting.

In my view this government has not come up with anything to deal with these problems. The minister talks about the treasury branches. Fair enough. I'm glad that we're finally going to take a second look at the policy with respect to the treasury branches. But where in heaven's name have we been in the last number of years that we haven't seen the treasury branches as an important economic instrument to diversify the economy of this province? One of the most important legacies of the old Social Credit government was the creation of the treasury branch system. These banks that the Conservative Party likes so much deserted rural Alberta in the 1930s, closed up branch after branch, couldn't care less what they did to the towns, consolidated their interests, and left communities dangling without any credit facility at all. It was the treasury branch system that bridged that gap.

We paid tribute today to Dr. Ross. A few days ago I had the opportunity — and I considered it an opportunity — to have quite a long chat with an adversary, but one whose ability and experience I respect from being on the losing end of some campaigns. That was Alf Hooke, a former Deputy Premier of the province. Mr. Hooke outlined the problems he had, as a minister in the government in those days, trying to establish the treasury branch system. Mr. Chairman, the treasury branches filled a gap in rural Alberta, a gap that the banks — we hear so much about the Toronto NDP — the Toronto Tory-oriented banks, said to heck with. They could care less. But it was the treasury bank system and the credit union system that moved in to fill the gap.

In my view we made a very serious mistake in how we handled the trust fund, because we had the economic development vehicle right here, owned by the people of Alberta — the extension of the Provincial Treasury, the treasury branch system with branches all over the place. Now we're talking about expanding the role for small business and farmers. Mr. Chairman, instead of setting up the ADC with a bunch of parallel offices all over the place, the AOC with a parallel bureaucracy, and all the other organizations top-heavy with bureaucracy, if we had expanded our programs through the treasury branch system and improved that system, we would have had the kind of one-stop shopping system the minister talks about here in one of the points he wants to explore. But this is 1984. Where was the government in 1975 and 1976?

Where was the government when we came in with the idea of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund? That was a golden opportunity to attach if not all at least a part of that surplus we had in the trust fund — certainly a good portion of the money earmarked in the so-called Alberta investment division could have been funnelled through the treasury branch system, rather than buying AGT notes, Alberta Housing notes, or some of these other notes of Crown corporations which had the financial capacity, with the province behind them, to borrow on the money markets and get excellent interest rates. But instead of using our treasury branch system to expand the capital for little people in the province and have some confidence in them, what we did, Mr. Chairman, was to lock farmers, small-business people, even smaller companies, into interest rates from banks that, frankly, are now extracting their pound of flesh.

I don't blame a banker who wants to become the president of a bank for moving quickly to make sure he's there to protect

the interests of the bank. I've cited examples already in this House — I'm not going to do so again — of people who've been sold out so the bank can recover the investment, the loans. But in the process, people have lost everything. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that part of the problem is that we have gotten all kinds of people into a circumstance in which there is very little hope.

I just add one other comment. For the last few months, we have had a slight respite in interest rates. But with the situation south of the border, does any member of this committee seriously think that once the presidential election is out of the way and the congressional election is finished, we are not going to see interest rates start to move up? What is tight money, which had such a major impact on an economy that had no limit to its boom, going to do to an economy that is now seriously in recession? It might be that circumstances in the Middle East, some kind of grave international tragedy, would force up the price of oil and rescue this government from its lack of planning. But I don't think anyone in the world would want that kind of thing to happen, even if we in this province were the beneficiaries of it in the short run. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the estimates of the Provincial Treasurer, I think it's incumbent on the government to give us some sort of indication as to what strategy, other than pious platitudes, more of the same, and playing with figures — the kind of comments we've had from the Provincial Treasurer to date — where this government proposes to go in the future.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, because I know that other members of the opposition and other members of the committee as well wish to participate, I say that at this juncture I have seen no evidence that this government is prepared to aggressively tackle the issues of economic slowdown. I think one of the reasons the minister's federal confreres are now in a little bit of trouble, that the sheen has gone off Mulroney and the boys, is that Canadians are looking at the track record of provincial Tory governments. And the more they look, the less happy they are about the prospect of putting the Tories into government in Ottawa. I suspect that the very best thing going for Turner is not the fact that he's a new figure around the national scene. It's that we've got all these Tory governments doing incredibly foolish things that, step by step, are causing people who were otherwise about ready to throw the federal Liberal rascals out to say: well, just a moment; if that means putting in the kind of economic policies the provincial Tories have adopted, maybe we'll stick with the devil we know rather than the Mulroney machine.

Mr. Chairman, with those words of positive encouragement, as always ... [interjections] I always like to encourage government members and stimulate their thought processes, especially the Minister of Advanced Education across the way. I might digress for just a moment with the minister of education. I don't usually comment on newspaper observations, but I thought there was a beautiful cartoon in the *Herald* on Sunday — that I almost meant to send to the Minister of Advanced Education — of a beautiful picture of Mount Allan and a big white elephant skiing down it. I thought it was really a classic cartoon. That Mount Allan white elephant might in fact become a sort of mascot of this session of the Legislature, if we could have a mascot for a particular session.

But that's the sort of thing — we get members in the back saying, let's go ahead because we'll create some jobs. People who want jobs by public-sector expansion aren't talking about white elephants like Mount Allan. They're talking about roads and railway links, for example — the kinds of things that have a direct relationship to building an infrastructure that will make us competitive in the future. They're talking about the sort of

agenda of public works that I've seen even this government advance from time to time. But they head for the hills when it comes time to do anything about it. Instead we get frivolous expenditures which are just wasting the taxpayers' money rather than creating long-term employment.

Mr. Chairman, with those remarks I look forward to the rest of the debate.

MR. MARTIN: It's my turn. I know all hon. members are excited that we're continuing with this debate. I don't want to belabour the point, but I think the hon. Treasurer and the Minister of Advanced Education would like us to continue along somewhat similar themes as the Member for Little Bow and the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Maybe we still feel a little bitter about the 1982 election, when everybody was called the knockers and the doers, when we didn't see the economy in precisely the same rosy way the government did. Maybe they were very successful. As we look around the House, we can certainly see that. But maybe we feel that they weren't entirely giving us the facts in that election. Maybe that smarts a little bit, Mr. Chairman, as we sit through what has happened in the two years after the election.

I really admire the hon. Treasurer. I think we're going to have to call him the minister of optimism, because every time I see him he's sunny and saying things are going well — just around the corner. After each Conference Board report comes up — where they were always right the time before — the hon. Treasurer says: it's just around the corner; they're wrong this time. The next one comes up, and it's "just around the corner". I really admire his perseverance and hanging in there, making the best of a bad situation. I certainly give him that. Every time I see him on television, I'm ready to run out and talk to the unemployed in the riding and say: tomorrow you're going to have a job; the hon. Provincial Treasurer said things are going to get better. But unfortunately I'm waiting for that case.

The minister again may take all the figures he wants. In question period the other day, I was rather interested in his interpretation of the latest quarterly forecast from the Conference Board, when he said British Columbia and Alberta are leading the way. When I look at it, it says clearly:

The Conference Board's latest Quarterly Provincial Forecast indicates that Alberta will show no economic expansion in 1984 and British Columbia very little, while other provinces will continue to recover from the 1981-82 recession.

I must admit, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Treasurer's interpretation of that was a little different from mine. Maybe what the Treasurer meant was that we were leading the nation into poverty. That's the only interpretation I can make.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues have gone into much of the forecasting — it's wrong. I think what is happening, and it's serious — we've talked about unemployment in this Legislature, and I know that some hon. members may be sick of hearing about it. But the fact remains that it is serious. I know the hon. Treasurer knows that. We can't just ignore it and talk about participation rates and all the rest of it when we see the latest unemployment figures of over 12 percent in this province. In the two major cities it's going up, to 13.1 percent in Calgary and 14.3 percent in the city of Edmonton, which both the Treasurer and I represent. I know that in my riding, I'm seeing a lot of desperation. We're getting a lot of cases. I don't know what's happening — his riding may be a little more prosperous than mine. But I certainly see the brunt of what is happening out there, and it is not pretty. People are losing confidence.

Like the hon. Member for Little Bow, I suggest that if we said okay, things are difficult, we understand, we made mis-

takes ... This government made mistakes; the Treasurer can't deny that. They've been in power for the last number of years. Nobody else has been there. But now, here's a new plan. We keep hearing about an economic resurgence plan coming sometime in the future, and we keep hearing that the private sector is going to pull us out. But we don't see any particular measures. Well, I should be fair; there was one announced yesterday by the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, but it's just a very small project. It's not going to really turn it around. We don't see anything laid out that would give people hope.

The hon. Treasurer says the private sector is the engine of recovery. As nearly as I can tell — and I think he's being told by business people; I certainly am — people are not going to invest in this province right now, especially when we haven't got a diversified economy and the price of oil is at least stabilized. My colleague has talked about events in the Middle East that could change that — unfortunate events, I think we would all agree. But at this point, that's the scenario. They're not investing. Investor dollars are not coming into this province, so we face serious difficulties. I think the people are saying: okay, let's recognize it, but what are we going to do now; lay out a program for us that will give us some hope.

It's not good enough for the Treasurer to just go around saying hang on, because a lot of people have been hanging on since the election and before. They are losing hope. Besides the investors, if you get a growing group of unemployed people that continue to lose hope — and I've talked about this many times — what are we going to pick up in the future? I can say to the hon. Treasurer that that is happening. There is a lot of anger out there, anger that's not particularly healthy. If the government's not hearing that, they're just not listening. When you hear from groups as diverse as the people I've talked to, yesterday from farmers who are from generally Conservative parts of the province — and I daresay overwhelmingly voted Conservative; at least that's what they told me — they're saying that they won't hang on until the fall. I said we'd look at some sort of legislation and try to bring it back to the government. They're saying it's so desperate that they won't be around for the fall. I asked the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the hon. Treasurer what they're going to do about it; it seems nothing. That's what has people angry. They can understand that we are in a recession. But they're looking for some hope, and that hope is just not coming anywhere.

The point we try to make to the government is, where is that economic resurgence plan? I've heard about it for a long time, but it keeps being put on the burner. I ask that as a general question. I'm sure the hon. Treasurer is part of the group that is dealing with an economic resurgence plan. When might we hear about that economic resurgence plan? Is it going to be tabled in this Legislature before we shut down for the spring? Because the longer we wait — and my other question is, are they looking at immediate things? It's all right to talk about the future, and we should be doing that. This government has never done that. We've never had an economic plan, and we've talked about that. But people want some answers right now, Mr. Chairman. Is part of that economic resurgence plan going to deal with some of the immediate problems people are facing, as witnessed by bankruptcies of small business and farms, the unemployment rate, and everything else. The hon. Treasurer may say things are going to get better, but people no longer believe that.

When you have the Conference Board, which the government swore to before, when things were good ...

MR. NOTLEY: Now they're swearing at it.

MR. MARTIN: Now they deny that it even exists. Again, I notice in the latest report that they're saying there will be another 1 percent increase in the unemployment rate in the future. It's not good enough for the Treasurer or any other ministers of government to say, look at the participation rate. That means nothing to people. It doesn't mean anything to an unemployed person out there that's desperately trying to get work and wants to get work. It doesn't mean anything to them. What it really means is that we probably have a younger group of people . . .

MR. NOTLEY: More urbanized.

MR. MARTIN: . . . a younger population that is basically more urbanized, as my colleague says. That's all that means. It doesn't mean anything to the person who has no job now and is looking for hope. There are a lot of people, ranging right up in the age groups. But young people are certainly heavily hit, and we've talked about that in this Legislature from time to time. When they start to lose hope, you're going to see ugly scenes like we saw last night, for any excuse at all, whether it be the Oilers winning or whatever. You'll see more of these types of things happening. It's happening in Britain; we've talked about it.

The point I'm trying to make to the hon. Treasurer, as clearly as I can, is that the time for action is now. Even if you believe philosophically, as the Treasurer does, that the private sector is the engine of recovery, what are we doing to stimulate that engine of recovery? What are we doing to give people hope? We of course have advocated a mixed economy. But if the Treasurer wants to reject that philosophically, I want to know specifically what we are doing to get that recovery going — not talk about generalities, about the good times rolling again, just hang on, and pulling out other figures here or there or some report he had commissioned. It doesn't mean anything, Mr. Chairman. At this time it doesn't mean anything to people at all.

Again to the Treasurer, I want to hear some more about this economic resurgence plan. Is it going to be tabled in the Legislature in this session, because we have an emergency out there right now, and is it going to deal specifically with short-term measures that we can get on with as well as long-term measures in terms of what's good for the province in the future? I hope it does have some particular answers.

The other comment I have specifically for the Treasurer has to do with the treasury branches. When I asked yesterday if the Treasurer would perhaps look at a moratorium on some debts, to give some breathing space so a lot of small-business people and specifically farmers wouldn't go bankrupt, he said nobody will lend money. I would remind the Treasurer that we have direct connections to treasury branches and to the ADC. We have some control over it.

I just remind the hon. Treasurer of the experiment that was in for a limited period in Saskatchewan. That's all I was asking about. I recognize that over a long period of time there could be difficulties. But in the short run in Saskatchewan, I remind the Treasurer that total farm credit rose by 4.8 percent from 1971 to '72 and by 13.5 percent from '72 to '73. Admittedly a lot of that was government; over half of it was government. But more significantly, Mr. Chairman, farm credit from banks, credit unions, and trust companies rose by 10.7 percent from 1971 to '72 and 28.8 percent from '72 to '73.

I say to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that these banks want to do business in this province. They're not going to take on the government over a short-term measure. I'm not sure they know what they can do with all the farms and land they own

now. So hopefully, with the clout of the Treasurer, they're not going to play games like that. That's precisely what the Treasurer is in power for. That's part of his responsibility. But if we don't want to go in that direction and it's as desperate as I'm told for a number of small businesses and farms, what's the alternative? Are we going to say good-bye, too bad, that's the way the free-enterprise system works, tough luck. I don't think that's good enough, and I don't think that's what people want from this government.

Besides questions on the economic resurgence plan, Mr. Chairman, the last comment has to do specifically with the Auditor General's report for the year ended March 31, 1982. Rather than go through the recommendations, I remember that in Public Accounts the Treasurer said that at some point he would respond to these recommendations. My question is a simple one. When might we get some idea of when the Treasurer will respond to the recommendations in the Auditor General's report, so we can take a look at those responses and make sure they're adequate? Will it be in the spring, the summer, the fall, or how soon?

With those few comments, Mr. Chairman, I leave it with the Provincial Treasurer and wait for his remarks on the economy.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the Provincial Treasurer like to respond, or are there other members?

DR. BUCK: I'd like to. Of course we can go back and forth all day if we want to, Mr. Chairman.

I know the Provincial Treasurer will look at some of the points that have been made. But I would like to bring one or two matters to the minister's attention. Several weeks ago when I was away, I was down in eastern Canada speaking to members of the Ontario and Quebec departments of small business development and tourism. I know it's common practice for governments to find out what's going on in other jurisdictions, but I feel that this government is getting so tired that they don't think they need any advice. I think most of the information I received was from the Quebec government. After the emergence of the PQ government, when so many corporate headquarters left that province, the government in its wisdom decided it had better do something about replacing with small businesses some of the large institutions that had moved their headquarters. Mr. Chairman, to the Treasurer, that province has certainly taken an aggressive step in encouraging small business.

[Mr. Hiebert in the Chair]

We are now in the process of looking at some of the programs and hopefully, before the next election, our package is going to be much more attractive than that of the tired old government we have in the Assembly at this time. We want to pay more than lip service to the fact that someone has to do something for small business.

It's great to bring in a 13 percent personal income tax. That's really helping small businesses, especially when some of them are just starting to turn the corner and hoping to see some daylight, so you hammer them between the eyes with this 13 percent tax. What that does is take 13 percent out of the pocket of the private sector and give it to the government. I've never seen any government spend funds more frugally or more wisely than the people in the private sector. Even though the Provincial Treasurer — sometimes I like to call him Mandrake the Magician, because he's juggling one account against the other and trying to tell us how great we in this province

are supposed to feel about all the great things that are happening. I'd like to say that it would be an airfare well spent if the Provincial Treasurer and the Minister of Tourism and Small Business went to Quebec and talked to those people to find out what you can really do to stimulate the small-business sector.

It's not good enough anymore to say that happy days are just around the corner. The Provincial Treasurer must really lead a sheltered life, or else he's got all the rich people in his constituency, because when the Member for Little Bow challenged the Provincial Treasurer to go knock on doors of small businesses in his constituency — he would certainly get different information than he's trying to tell the people of Alberta. If he were reflecting the thinking of that small-business sector, he may be a little bit more pessimistic than he is.

Of course politicians, after they've been in government for too long, become administrators. They stop being politicians. They stop listening to what's going on. That happened to the previous government, and that is happening, in a much hurried-up form, with this government. Mr. Chairman, the people in this province are starting to tell this government that it's time for a change. You can't go to a social function, you can't even go to a funeral, without people coming up to you and saying it's time to get rid of this government. I don't care how sophisticated the polls of this rich Tory party are, their sophisticated polls are telling them they're getting into trouble. It doesn't matter if you have a thousand of your hard-core, rich friends out to a banquet to hear the Premier speak, extracting \$250 from each of those thousand pockets. You are speaking to the exclusive Tory club; you are not speaking to the people who get you in and out of government. Right now, Mr. Treasurer, I'm finding that there are more wanting to get you out than to keep you in. So I'm giving the government that friendly bit of advice, that they had better — and laughing boy back there from Edmonton Belmont may be back being a full-time teacher a lot sooner than he thinks. As pointedly as I can, I'm just trying to indicate that there's a lot more trouble out there than this government thinks.

Mr. Chairman, I would again like to give some advice to the Provincial Treasurer and the minister responsible for tourism. We are taking tourism in this province for granted. I don't think we deserve the tourists we get in this province. Where is there an institution like the one I toured in Montreal? In a 10-storey building, they graduate 3,500 graduates from a school teaching everything from how to be a busboy to running one of the largest hotels on the continent. What do we have in Alberta? Where is the initiative? The other evening we met with the hoteliers and restaurant people. I said the initiative in Quebec came not from the government; they were pushed into the program by the restaurant and hotel people. That same theme was told to us at that dinner last week: we're willing to help the government. Certainly we have programs at NAIT and SAIT that teach some of those things — but some co-ordination. Make it a profession. Get involved.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell a brief story. Last summer my wife and I were golfing at Banff. We were in a foursome with a couple from New Jersey. First of all, these people rented two sets of clubs and a power cart, paid their green fees, and the bill came pretty close to \$100. After we finished our game of golf — the gentleman was a little bit older and he'd had a minor operation — we dropped our carts off, left the clubs in the cart, and went up to replace the fluids we'd lost on that hot day. The young man at the pro shop said, where are the clubs? Before the little gentleman from New Jersey could answer, I said they were down in the cart. The kid said, you're supposed to bring them up. The gentleman said, yes, yes, I'll go get them. I said, that's okay, we'll get them later. The point I'm

trying to make is that this so-called business doesn't seem to appreciate the fact that these people have spent \$100. They're not being unreasonable. We're not treating them like we appreciate the fact that they've spent \$100. What we're saying to them is: Yankee go home; we don't want you. I know how long that young man would have worked for me. The first time somebody brought that to my attention, he'd be history.

We did go up to supplement our dehydrated condition. The young man, quite obviously a university student, asked, what would you like, sir? So we ordered four soda pop, and because it was such a hot day, that first one went down quite quickly. I guess the other gentleman and I must have swung more times than our wives did, because we wanted another round. The waiter came and replaced those two drinks and didn't ask the ladies if they wanted anything. So when I picked up the bill, I said, young man, here's 10 cents for your tip. He looked at me and said, do you think you can afford it? I said, I'm being overly generous with you for the service you gave us.

The point I'm trying to make is that we've got a golden opportunity in this province to attract people from south of the 49th. But we've got to realize that the customer is right. We've got to do something to encourage him to come back. The next day, we golfed with a younger couple from Los Angeles. Those people will never come back either, because their story of the service they received in Banff was just about that dismal. There are four people who will never come back to Alberta because the service was so bad.

Mr. Chairman, I am standing in my place and telling the Treasurer that that is \$200 just in green fees, plus their accommodation. Alberta will never see that kind of revenue from those four people. You go down to the United States, you sit down, and before you can even open your mouth, the gal says, would you-all like a cup of coffee? You go into a golf club, and before you step in the door, they say, did you-all have a good game of golf? A completely different attitude. They appreciate the fact that you're in their country. They want you to have a good time, and they hope you'll come back. But in good old Alberta, it seems that if we've got you here, you're so lucky to be here spending you're money that if you don't come back, it doesn't matter.

MR. ALEXANDER: Not in Kananaskis.

DR. BUCK: Not in Kananaskis. I hope not. I'm worried about Kananaskis, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud. With Kananaskis and Mount Allan, I don't know where we're going to attract more bodies into the province so Banff, Lake Louise, and the white elephant known as Mount Allan can make a living. If those three facilities are going to split the same number of golfers and curlers we have at present, all three of them are going to go broke. The only difference, hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud, is that that is taxpayers' money we're playing with down at Kananaskis, old buddy, not private money like we've got in Banff and Lake Louise, where the private entrepreneur has put his money on the line. Now he's having to compete with his own tax dollars. If he goes broke, brother, he's gone. We'll just keep pouring more money into Kananaskis Country and the brown elephant known as Mount Allan. There's a big difference between going broke if you're a private entrepreneur and if you're a government entrepreneur.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken to people in the road construction business. I used to attend their little annual golf tournament. More and more of these people have discontinued belonging to the roadbuilders. They're finding that they just can't afford the \$1,500 or \$5,000 a year anymore. When you

speak to some of these people, the bids are so competitive that they are bidding to keep some cash flow going and losing 20 or 30 percent. You can't keep doing that forever. Only provincial and federal governments can keep going that way in a deficit position. Even this government can't keep going forever, because they're just digging into the old cookie jar known as the heritage trust fund. For all intents and purposes, at the present rate we could spend that thing in about five years, and it would be long gone. It would be history.

There are some problems out there, Mr. Treasurer, and you had better recognize them. Because if you don't do something about them, the people are going to do it for you in two years. I'm optimistic that they are going to do that for you. They're going to help out. They know this government is getting tired. They know they've been had in the last couple of elections. They're sick and tired of these slick elections where the government or the PC Party tells you one thing and does another.

We're still waiting for this economic resurgence. Everything was so optimistic before the '82 election. If it was so optimistic, why didn't they wait till the spring? The hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont knows why they didn't wait till the spring: the old polls were telling them that she's just on the old slide down; you'd better call it quickly, because you may lose 25 seats. It's too bad we don't have a statutory term, because we'd have 25 people on this side of the House if the election had been called about the middle of June of the next year.

It's fine for these Tories to be looking forward to their big, fat pensions. Of course half of them are cabinet ministers. There's another thing, Mr. Treasurer. If you really want to save some money, get rid of 10 departments. If you want to know which ones, I'll be glad to sit down with you over a cup of coffee and tell you which ones you could get rid of. All it's doing is solving the Premier's problem, that he's got 10 backbenchers who are now frontbenchers. Every time you open one of those departments, it costs the taxpayers a minimum of a \$1 million just in support staff and so forth. So you could save \$10 million right there.

Of course if you had all these people in the back benches, you would have a mutiny for sure, because instead of having one question a month in caucus, you'd have one question every other month. There's the old story about all the fighting going on in caucus. That's a bunch of poppycock, and we know that. Anybody who has sat in a large government caucus knows that if you just divide the number of members into the number of hours you have for caucus, you get one question every second month.

On the question of agriculture, Mr. Chairman. I guess the reason I've survived the last three massacres, known as provincial elections, is that I try to be in contact with my people. In all the years I've been in this Legislature, I've never seen as much concern in the agricultural sector as there is at this time. People are almost dazed, wondering about how much fertilizer to buy this year: can I afford to buy fertilizer; I know I can't afford not to, but can I afford to buy it? So a lot of them are cutting back. If they should be putting X number of pounds of fertilizer per acre, they may be cutting that back two-thirds or three-quarters. Because you just don't know: if it happens to be a particularly dry year, that's money you put into the ground that you have no hope of getting back. The concern in the agricultural sector is very, very grave.

At a social function just four nights ago, somebody said: who is the Minister of Agriculture; I've never heard of the guy. It's too bad the hon. minister isn't here, because that's not meant to be derogatory. This man, who is only indirectly asso-

ciated with agriculture, hadn't ever heard of the guy. So, to the Provincial Treasurer, agriculture is in bad shape.

Today on the news, we're talking about a \$3 to \$5 per hour rollback in wages in the meat-packing business. We all know the meat-packing business has some problems, and there's going to have to be some rationalization. Rationalization is a polite, bureaucratic way of saying you have to chop a lot of people. I know that competitively, this rationalization has to happen. But what are we going to do? Where are we going to put those people that are going to be rationalized? Of course the term they use in the United Kingdom is "redundancy". If you don't need that many people, you get chopped; that's a redundancy, a reduction. Mr. Chairman, to the Provincial Treasurer, as plainly as I can make it: there are problems out there. We're looking forward to this economic resurgence program. It's fine to make these statements, but something has to be done.

I mentioned the roadbuilders. Some of the contracts being bid for provincial jobs are so low that many of these people have gone to their financial institutions and said, do you want to run the bulldozer or do you want me to run the bulldozer? The lending institutions are going to have to make that decision pretty soon, because they're going to be doing a lot of the farming and roadbuilding and running a lot of businesses. My philosophy has always been that I know how to fix teeth better than the bank does. The bank's business is to lend money at an interest rate. So far, we've gotten along pretty well, because we understand each other: my business is to fix teeth; their business is to lend money. But if the small-business man is in the position where he needs a longer term, I think it's just about time that the Provincial Treasurer and Premier sat down with our banking people and said, maybe you bankers had better have a look at longer terms than what we have.

I am optimistic, the same way the Provincial Treasurer is, that Alberta's got a great future. I think it's still got one of the best futures in the country. In Ontario things are booming a little bit now, because the car business has come back. I think there's going to be a rationalization in the car business, because I'm getting sick and tired of driving that American junk. Mr. Chairman, I have said I have not bought a foreign car because it means some people in Canada would not have a job. But I'm sick and tired of having to buy insurance for their junk.

I want to tell the Provincial Treasurer a story. I hadn't driven Fords for many, many years. I drove other products. But I bought a Ford, and I got this "Dear Mr. Buck" letter: we are so pleased that you have joined the happy family of Ford customers; for \$485 you can take out an extended warranty. I thought, what is this? So I wrote them a "Dear John" letter back, because they asked for my comments as a member of this happy Ford family.

I said: Dear Sir, how things have changed in the last decade since I bought my last Ford. The reason I bought that Ford 10 years ago is that you people said you had a 50,000-mile power train warranty. Our car is superior to the other products; you buy ours and it will last all that time; we guarantee it. Now, in 10 years, you have asked me to insure your inferior workmanship. Something has to be wrong. I have not bought a foreign car, but this may be the straw that breaks the camel's back.

Of course that got a reply, which said: Dear Mr. Buck, thank you for showing your concern, et cetera, et cetera. I threw it in the garbage. But now we see that Ford keeps advertising — Ford tough, we're proud of our product. So maybe the North American car manufacturer is finally waking up to the fact that if he doesn't get his act together, he's not going to be around very long. In Ontario of course, the buoyant car

industry has certainly helped raise the economy of their province.

Mr. Chairman, there are a few humps and bumps that will occur in this province. But let's hope the downturns are not so severe that when we start on the road back up, there's nobody to start pulling it up. I know that when the Provincial Treasurer sits around with his colleagues looking at spending priorities — where do you cut? If there's any major criticism I can level at this government, it's that this government set up too many programs in the 12 years it's been in power. Now it is paying the price of having too many programs.

We were honouring the late Dr. Ross. If he had still been the minister of hospitals, I can tell you we wouldn't have these 10-bed hospitals in this province. That was a response to a political situation; it wasn't a response to provide better health care for our people. In this day and age, most people drive 25 to 35 miles twice a week to go curling. So you jump in the car and take your person to a regional hospital. That would have been a better rationalization, a better utilization of the taxpayers' money, because some of these small hospitals still don't have doctors and may never have doctors.

This government has run a pretty loose operation. There were hundreds of millions of dollars they could squander, but now when they squander just \$25 million more on Mount Allan in Kananaskis.

MR. JOHNSTON: You're opposed to it too?

DR. BUCK: Mount Allan? I certainly am. I think history will prove that we were right and our concerns were right. I don't think I'm an expert, but the people that seem to think they know . . .

MR. DIACHUK: You used the word "seem".

DR. BUCK: Seem to know. Of course this government's philosophy is that the more money you pour in there — you're going to cover 284 acres of land with artificial snow. That's got to be utter nonsense, when there are mountains in this province that have bloody snow that comes from up above.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where?

DR. BUCK: Where? First of all, Lake Louise has it. We wouldn't have to spend any money. [interjection] Johnston, you as an accountant . . . I beg your pardon. Mr. Chairman. The hon. minister, who is an accountant — I'm glad he's not my accountant. If that's the way he looks after somebody's money, I'm sure glad he's retired from the accounting business and gone into politics.

Mr. Chairman. I just want to end on one other note. We talk about this government's forward thinking. Under the E.C. Manning government, there were five-year plans and white papers. There was initiative. There was some looking down the road. But this government just seems to bounce from crisis to crisis. Crisis management government is what it is. It's getting more difficult to be crisis managers, because the pot's getting a little dry. Anybody can operate when there's a lot of money around, but we're going to see if this is a government of statesmen or a government that just had too much money and didn't know how to handle it. That's why everybody in Alberta is looking at this government now and scrutinizing it much more than they ever did before. Mr. Chairman, I'm on my way down south to do everything I can to make sure this government is replaced in two years.

Mr. Chairman, on that note I would like to adjourn the debate.

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

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

[Mr. Hiebert in the Chair]

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Committee of the Whole Assembly will now come to order.

Bill 1 **Students Loan Guarantee** **Amendment Act, 1984**

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any section of this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Premier, I move that Bill No. 1, the Students Loan Guarantee Amendment Act, 1984, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 2 **Agricultural Chemicals** **Amendment Act, 1984**

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any section of this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman. I move that Bill No. 2, the Agricultural Chemicals Amendment Act, 1984, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 3**Emblems of Alberta Amendment Act, 1984**

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any section of this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. TOPOLNISKY: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 3, Emblems of Alberta Amendment Act, 1984, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 4**Municipal Land Loans Repeal Act**

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments with respect to [any] section of this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Municipal Land Loans Repeal Act be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 7**Attorney General Statutes
Amendment Act, 1984**

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

[Motion on amendment carried]

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments concerning the Bill as amended?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 7 be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 9**Senior Citizens Housing
Amendment Act, 1984**

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any section of this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. ALGER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 9 be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 10**Fur Farms Amendment Act, 1984**

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 10, Fur Farms Amendment Act, 1984, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 11**Municipal Financing Statutes
Amendment Act, 1984**

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Two amendments have been circulated. Are there any questions or comments with regard to the first amendment, circulated May 8?

[Motion on amendment carried]

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments with regard to the second amendment, circulated May 23?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Chairman, just a brief sentence or two on the second amendment. Members will recall the debate during the course of second reading of Bill 11. In response to certain concerns enunciated by the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association, the amendment we are now speaking to has been submitted for the approval of members of this committee, with the idea that the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association would have the opportunity to provide political input to the decision that would ultimately be made by the Local Authorities Board relative to borrowing limits which might be imposed on municipalities. The amendment would see that those borrowing limits would not be determined solely by an appointed board but would require the approval of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and, in that process, would permit political involvement by the AUMA and interested municipalities.

[Motion on amendment carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my colleague Mr. Musgrove, I move that Bill 11, the Municipal Financing Statutes Amendment Act, 1984, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 12**Co-operative Marketing Associations
and Rural Utilities Guarantee
Amendment Act, 1984**

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MRS. CRIPPS: On behalf of my colleague the Hon. Bob Bogle, I move that Bill No. 12, Co-operative Marketing Associations and Rural Utilities Guarantee Amendment Act, 1984, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 14
Pipeline Amendment Act, 1984

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any comments, questions, or amendments with respect to this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 14 be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 15
Agricultural Pests Act

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment. Are there any comments or questions concerning the amendment?

[Motion on amendment carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 15, the Agricultural Pests Act, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 16
Stray Animals Amendment Act, 1984

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Bill 16, Stray Animals Amendment Act, 1984, with an amendment. Are there any comments or questions with regard to the amendment?

[Motion on amendment carried]

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments or questions regarding the Bill as amended?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 16, Stray Animals Amendment Act, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 17
Cancer Programs Amendment Act, 1984

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments with regard to this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. WOO: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 17, the Cancer Programs Amendment Act, 1984, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 18
Department of Energy and
Natural Resources Amendment Act, 1984

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 18, Department of Energy and Natural Resources Amendment Act, 1984, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 21
Insurance Amendment Act, 1984

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any comments, questions, or amendments with respect to this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would someone like to move the report?

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the minister, I would like to move that Bill No. 21, Insurance Amendment Act, 1984, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 30
Queen's Counsel Amendment Act, 1984

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments with respect to this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 30 be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 31
Financial Administration
Amendment Act, 1984

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment to Bill 31. Are there any comments or questions with regard to the amendment?

[Motion on amendment carried]

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any comments or questions with regard to the Bill as amended?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would someone like to move the report of this Bill?

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 31, the Financial Administration Amendment Act, 1984, be reported.

MR. CRAWFORD: As amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 32
Government Land Purchases
Amendment Act, 1984

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments with respect to this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 32 be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 33
Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund
Amendment Act, 1984

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments with respect to this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 33, the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Amendment Act, 1984, be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 34
Corporation Statutes Amendment Act, 1984

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments with regard to this Bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the minister, Mrs. Osterman, I move that Bill No. 34, Corporation Statutes Amendment Act, be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Bill 35, Child Welfare Act. There was an amendment circulated. Are there any questions or comments with regard to the amendment?

MR. CRAWFORD: Which one did you call?

MR. ACTING DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Bill 35.

MR. CRAWFORD: I'm sorry, it's being held.

Mr. Chairman, I've just taken note of the time and move that the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair]

MR. HIEBERT: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration and reports Bills 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 12, 14, 17, 18, 21, 30, 32, 33, and 34, and reports Bills 7, 11, 15, 16, and 31 with some amendments.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the report, are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Assembly will sit tomorrow evening in Committee of Supply, proposing to start at 8 o'clock with the estimates of the Legislative Assembly; following that, a selection of departments which have previously been called but not concluded, starting with Treasury, and if there's time after that, Municipal Affairs, Energy and Natural Resources, and Education.

[At 5:31 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 4, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]

