

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Friday, May 12th, 1972

(The House met at 2:30 pm.)

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

NOTICES OF MOTION

DR. MCCORMON:

Mr. Speaker, I hereby give notice that on Monday, May 15th I will move, seconded by the hon. member Mr. Chambers, that the following report of the second meeting of the committee on Public Affairs, Agriculture, and Education be received and concurred in.

"The committee recommends that this Assembly do stand adjourned from 5:30 o'clock p.m. on Friday, May 19th, 1972 until 2:30 o'clock p.m. on Monday, May 29, 1972, unless the committee earlier concludes the said hearings or moves to request the Assembly to reconvene."

Mr. Speaker, the hearings will be conducted on May 23, 24, 25, 26, 1972 from 9:00 a.m. to noon; 2:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. and 8:00 p.m. to 10:30 p.m.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 83: The Mental Health Act, 1972

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being The Mental Health Act, 1972.

Mr. Speaker, the principle of this bill is in accordance with the intent to provide an improved quality of mental health services for the people of Alberta with greater speed and availability throughout the province, than has been the case in the past. In doing this, the act increases the protection of rights of individual patients as well as the safety of the public.

The act will achieve its aims with a number of innovations as well as by the retention of some provisions of The Mental Health Act, 1964. The prompt delivery of service, particularly in rural areas, requires the use of greater numbers of workers in the community. The act facilitates this by recognizing more non-medical personnel, such as psychologists, social workers, and nurses, as having partial powers of committal and the responsibility for therapy. Licensing of such personnel will be granted by a licensing board and therapeutic responsibilities will be dependent upon the admission procedures of the facility in which the treatment is being carried out.

The act is, therefore, recognizing the contribution which can be made to mental health services by those who have been well trained in the behavioural sciences. Admission of a committed patient to the facility will require examination by two therapists, one of whom must

49-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

be a physician and one of whom may be a non-medical person. The procedure of informal admission is now brought into line with the admission procedures of general hospitals and a waiting period of 72 hours can no longer be enforced if the person wishes to leave against advice.

Community care will be encouraged in urging acceptance by general hospital units of the responsibility of caring for the committed patient. The definition of 'mental health facility' does not contain any reference to mental hospitals. Regionalization of mental health services is envisaged with the creation of regional advisory councils. Decentralization of services will be encouraged by this provision and will allow services to respond in a sensitive manner to local needs. A wider contribution to the planning and development of mental health services is also encouraged by a provision to establish a provincial mental health advisory council which will consist of professionals and others.

The protection of patient rights is enhanced and secured by several methods. The review procedure, whereby complaints against detention are heard, has been retained with little alteration from the previous act, although access to this process is now possible at more frequent intervals.

The Mental Health Act will now require that patients be made aware of their rights in writing in plain language, utilizing an interpreter if a language difficulty is encountered.

Censorship of communication by patients is banned by the act and restrictions on visiting are minimized. Periods for which patients can be detained are, in general, reduced, and a greater onus is placed upon facilities to provide a prompt examination. The act provides an alternative to the lengthy detention of persons remanded for psychiatric examination, after being charged with an offence, in that there is to be provision for out-patient examination of these persons. Provisions for detention of patients under the Criminal Code of Canada remain unchanged. Public safety is safeguarded by retention of those sections of the previous legislation which allow a peace officer to conduct a person to a facility for examination, and which allow persons to lay information to the effect that a person is mentally ill before a judge who may order examination.

No important innovations have been made in the sections dealing with administration. The act will rely on regulations governed by the intent of the proposed legislation. The regulations are being formulated at the present time in draft form, with the advice and assistance of an advisory group representing the major agencies and active occupational groups in the mental health field.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 83 was introduced and read a first time]

Bill No. 79 The Alberta Labour Amendment Act, 1972

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I'm anxious to introduce Bill No. 79, being The Alberta Labour Amendment Act, 1972.

The purpose of the bill is to first expand the membership of the Board of Industrial Relations. We will do this by providing each member with an alternate member on the board. The effect of this will be to enable the Board of Industrial Relations to hold at least two times as many hearings in one year, and our experience has been that this is altogether necessary.

Second, it will make provision for an expanded work day, within the regulations of the Board of Industrial Relations, so long as the

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-3

expanded work day is within the total limits of hours per week. We can then envision arrangements with an employer and the Board of Industrial Relations in which the result would be a three or four day week.

The amendments will establish priority of wage claims, Mr. Speaker. That is to say that when an employer has several indebtednesses, and is forced to go out of business, this act will place the matter of employees' wages as number one priority for claims.

Fourthly, the bill will expand the capacity for registration of employers in the construction industry.

Fifth, it will add conditions to the matter of the termination of employment. Mr. Speaker, this will place the fair and proper onus on the employers to give proper notice to employees with respect to possible termination of services. This will relate, in particular, to how long an employee had served a particular company.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 79 was introduced and read a first time]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly students from the constituency of Edmonton Strathcona, who attend the school -- one of the older schools in Edmonton -- that was named after the first premier of this province, Dr. A.C. Rutherford. The students are from Grades V and VI in Rutherford School, and are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Diana Graefe.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the students for taking this afternoon off, coming to this Assembly to watch the democratic process in action, and viewing the proceedings of this House. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the students and Mrs. Graefe stand and receive the acknowledgement of the members of this Assembly.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in introducing a group of junior high students from the constituency of Athabasca to you and to the members of this Assembly. These are from the Dapp Junior High School, Grade IX students, 43 in number who have come a considerable distance today to see our Legislature in action. They are accompanied by the principal of the school, Mr. Frank Gurak, one of the teachers, Mr. John Muzyka, and the bus driver, Mr. Christenson. They are seated in the public gallery. I would ask them to rise now and be recognized by the House.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to beg your leave to introduce to you and to the members of the House, through you, a class of students from the Holy Cross School in the Canora neighbourhood of my constituency, and their teacher, Mrs. Mireau. They are in the members' gallery. I would ask that they rise and be recognized.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

DR. HOFNER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a return ordered by the Legislature.

49-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the 1971 Annual Report of the Public Service Commissioner.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Sugar Marketing

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Taber-Warner, followed by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray.

MR. D. MILLER:

Just a word of explanation before I ask the question. The Ontario Sugar Beet Growers have met recently with the Commons Agriculture Committee, asking for an increased share of the Canadian domestic sugar market. Hon. Minister, my question is, has representation been made recently to the Commons Agriculture Committee for a share of this potential sugar market for the Alberta beet growers?

DR. HCFNER:

Mr. Speaker, when I was in Ottawa I had an opportunity to discuss the matter with the Agricultural Committee or some members of it. We in Alberta of course, are concerned about having a national sugar policy announced by Ottawa. We support the Ontario people in this particular cause. As I have announced before in the House we have, through the good auspices of the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, assisted the sugar producers in Alberta in making presentations to the Tariff Board in Ottawa, which is really the crux of the matter insofar as getting a larger share of the sugar market in Canada for the beet producers in Alberta.

However, we are quite willing to, and will take steps, to be in touch with the chairman of the Commons Agriculture Committee in regard to further input from the sugar industry in Alberta.

MR. D. MILLER:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the hon. minister met with the Alberta sugar beet growers to discuss this opportunity?

DR. HCFNER:

Not as yet, Mr. Speaker, on this particular item. We have met with delegations from the sugar industry in southern Alberta with regard to the tariff items that I have mentioned, but we are quite willing to meet with the sugar beet growers, and would benefit by their advice in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill.

School Construction

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Education, with regard to your recent announcement of freezing the construction of new classrooms in the province -- a policy with which, incidently, I agree. Have you considered Fort

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-5

McMurray as a special case, and are you giving special consideration to their needs?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that the announcement was not that there would be a freeze, but rather that there would be a holding pattern established, a filter in respect to requests.

Certainly there are unique parts of the province that will be given special consideration and I have been spending quite some time in the last few months looking at the possible and present school situation in Ft. McMurray. Certainly at the moment it is difficult to plan school situations by reason of the fact that the future of the whole area has not exactly been determined and will not be for some months ahead. But it is a case where if there are local conditions which are very special, we'll be looking at them and putting them into any decision we make regarding school construction.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary --

DR. ECUVIER:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that there is a real lack of classrooms already in Ft. McMurray and if this means a review of existing conditions -- and I understand, especially the separate school board, is in dire need of construction -- will the minister be prepared to have this review immediately so that it won't hold up classrooms, say for the start in September of the fall school term?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, certainly we would make any decision in review on the basis of trying to ensure that all youngsters will be in school in September. It may well be that there would have to be use on a multiple basis of all the various school facilities whether the location was separate or public to make sure that the highest possible use of available space is there for a temporary period of time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Investment Practice of the WCB

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Labour. Mr. Minister, with regard to the huge reserves of the Workmen's Compensation Board, some \$107 million worth of investment at the end of March, 1971, is all this money invested in Alberta bonds, and is it the practice of the Workmen's Compensation Board to invest the money in Alberta bonds?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the investment practice of the Workmen's Compensation Board is to be guided by the principle of going where the market appears to be the best. On this basis, no place is excluded. In the statements for 1970, a proportion of the investments of the Workmen's Compensation Board was, in fact, in Alberta through places like the Alberta Government Telephones. The

49-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

interest and the principle on these investments is guaranteed by the Province of Alberta.

MR. FARFAN:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that statements for the Workmen's Compensation Board as of March, 1971, show contingency reserves of some \$20 million, would you be carrying out some investigation to look into the possibility that the Workmen's Compensation Board is over-funded?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the Workmen's Compensation Board is an agency that it autonomous, it doesn't report to government as do the departments. Whether this kind of concern would fall within the frame of reference that the legislative Committee would have when it examines the concerns of the Workmen's Compensation Board would be a moot question. Certainly financing is important. I think the Workmen's Compensation Board feels that it has to have a funded capacity in case of unforeseen circumstances when investments are not as effective as they might have been.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. the Attorney General. Is the Attorney General permitting seizures of essential farm machinery and chattels under federal legislation where the farmer refuses to deliver same to the creditor?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I don't have any knowledge of that situation. If the hon. member has and will bring it to my attention either now or outside of the House, I would be happy to look into it and give him an answer.

The Exemptions Act

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. Attorney General aware that where a farmer refuses to deliver up the chattels, and the creditor must go and get the RCMP, that the man is denied the rights of The Exemption Act, and his day in court.

My question would be, would the hon. Attorney-General instruct the RCMP not to accompany creditors under the federal act, and thus force the seizures to be made under provincial legislation, where the farm would have the benefit of The Exemptions Act?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I can't answer the hon. member without first looking at the legislation under which this action is taking place. I think that once I have done that, I would be in a position to give him an answer to the question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-7

School Construction (Cont'd)

MR. LEE:

I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education. This question might be a sort of a supplement to the question from the hon. Member for Port McMurray.

In light of your recently announced policy regarding the temporary suspension of further school construction, is your department considering increased assistance for the use of portable classrooms as a supplement to the busing of children, especially at the elementary level?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, the question of permanent classrooms, portable classrooms, and busing, are all inter-related and the present provincial support of \$12 per square foot for portable classrooms is being reviewed. Certainly, it does seem to me, on an initial review, that the concept we have been following of building structures for school children lasting from 20 to 30 years -- that that method of building, when school populations are rapidly going up or down or, indeed, becoming unpredictable, is a single line of approach which we will not be able to use in future years. Much greater flexibility, be it with portables or with busing or with modular concepts of school construction, will have to be very closely investigated.

MR. LEE:

A supplementary question. In those areas where portables already do exist next to a school, and where there are empty rooms, could these portables be used for community kindergarten activities?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, I believe this is occurring, Mr. Speaker, in a number of locations in Alberta already. Certainly it does raise the question with this excess space, as to whether or not those present and contemplated early childhood programs, might not be able to be carried on in capital facilities already available.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clds-Didsbury, followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Education, and ask him if the Alberta Home and School Association have received their grant for the calendar year that we are now in?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I don't know, Mr. Speaker. I will check that out and inform the House and the association very shortly.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the hon. minister think of any reason why the association would not have received this grant, to this time?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I will check it out, Mr. Speaker.

49-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

MP. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Little Bow, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Senior Citizens' Allowances

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Since the old age assistance and the guaranteed income supplement of Alberta's old age pensioners will be raised to \$82, and \$150 for single, and \$255 for couples, retroactive to January 1st, 1972, a number of our senior citizens will be affected, who are on social allowance. My question is, will the government allow the senior citizens to take advantage of all benefits that are derived from the federal changes?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that that matter came up on an occasion that will allow me to make it abundantly clear that the government has already arrived at a policy on this very recently announced federal budget in that regard. The answer is, that the senior citizens who are on public assistance in some form, who are receiving funds from both the federal and provincial governments, will not lose from provincial funds as a result of the increase in the federal allowance.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's a major change.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Will the minister provide a change in the income level, then, to other recipients on public assistance?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is not anticipated at the present time, but it is a matter that will be under review.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Member for Stony Plain.

Pipeline Conference

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question today to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. A number of weeks ago he announced in the House that it was the government's intention to call together a high level pipeline conference in our province, to do with the major pipelines in our province and also those to the north. Owing to the recent announcement by the American government yesterday on the Trans-Alaska pipeline and the federal government's anxiety to get the Arctic-Mackenzie pipeline going, I wonder if the hon. minister is in a position to tell the House, or indicate to the House, when this conference will be held because it's very urgent at this time?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we followed with considerable interest the news about the pipelines in the Mackenzie valley. We've been

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-9

assessing the news and comments with respect to our proposed pipeline conference and, with that in mind, we've called a special meeting next week to set the date for our proposed pipeline conference.

I think the news in the last few days has certainly emphasised the need for having our pipeline conference. Although there was some disappointment expressed with the U.S. decision, I think we can say in respect to that decision that Interior Secretary Morton did raise three objections, and at this conference we can deal with those three objections. I feel there are answers to those. Of course that's part of our effort to make Alberta the energy corridor of North America. We will be looking to see if we can satisfy those answers.

I would also like to say that although he did make the announcement, there are still obstacles that they face in respect to environment before they finalize their decision. It is our hope that when we do have this conference, if we can come up with the answers, that we will be in a position to take positive steps towards making sure that an oil line does come down.

In addition to that, I would like to tell all the hon. members that it appears, as a result of that decision, it should spur the gas line and the principals involved are optimistic that this may encourage the date to be brought ahead. I think hon. members will recall that we are talking about an application on the gas line sometime in the early part of 1973. As a result of that position it will probably precipitate an application earlier than that time.

MR. DIXON:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. You indicated that you are having the meeting next week. Well, surely the government must have some date in mind that they favour to hold this conference. I'm anxious to find out, because it is urgent and I would like to know just when it's going to be held.

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member raised the question of urgency and that's been our assessment of it, too. We have held off studying the particular date to make sure that we could hold it after the House had completed its session. Therefore I would anticipate that we're going to urge that the conference be held as soon as we can after the sitting of the House, which I anticipate will be in the month of June.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Stony Plain followed by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

Rapeseed Production

MR. PURIY:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture. A noxious weed, cleavers, has been evident in Alberta grain crops for a number of years -- can you inform the House if this is evident in the rape crops?

DR. MCENEE:

Mr. Speaker, cleavers is a common form of annual noxious weed that has been around for a long time. In ordinary small cereal crops it's no problem, but it is a problem in rapeseed. It is really a great advantage to the grower of rapeseed to use certified seed and to follow recommended cultivation practices in regard to summerfallow, etc., to overcome this difficulty.

49-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

MR. FURDY:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. With this weed being evident in rape, has it any detrimental effects on price of market rape?

DR. HCFNER:

Papeseed contaminated by cleavers seed is graded No. 3 Reject, and is substantially lower in price, something like 50 cents to 60 cents lower.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drayton Valley followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

School Boundary Changes

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education. Has your department received any requests from school divisions, or individuals, or groups of people residing in counties or school divisions, for a change in boundaries or attendance areas to make better use of our educational facilities?

MR. HYNEMAN:

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't quite hear all of his question. I wonder if he would repeat it?

MR. ZANDER:

May I repeat, Mr. Speaker. Has your department received any requests from school divisions, or individuals, or groups of people residing in counties or school divisions, for a change in boundaries or attendance areas to make better use of our educational facilities?

MR. HYNEMAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, a number of requests have been received. Certainly the hon. Member for Drayton Valley has brought to my attention on a number of occasions, very forcefully, the concerns of a number of residents in his area. And indeed other parts of the province also have brought this to my attention. It does appear that some very careful consideration very shortly is going to have to be given to the possibility of a new boundaries commission. The last one was in 1955, the boundaries have not changed since that time and I think there is very substantial merit in making such changes as are deemed appropriate, not on a hop-scootch, helter-skelter Band-aid kind of approach, but rather, on an overall approach with a view to coming up with boundaries reflecting the contemporaneous 1972 situation.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Gross National Product

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Are there any studies being done at the provincial or federal level to determine the percentage of gross national product beyond which all levels of government spending combined should not be exceeded, in order to

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-11

assure that the private wealth producing sector can continue to grow and create new and productive job opportunities?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, it's a question with considerable scope involved in it. I'm not aware of the details just offhand, but if the hon. member would like to place that before the House as a Motion for a Return or as a written question, perhaps we would be able to get him all the information he desires.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as the tax revenues of the three levels of government have increased 50 per cent faster than the economy has grown over the past five years, have you discussed this issue in your government-to-government negotiations?

MR. GETTY:

I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, if the exact issue the hon. member is referring to has been discussed in government-to-government negotiations. I do know that many of the factors involved are discussed, not only in government-to-government negotiations, but also in Cabinet deliberations -- but not specifically am I aware of any on this subject.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

International Trade

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Industry. It's reported that Mr. Wenzel, the Director of International Marketing for your department, has completed a tour of Europe and during his visit to Europe had discussions with two major German concerns who are apparently interested in establishing subsidiaries in Alberta. My question to you is, who are these concerns, and what is the size of the operations that they plan to set up in Alberta?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I think, in answer to the hon. member's question, that because it is of a confidential nature yet, it isn't in the best interests to reveal who they are at this time. As the negotiations proceed and are developed and come, we hope, to fruitful conclusions, we will be able to announce it to all.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the hon. minister advise the House whether, in making submissions around the world to bring industry to this province, the government is giving any consideration to imposing a set of 'Alberta first' conditions on foreign capital from other parts of the world, similar in principle to the Syncrude proposition?

MR. PEACOCK:

The answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, is yes. We are certainly relating our concern as Albertans to capital and to people contacted.

49-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands.

Stockyard Development in Calgary

MR. MC LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of the Environment. Are you aware that there was a meeting held last Wednesday, attended by 400 people at the Forest Lawn High School, to protest the stockyard development in northeast Calgary?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I wasn't aware of the meeting.

MR. MC LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In that it is my understanding that the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo has been in touch with the people involved, has he not had occasion to discuss this problem with you?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, we haven't had a discussion on this problem because the problem is one of long standing, and in fact it is a decision that must be made locally. I hope that the local authorities will be making that decision before very long.

MR. MC LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I do appreciate the procedures, but does that preclude the people of this area approaching the hon. Minister of the Environment with their problems?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, it certainly doesn't preclude anybody from coming to me with their problems. I am very pleased to talk to anybody about their problems, and I think I indicated this before. If an organization from that area of the City of Calgary came in to see me, I would be very pleased to discuss the matter with them.

Municipal Planning

MR. GHITTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Mr. Minister, would it be possible to consider amendments to The Planning Act, whereby decisions of municipal bodies could not be brought back before those same municipal bodies within one year from the date thereof, so that the citizens in an area would have some feeling of firmness when decisions are made and so that applicants could not come back willy nilly every year, or 18 months, with the same application again?

MR. FUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the matter that the hon. member has raised is a very important one and, as I have announced earlier in the House, it is this government's intention to bring in a completely new Planning Act in the spring of 1973. In line with that, I have written letters to all the users of the act -- that is all the planning authorities and professional associations throughout the province -- asking them to submit their ideas on any contentious matters, such as the hon. member has suggested. From the response we have had so far, it looks

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-13

like the idea has been enthusiastically received, and I am looking forward to the day when the new act, written by the users, will be introduced.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Caldwell is ready. I regret that I didn't mention his name ahead of time.

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, I believe --

MR. SPEAKER:

. . . sorry, followed by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray.

Sunday Bingo

MR. CHAMBERS:

I have a question for the hon. Attorney General. I would like to ask the hon. minister if there is a change in policy with regard to the permitting of Sunday bingos? By way of explanation, a community league in my constituency has been in the habit of holding Sunday evening bingos. They have recently been refused a permit for any more. The money raised at these bingos finances community activities, in particular, children's sports activities.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is rather complex. I suppose I should begin at the beginning and say that one starts with the proposition that all gambling is unlawful. Some of it is unlawful in the sense that the courts will not enforce a gambling agreement. Other forms of gambling are unlawful in the sense that, if they are engaged in, there will be criminal charges laid. By way of example and explanation of those two statements, if one were to wager on the recent Stanley Cup series, the courts would neither help you to collect your bet or force you to pay it. Whereas, if one were to run a gambling house or engage in bingo, that would be unlawful under the code and charges would be laid.

We then come to the exception, and the exception arises because of a provision passed a year or so ago in the Criminal Code of Canada authorizing the provincial government, and in particular the Attorney General's department, to issue permits for gambling such as lotteries and bingos, providing the organization getting the permit is a religious or charitable organization, and providing that the purpose for which the money will be used is religious or charitable. A community association that raises money by way of a bingo for use of sports within the community -- children's sports -- would be a charitable organization and the purpose would also be charitable. So they would meet those two conditions.

But we then come to the question of whether the bingos are lawful on a Sunday, and that involves some further legislation. The Federal Lord's Day Act generally prohibits commercial activities on Sunday, but there is not a provision in the Federal Lord's Day Act which authorizes the provincial governments to pass an act permitting certain commercial activities on Sunday. The Province of Alberta has such an act which was passed some time ago. It in turn authorizes the local governments -- the municipal governments -- to pass bylaws permitting certain Sunday activities such as football games and so on. The issue then is whether under that legislation -- The Federal Lord's Day Act, The Provincial Lord's Day Act, the municipal bylaw -- a bingo in the City of Edmonton is lawful on a Sunday. The practice

49-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

has been, up until last summer, to interpret that legislation as authorizing the Attorney General's department to issue permits for Sunday bingos.

Last summer, because a case was then moving through the courts on the validity of the permit issued by the Attorney General's Department for the raffle of a car, the members of the department re-examined the legislation for the purpose of forming an opinion on whether they were authorized to issue permits for bingos on Sunday. They concluded, as a result of that review, there was no authority in The Lord's Day Act of the Province of Alberta, to authorize Sunday bingos. So since last summer there has been a change in the policy that existed prior to that time. There are not now, to my knowledge, any bingos being run on Sunday, except those that are being run pursuant to permits issued before that opinion was reached by the Attorney General's Department last summer.

I may just say a word as to why it's important that bingo be lawful on Sunday, that is if the department had the authority to issue the permit to run it on Sunday. The reason it's important is that if we don't have that authority, the people who engaged in Sunday bingos would be engaging in illegal activities, and would not be able to enforce any rights they might have as the result of taking part in the bingo, such as the right to sue for the prize, and so on. So to answer the hon. member's question about a change in policy, there was a change brought about last summer for those reasons.

MR. CHAMBERS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would consider a change in legislation in some manner, in order to make these bingos legal.

MR. LEITCH:

That, Mr. Speaker, raises a very important question. I think the legislation that would have to be changed is The Lord's Day Act of the Province of Alberta, and it could be changed to enlarge the authority of the municipal governments to pass by-laws to authorize this kind of activity on a Sunday. I may say that we have no plans to introduce such legislation during this sitting of the Legislature. I have, at the moment, under review the entire question of lotteries, where the question of Sunday bingos is merely one of the very serious problems involved with lotteries. There are a number of others, we are reviewing them, and I would anticipate some changes being made in the existing system of licensing lotteries, but not during this session.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

Alberta Health Care

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the beautiful Ministress in charge of the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You're blushing, Dan!

DR. BOUVIER:

In view of the announced policy and the impending legislation, which will allow people who have not registered for Medicare to

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-15

register without penalty -- and by that I understand that this means not having to pay the premiums -- are you giving any consideration to those people who have registered, and for one reason or another have not been able to pay the premiums either?

MISS HUNLEY:

First he gets me so flustered that I can't think what he's asking me, and then he asks me a question. Yes, I have given that quite a bit of consideration. As far as I'm concerned, the debts they have accrued are legal debts to the province, and they can only be handled in some legal way. If they can be collected, they'll have to be collected. It's unfortunate that this is happening. Mind you, the time to debate the bill, I guess, is at the time of second reading, which is maybe when we should be doing it. But I appreciate the extra concern that you have about the other persons. I have thought of it, but I don't have a solution. I just feel that two wrongs only make two wrongs -- they don't make a right. So, I'd like to correct the one, anyway.

MR. FENDELFSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. By the reasoning of the minister, is it not the same case with those who did not register and didn't pay the premium either -- that they still have a legal debt?

MISS HUNLEY:

Are we going to debate the bill? Are we in order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister is perfectly entitled to defer answering until the bill comes up for debate.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

Amateur Sports

DR. PAFFOSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. There has been very strong concern expressed by some segments of the community regarding possible lack of support for amateur sport in the Province of Alberta. I would like to hear his comments, and maybe answer whether this is true or not.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the greatest contribution to amateur sport is made by the thousands of volunteers in our province. I think the Legislature here wouldn't mind giving them all a good round of desk thumping before I continue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SCHMID:

We had more volunteers this week when some of the hon. members here voluntarily contributed their time to open the local little league baseball season.

I think about \$500,000 of our yearly capital grants of the province go toward the building of facilities for amateur sports by the different recreation boards throughout the province. Just

49-16

ALEERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

recently my department gave a \$20,000 grant to Sports Alberta, which is, with this grant, using these funds to set up administrative help for the different sport organizations; and also, hopefully, helping to set up championship games throughout the province in the summer and winter of 1973, and every year thereafter.

Also the province helps in paying 2 per cent of the contributions of the fare to go to national games in Canada. Another thing, we just approved very recently, \$1,000 to the National Wheelchair Games which are being held in Calgary. In other words, any national championship that is held in Alberta receives a \$1,000 grant. We also pay a \$200 grant to each sports group in Alberta that holds a provincial championship. Further, we pay a \$300 administrative grant to every provincial sports discipline. We have about 250 films which we make available to all sports organizations showing how, for instance, to play football, hockey, soccer and many other sports. Of course, we have rule books as well as instruction booklets.

We even have stopwatches which we lend out for championships, to be returned after. So there are many, many things the province is involved in, but I do like to emphasize that all these things are done to help the volunteers to help their community. In other words, again our philosophy of our government -- to help the people help themselves.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, followed by the hon. Member for Ottewell.

High School Student Employment

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, following that commercial, I hope I can get a straightforward answer to a straightforward question from the hon. Minister of Public Works.

SOME HCN. MEMBERS:

Ch,oh.

SOME HCN. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. LUDWIG:

You should talk. I posed a question to the hon. minister on the important matter of high school student employment with the Department of Public Works this summer. I wonder if the hon. minister had taken the trouble to become informed in order to be able to give me a reply today.

DP. BACKUS:

I can't give the hon. member exact numbers on this. As I explained to him at the time, any students wishing to get employment with the department during the summer months, can make application to Mr. Cairns in our Department of Personnel. As I said, the jobs are being taken up very quickly, so I don't know how many are left at this stage.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the information I wanted, the number of jobs that are being let by the Department of Public Works,

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-17

and the number still available. This is of tremendous interest to the high school students of this province, and I would like to recommend to the hon. minister that if he has trouble remembering --

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. member, it is out of order for the hon. member to make recommendations during the Question Period.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister undertake for the second time to give us an answer to a straightforward question on the simple matter of mathematics as to how many jobs are still available in the Department of Public Works?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is loading his question with innuendo. If it were asked in a straightforward manner, perhaps it would be in order.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to reword my question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Minister, may we please have information as to the number of jobs available in the Department of Public Works for the summer of 1972 for high school students specifically, and how many of these jobs have been taken to date and how many are still available.

MR. SPEAKER:

Under the circumstances, in view of the nature of the question, may I suggest to the hon. member that he place it on the Order Paper.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, with due respect, I think it is an overwhelming question to the minister. I'll do that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewill followed by the hon. Member for Vegreville

Active Treatment Hospital Beds

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. I would like to know the approximate relative cost between the active treatment beds, auxiliary hospital beds, and nursing home beds in the Edmonton area. And I would like to know approximately how many of these active treatment beds would be released if we had sufficient auxiliary hospitals and nursing homes in the Edmonton area.

49-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, is this another commercial?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I would like to answer the question raised by the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell. I think it is information that is of interest and importance to all members of the House. The situation in the Edmonton area at the present time is similar I think, in this respect to the situation in Calgary where the construction of active treatment hospital beds and the imbalance of the facilities between that type of hospital and the auxiliary hospitals and nursing homes has been such that although there would appear to be a sufficient number of beds in the active treatment hospitals, there are still delays in people obtaining access to them when they're needed.

To see the significance of this it should be noted that the cost of the metropolitan hospital bed runs in the neighbourhood of \$55 per patient per day and in a treatment hospital such as the University, up to \$68 a day, whereas in an auxiliary hospital the cost is about \$20 a day.

In answer to the portion of the hon. member's question where he wondered about the extent to which the transfer, you might say -- of patients could take place if more auxiliary hospital beds were built. This is a difficult matter to estimate. But overall, the indications for the system in the two major centres at the present time are that it is indeed the auxiliary hospital beds which require construction in order to relieve the pressure on the active beds and not the construction of more very extensive active beds.

MR. ASHTON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister. Do I take it from this that the government probably will not construct further active treatment beds in the Edmonton area for several years?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the indication is very strong that for at least five years, no substantial construction of active treatment beds should be anticipated in the Edmonton area.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. --

MR. ASHTON:

May I be permitted one more supplementary, Mr. Speaker? I understand that the Alberta Hospital Services Commission is conducting a study into the feasibility of a medical treatment centre of a halfway house nature for the Sherwood Park area. And I was wondering when this report would be available.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, early indications, a couple of months ago when the matter first started to be considered in conjunction with the possible use of some federal trust funds which it was anticipated perhaps at that time might be forthcoming in this fiscal year, were that a report could be done by this month, the month of May, and I don't have the report from the Hospital Services Commission yet. What it will exactly lead us to in the absence now of one of the basic presumptions with regard to the possibility that federal funds will be available, is another matter, but I am quite willing to

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-19

undertake to keep the hon. member fully informed on the issue which is of great importance to Sherwood Park.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. the number of auxiliary hospital beds in Calgary is much below that of Edmonton, will there be priority given to Calgary to develop the next auxiliary hospital in Alberta?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think the attempt to balance the systems in both major cities is one that we're still struggling with. It is a matter of both capital concern and operating concern to embark on any one of these schemes. We'll bring it into the very best balance and certainly there will be every consideration given to Calgary in the same sense as there would be to any other community.

MR. SPEAKER:

Well, there is time for one more short question. The hon. Member for Vegreville.

Farmers' Day

MR. BATHUK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. the Premier. Since our government is taking a hard look, and giving consideration and recognition to agriculture and to rural Alberta, and since various organizations are making preparation for Farmers' Day, and there are expectations that some of the members of the Legislative Assembly should participate, would the hon. Premier consider making Farmers' Day a holiday for the Legislative Assembly?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No way.

MR. LUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that if circumstances require it, and it appears they probably will, I think we will be working that day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to ask the leave of the House to revert very briefly to presenting reports by Standing and Select Committees, so that the chairman of the Committee on Public Affairs, the hon. Member for Ponoka, can table the report, notice of which he gave just a few moments ago.

MR. SPEAKER:

Do the hon. members agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

49-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

DR. McCRIMMON:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the report of the Committee on Public Affairs, Agriculture, and Education.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, in order to demonstrate our willingness to co-operate with the government in speeding up the business of the Legislature, we would like to make the following suggestions for the agenda of next week for the government's consideration. We would like to suggest that on Tuesday we forego our private members' day, and that it be used as a day for government business. We would also like to suggest that we are prepared to sit next Wednesday evening.

Then we would like the government to give consideration to keeping Thursday as a regular day for business. Then, also, we would suggest that we are prepared to come back in the evening at 7:00 to give one hour extra each evening for the evening sittings. We believe that this would be very helpful in facilitating the business of the House and I have discussed this with the hon. members on this side, including the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, and we would like to make that proposition to the government, for their consideration at this point in time.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we will take under advisement the suggestions by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Frankly, my response to the question of Wednesday night is not favourable. I think it is important that hon. members be able to make commitments, and some of them have made them, for evenings such as Wednesday night, unless there is a substantial amount of advance notice. To make abrupt changes and then deal with items of important business is not fair to the members who are placed in that position. But, with regard to the other suggestions made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, we will take it under advisement, and the government House Leader will no doubt respond on Monday.

DR. HOHCL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an announcement for the government. This has to do with the Alberta minimum wage law.

This topic has had extensive discussion on the floor of the House, and in the public generally. I should now like to announce to the House that the Board of Industrial Relations will convene public hearings in June of this year, for the purpose of receiving submissions from persons and organizations respecting matters of minimum wages, hours of work, vacations with pay, general holidays, and conditions of employment.

This topic was last reviewed through public hearings in October of 1970, at which time the minimum wage was set at \$1.55. During the sitting of the House, in answering several questions on this subject, I had indicated that there would be a raise in the minimum wage, but whether by ministerial announcement or by and through public hearings, was something that we had not decided at that time. The result of that particular answer was that we had quite a few representations from organizations and individuals, most of whom suggested that we hold public hearings. It is, in particular, to this kind of response, that we are going to hold these public hearings.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that because public hearings can be held infrequently because social, and economic, and technological changes are very rapid, it could well be that certain changes in working conditions in the minimum wage itself

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-21

might be adjusted from time to time by government, rather than through public hearings.

We intend that the Board of Industrial Relations shall begin the hearings towards the end of June in at least five centres of Alberta, including Edmonton, Calgary, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, and Grande Prairie. We hope that people come forward, not just at this time but throughout the year, giving us their views and their impressions on this very important matter of the minimum wage law and the related matters of hours of work, vacations with pay, general holidays, and conditions of employment.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to bring to the attention of the House, very briefly, an important matter that was announced this morning by the government as a consequence of decisions made earlier in Executive Council.

It relates to a change in policy in regard to patient day charges at provincially operated institutions for mentally handicapped children and for patients who are mentally ill. I just wanted to indicate to the hon. members without giving the same statement in full at this time, that the announcement was made and copies are available for distribution this afternoon for all hon. members and I have them ready to distribute now.

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

The hon. Mr. Miniely proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by the hon. Mr. Leitch.

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the Assembly do immediately resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering a Resolution for the granting of further Interim Supply to Her Majesty.

Resolved that a further sum not exceeding \$273,497,186.50 being one-fourth of the amount of the items set forth in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1973 as laid before the Legislative Assembly at the present session of the Legislature, except Health and Social Development Department Appropriation 2537, and Education Department Appropriation 1303, be granted to Her Majesty on account, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1973.

[The Motion was carried without debate.]

[Mr. Speaker took leave of the Chair.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair.]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of the Whole Assembly will come to order.

Moved by the hon. Provincial Treasurer resolved that towards making good the supply to be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, the sum of \$273,497,186.50 being one-fourth of the amount of the items set forth in the estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1973, as laid before the Legislative Assembly at the present session of the Legislature, except Health and Social Development Department Appropriation 2537, and Education

49-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

Department Appropriation 1303, be granted as further interim supply out of the General Revenue Fund of the province. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report.

[The Motion was carried without debate.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration the following Resolution, that to making good the supply to be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, the sum of \$273,497,186.50, being one-fourth of the amount of the items set forth in the estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1973, as laid before the Legislative Assembly at the present session of Legislature, except Health and Social Development Department Appropriation 2537, and Education Department Appropriation 1303, be granted as further interim supply of the General Revenue Fund of the province, that it is expedient to consider the Resolution of the bill and beg leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move the resolution be read a second time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Moved by the hon. Government House Leader, seconded by the hon. Provincial Treasurer that the resolution be read a second time. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Leitch that you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly do resolve itself into Committee to consider the ways and means of raising the supply to be granted to Her Majesty. Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor has been informed of the subject matter of this motion and recommends it to the consideration of the Assembly.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-23

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair.]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of Ways and Means will come to order.

Resolved that towards making good the supply to be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1973, the sum of \$273,497,186.50, being one-fourth of the amount of the items set forth in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1973 as laid before the Legislative Assembly at the present session of the Legislature, except Health and Social Development Department Appropriation 2537, and Education Department Appropriation 1303, be granted as further interim supply out of the general revenue fund of the province. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The motion was passed without debate or dissent.]

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report.

[The motion was passed without debate or dissent.]

[Mr. Diachuk left the Chair.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means of this Assembly have had under consideration the following resolution:

that towards making good the supply to be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1973, the sum of \$273,497,186.50 being, one-fourth of the amount of the items set forth in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1973 as laid before the Legislative Assembly at the present session of the Legislature, except Health and Social Development Department Appropriation 2537, and Education Department Appropriation 1303, be granted as further interim supply out of the general revenue fund of the Province of Alberta, and that it is expedient to consider resolution for an act being as was agreed to, and we beg leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYKDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be read a second time.

49-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The motion was passed without debate or dissent.]

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being An Act to Amend the Appropriation Interim Supply Act, 1972.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that we had passed earlier in an Interim Supply Act, an amount equal to approximately 1/4 of the total estimates which we were reviewing during the course of this session. Hon. members will also realize that the end of May, the end of this month, we will in effect, have completed one quarter of the fiscal year of the Province of Alberta. The prime reason for the need to pass this act at this time is because of the timing of the oil royalty hearings which are going to take up the better part of the last week of May, the end of this month.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 98, was introduced and read a first time.]

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS

[Second Reading]

Bill No. 50 The Alberta Opportunity Fund Act

[Adjourned Debate]

MR. STRIMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed the remarks made by the hon. Member for "Downhill" when he stated his success on the rocky road to becoming a newspaper tycoon. I have also enjoyed the remarks by the small town lawyer from Mountain View trying to pull himself up by his boot straps. But, Mr. Speaker, regardless of what members opposite say about Bill No. 50, it will be to rural Alberta what the discovery of oil was to Edmonton and Calgary. I think of the countless villages, towns, and cities in Alberta, together with their chambers of commerce and the service clubs that, over the years, have given so much of their time, money, and effort in promotion to attract secondary industries into their communities.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 50 will mean that for the first time the government is leading the way. If we are to curtail the continuing migration of people from agriculturally based towns and villages to the cities, government has to lead the way to rural industrialization and industry most certainly will follow.

Mr. Speaker, a fact of life is that, in the past, lending institutions such as eastern Canadian dominated banks and the Alberta Commercial Corporation, took a dim view of rural property and took the attitude that it was poor security. They also took the attitude that if you did not need the money, they would loan you all the money you needed. No wonder, with this sort of an attitude, rural Alberta has 30 years of lost development to retrieve. Bill No. 50 will ask for a man's security, a man's ability, his ambition, and his ideas.

Mr. Speaker, may I quote from the Alberta Chamber of Commerce policy book of 1971-72 in regard to rural development recommendations:

"Our province has so matured that the time has come when all businessmen must actively co-operate with our provincial governments to institute a program of development which

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-25

acknowledges the difficulties associated with both development and depopulation and encourages the growth of any centre, large or small, which expresses the desires and the aspirations of its people. Coupled with this must be government leadership, direction and encouragement and assistance to communities, industries, and its own departments to decentralize employment opportunities for the economic and social well-being of the people of the province as a whole."

Thank you.

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, I will begin by saying that I am very pleased with Bill No. 50. I have also enjoyed the debate so far and I feel that, with one or two exceptions, the comments have been constructive and positive. I am convinced that this fund will be the catalyst that is required to really get started in the serious business of diversifying and strengthening Alberta's economy.

In my view, to use a currently popular expression, the minister is 'right on' with regard to the priorities that he has emphasized in this bill. The orientation toward small business, smaller centres, local development groups, to research and development, to tourism, and to the stimulation of job-creating projects in general should, I think, be of significant benefit to Alberta.

I would like to give briefly my personal view on a few items for the consideration of the hon. minister. Although broad diversification of our economy should or might be our objective, nevertheless, I would like to suggest that we should still concentrate on our strengths, that is, on secondary and tertiary industry associated with our major resource industries. That is in agriculture, oil and gas, coal, and tourism.

It is obvious that our relatively small domestic market and our inherent high transportation costs hurt us, when we think of heavy manufacturing, whether for local use or for export. That is not to say that I would advocate this kind of emphasis to the exclusion of any non-associated industries. Certainly, for example, a furniture factory may employ as many people as an oil refinery, at only one per cent of the capital investment. However, I think we have to keep in mind the economic facts of life, with respect to the size of our Alberta market, and to transportation costs.

As mentioned earlier in this debate by the Member for Calgary North Hill, the ATCO Company, I think, are a good example of a resource-associated secondary industry which has become highly successful. This business grew with the Alberta oil industry, and basically provided portable housing for this resource industry. Of course, ATCO has grown considerably beyond the oil industry now and is marketing world-wide. However, without their basic oil industry market, and the expertise they gained in servicing this market, it seems doubtful that they would be where they are today. Similarly, a large variety of large all-terrain transporters has been developed in Alberta, again to service the oil industry. They were developed, in particular, because of our northern muskeg environment. It would seem, in view of the international interest shown in this type of vehicle, that it could also be a market success.

Although it has recently been said that some 65 per cent of the material used here in the oil industry is now manufactured in Alberta -- and I don't know if this figure is correct or not -- nevertheless, I do know that there is still a lot of hardware being imported. I think this class of secondary manufacturing should have large potential in future tar sands developments, not only for the surface mining projects, but also for the in situ developments -- which could well be the way that the majority of these tar sands are developed.

49-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

Although representing a huge number of barrels, actually only a small percentage of the tar deposits are amenable to low-cost surface mining. The in situ -- and here for the benefit of the lawyers -- by in situ, I refer to operations where the oil is separated from the sand and removed from the pay zone without affecting the overburden, probably through drilled wells. In situ development would probably require a large number of drilled wells, and a lot of processing equipment. I would hope that Alberta secondary industry can manufacture this equipment in the years ahead, and I think there's certainly a large potential for associated tertiary business service industry, and whatnot.

I'm sure that the same opportunity exists with very many other resource industries. Fortunately, we're well endowed in this province with natural resources.

I would also echo the enthusiasm of the Minister Without Portfolio, Responsible for Tourism. I think in this area the Americans have done a much better job than we have, in the past. We can certainly learn from them. I think most of us have seen how they can publicize local attractions and draw large numbers of tourists, complete with their dollars, to what, by our standards, would be relatively unspectacular sites. They maximize the potential of their historical events, and by contrast, I think we have the most colourful history. And yet, how many of the trails of the great adventurers and explorers are marked out? The sites of significant historical events are, in many cases, either barely noted, or not at all. For example if you compare the site of the Frog Lake massacre with the development of the Powder River site in Montana, where Custer made his well-known last stand, and you consider the number of visitors who visit that Powder River site each year, there is just no comparison. In order to draw tourists, we must have good roads and good accommodations and particularly, we've got to have good food served along these routes.

I would like to make one brief point with regard to transportation. I am sure the hon. minister is way ahead of me on this one, but I haven't had a chance to discuss this point with him. This is in regard to what I might call co-ordinated transportation planning. Being good business people I would suspect that the railways, for example, have long-term service plans; they probably have long-term plans for phasing out service to certain smaller communities, if they can.

Meanwhile our hon. Minister of Highways is developing a grid road plan. We want to encourage the decentralization of industry where possible, of course, in order to improve the health of our smaller communities. During this time a small community may be aggressively going after industry and be worthy of considerable help; whereas another community which may be better served by the planned future transportation development might not be interested in actively promoting industry.

What I am getting at is there must be communication and co-ordination on a long-term planning effort between the government and the transportation companies in order to ensure that everybody is on the same wave length.

My final point concerns something that has been bothering me a little bit. That is with regard to employment in Alberta, of Alberta and/or Canadian engineering companies. I can't help feeling that we are getting a bit of a snow job from industry concerning the need to bring in large foreign engineering consortiums in order to handle our big development projects. Supposedly it is because we do not have the necessary expertise, but I would dispute that fact. I think we do have the experts. Canadian engineering talent is recognized world-wide. In the field of mining, for example, Canadian mining

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-27

engineers have for a long time been world leaders in the development of mining methods and of mine operation techniques.

Petroleum engineering has developed in this country more recently, but nevertheless, I think it is now recognized generally that Canadian petroleum technology is at least on a par with that south of the border, and in some cases, probably even more advanced.

As for construction, chemical, electrical, and mechanical processes, again Canadian engineers have achieved world-wide recognition. I submit that maybe the reason some big industries see the need to farm consulting out to a foreign concern is that it is more convenient at this point, from the financial and administrative standpoint, to turn the job over to big international outfits than to spend the extra effort required in helping Canadian engineers to get together to do the job. Perhaps this is an area where the hon. minister would consider backing the establishment of an Alberta engineering consortium, which could handle not only our own large resource development, but also compete for world-wide contracts.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by saying that, to me, the most gratifying aspect of this bill is that the emphasis throughout is on small business. While big business is certainly a vital part of our free-enterprise system, nevertheless, I feel that this bill should help reverse the creeping trend toward bigness at the expense of the small operation. There are a lot of people who prefer to be self-employed, or to work for a small enterprise. I think in the long run it is the small business, the entrepreneur and the individual imaginative Albertan who will provide those extra jobs and play a significant role in creating the business expansion and the diversification that will make Alberta truly great.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a number of comments that I would like to make with regard to the bill. I would like to come straight to the point and start off by saying I support what the government is trying to do in this particular bill. I don't want the hon. minister nor anyone else to take the comments that I make or the suggestions I make as an indication that I don't support the bill. But nevertheless, I do think there are some areas that the hon. minister and the government might well reconsider.

I would start by saying that in our particular part of the province, we have the people in the Olds Development Co-Op who have certainly done some pioneering in some of the areas that this legislation attempts to come to grips with. I think I can say they have been reasonably successful in their ventures to date. One of the most serious problems that I see rural Alberta having, with this kind of legislation or with the previous incentives legislation, is the problem that once the local community develops a certain amount of momentum, and gets whatever mechanism they have operational to encourage industry to come to the community, they become involved in the problems of providing services that are needed -- land, and these kinds of things. There is a real problem when you have volunteer men in the community doing it. They simply don't have the time. It has to become number two, to very obviously making their own business function and operate.

I note that there is provision in the bill for some assistance to develop organizations like this. And I would sincerely hope that some of the funding in this particular bill can be used to help strengthen that part of these local development groups that operate.

I know the group at Olds have had, and are now having, some serious problems in the particular area that I just mentioned. I would go on and say Mr. Speaker, that I would like to ask the minister once again, if it would be possible for him to have the

49-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

regulations, at least a draft of the regulations, in the hands of the members before we get into the committee; because this legislation is extremely broad, very, very, broad, and I can appreciate some of the reasons for giving it that kind of flexibility. But I for one, would find it extremely helpful if we had even one of the last drafts of the legislation a few days before we become involved in a detailed, clause-by-clause study.

A point has been made that this legislation emphasizes rural development in rural Alberta, and I appreciate and support that. I frankly would have liked to see the government go further and take out that clause in the legislation that says an order in council can approve assistance over an amount of \$500,000. The Premier, the other day when he came in and made his comments close to 5:30, made quite a point that all the loans or almost all the loans and guarantees would be below \$500,000, and I support this. I really don't see, if that is the government's intention, why in fact, we have a provision in there that is saying, for certain purposes over the amount of \$500,000 the company, through an order in council by the government, can get approval to do this. I would like to have seen also a continuance, in a limited form, of the forgivable loans which were in the incentive program of last year. And I emphasize once again, that in principle, I support the bill.

But really I wish the Minister of Industry had won the argument on what you are going to call the thing. The idea of the "opportunity company" really isn't in keeping with the businesslike approach that I hope the minister and the company are going to take to this particular organization.

I think I should say also that in many regards this legislation doesn't do a great deal more than could have been done by the Alberta Commercial Corporation, had the Commercial Corporation been given full scope to use almost all this legislation. I do appreciate that there are some extensions. But to quite a degree this is an expansion and a continuation of the Commercial Corporation's operation; and with, I would suspect, some additional and perhaps firmer direction from the Minister, I am prepared to go along with that.

The member who spoke just previously made a number of good points, with which I certainly would like to agree. One is the question of Alberta engineering firms; I agree with the member when he says on occasions he thinks we are "snowed" by corporations that come in and say, we are the only people in North America, in some cases the only people anywhere, who have the expertise. Unless someplace down the road we take a stand and simply say, look, you've got to do this here in Alberta by Albertans, we are never going to develop the expertise here, and I would certainly support the member's comments there.

And the other question is on the matter of co-ordination. There is a need for a great deal of co-ordination between government agencies and government departments here. Because if the Opportunity Fund is going to be making assistance available to business to settle and get operational in various communities, and at the same time there is going to be some work done on this question of decentralization of government services throughout the province; then this must be done hand in hand.

And the last point that I want to make, and perhaps the most important point I want to make in addition to saying I support the bill, is that I would ask the hon. minister to go back and see if he can't see his way clear, and the government see its way clear, to write in the legislation here that in fact Alberta companies, Alberta-based companies, and Canadian-owned companies receive at the very least, priority. Frankly, I for one, would support legislation that would say, this applies to Alberta and Canadian-owned business

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-29

ventures. small business ventures -- hopefully, yes. But if the government is going to retain this portion, which says they can become involved in assistance in excess of \$500,000 by means of an Order in Council, then I think it is important enough that we write, right in the legislation, that this applies to Alberta-owned or Canadian-owned companies, and could not apply to companies owned outside the province or the country.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments -- I will be very brief -- on this bill, The Alberta Opportunity Fund Act. I want to speak on this bill to be recorded, firstly, as one of the strongest supporters of this bill, as the MLA for Edmonton Kingsway.

My first comment is to indicate that I concur with all the supporting comments that have been made to date, and reinforce these remarks ten-fold, one hundred-fold, or even a thousand-fold, if that is necessary. I feel that to offer loans, or guarantee loans, up to 80 per cent, to make loans or guarantee loans not exceeding, or in the vicinity of \$500,000, truly is for free enterprise, for stimulation of industry, and for small industry. And this is to be applauded.

To offer this to Albertans, as individuals first, as a first thrust, as the hon. minister has mentioned, and then rural Albertans as an added emphasis, must be hailed as a bold step, and it is truly imaginative. But when this is coupled with research, and the business management counselling that has been indicated, then it is impossible to conceive any criticism whatsoever, except that the bill is long overdue. And all the ifs, and the buts, and the qualifications that are made at this time, I think, are away premature, because there will be ample time for these qualifications as this bill is applied. I am sure the hon. minister recognizes this, and is flexible enough.

The probable impact that such an action, in such a bill, will make for all Albertans, not only for Alberta's industry, is rather obvious. I again support this area, too.

So, in conclusion, it is this type of boldness and imagination to deal effectively with the serious problem of industry and, as a result, Alberta's problem; which has such far-reaching dimension in all walks of life; which is the direction of the new government, which is the direction of our new minister, which is the direction for quality of life. I think it should be supported unequivocally and unanimously. The minister has to be commended for bringing this type of a bill to this Assembly, and to the citizens of Alberta. Let's pass it. Let's get on with the job.

I think the true test is using the bill, and this is the true guts of the bill, when you bring it out and bring it out to the citizen, and use it as time goes on. Thank you.

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, the objects and priorities set out in The Alberta Opportunity Fund Act are very, very significant. This bill, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the sceptics, hopefully will turn the tide of economic stagnation in rural Alberta.

I want to repeat what I said in my budget debate, very briefly. This attitude, Mr. Speaker, we have to play down -- the attitude that the small community is dying is prevalent amongst the executives, and perhaps government policy in the past was that the small community is unimportant, it is disappearing, and there is nothing that we can do about it. We have the attitude that the small farm, the small

49-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

business, the small community, can survive. With new policy, new directions, the trend toward urbanization can slow down.

Towns and villages 50 or 60 miles away, around large cities, have to offer the good life in exchange for overpriced high rises, or the poor housing accommodation in the large cities. These typical prairie towns have an over-supply of inexpensive, vacant houses and unused building lots, while the large cities have a desperate shortage of low-cost housing. When representatives of two villages, of from 500 to 600 people, in a farming area, approached the provincial government for some financial assistance to aid the low-income families, they were told that it would not work, and it is no use trying.

These two villages had two officials, one the president of the local Chamber of Commerce, the other a secretary of the Lions Club in the neighbouring village, who decided to go ahead on their own. They said, "We made up our minds to make it work."

They advertised and described the housing opportunities that they had available in their villages. They put out a brochure, a very colourful one, setting out the highway and what they had to offer. In fact, the promotion went into Time magazine. The radio and television were also used to promote these small towns and the communities really promoted the things they had to offer, the good schools up to Grade XII, recreational facilities, livable good homes.

This certainly generated so much interest that 82 families had moved into the three neighbouring communities, two villages and one town, ranging from 40 miles to 60 miles away from Edmonton.

Here's a typical example. A pipefitter with four children gave up a \$225 a month rental in Edmonton for a three bedroom house in town which he is purchasing for \$118 a month.

People on welfare with school children have much to their advantage to live in such communities.

Not only have they vacant houses in these two or three communities, they also have good homes on the farms around the villages in this particular town that have been snapped up for rentals as low as \$40 to \$60 a month. They also have the 50 serviced building lots for as low as \$100 each.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is an illustration of what people can do with new attitudes, and new approaches, and new directions. We're talking about development in rural Alberta. Perhaps in three very important areas, industrial development, agricultural development, and residential development. There appears to be a swing towards bedroom communities, communities which are prepared to take the initiative to help themselves and these should be encouraged and supported.

We must be sensitive to areas of greater need and we have to involve people in defining their needs. We have to encourage public participation and involvement in program development. The Alberta Opportunity Fund Act reflects our determination to give the opportunity that is required to all Albertans to help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 50, coupled with Bill No. 73, The Agricultural Development Act, hopefully, are the salvation of rural Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the hon. Member for Bow Valley is next followed by the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-31

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a very few brief comments to register my support for this bill. I think it's one of the better pieces of legislation that has been before the House at this session.

Two of the principles I certainly endorse. One is that it doesn't legislate out any areas of the province, it takes in all of the province. I don't think we should have legislation that's discriminatory and I certainly subscribe to this principle, that it's taking in the entire province. The corporation which will be set up, can make the decisions, and the allocation of funds to these various industries.

Another principle that I endorse is that it's set up for loans and guaranteed loans. I think this is a step in the right direction. Sometimes when we have grants we get industries involved and we get them set up, and then in the end they are not viable. A grant sometimes leads us into industries that are not able to keep their heads above water.

As I read this bill, it looks to me like it's supplementing the Alberta Credit Corporation and it's going to be a continuation of this corporation, and they have certainly helped our industries in this province, and my own constituency.

In the last four years they have started out industry in my area to the tune of \$1 1/2 million. We have the Newell Vegetable Co-op Ltd. that was set up down there and I'll say that they have been under-financed. They have been trying to operate without enough money, and I'm sure this bill is going to be able to supplement their finances and get them more viable.

They are growing a vegetable that is a very good vegetable and this new co-op is helping our area and in time it's going to help the entire province. We grow a natural grown vegetable which you can't get from California. In California vegetables are force grown with fertilizers, they use asphalt on the rows to product heat and they grow vegetables down there -- I'll say they are a nice looking vegetable, but they don't compete if you taste our vegetables that we grow in the Brooks area. Our vegetable is natural-grown without any forced-growing and they are a tremendous product for our market. And it has certainly stimulated the area down there.

We have also had two dehydrating plants set up. We've got one at Tilley and we've got one at Brooks. Right now they are going to contract a third of the hay in the Eastern Irrigation District and the Eastern Irrigation District takes in a third of the irrigation in the province. So this is certainly establishing markets for our alfalfa hay, which we have long needed. Here again the dehydrating plants are under-financed, and I'm certain this bill is going to help supplement them and keep them operating.

I do think that with this bill and the local involvement that we can get from our local areas that we're certainly going to be able to stimulate industry in this province.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the first bill I have chosen to rise and speak on, other than those I sponsored myself. I have done so because for the past three to four years, while practising chartered accountancy, I've had a very personal interest in this particular matter and the matter which this particular bill covers.

Mr. Speaker, I've been fortunate, during the course of the preparation of the bill, to have worked with the hon. minister, my

49-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

colleague, the hon. Mr. Peacock, in the development of many portions of the bill. I must say when I look back on the development of the bill, and I look back upon the years I was in practice in chartered accountancy, I also feel somewhat a sense of satisfaction and somewhat a sense of enjoyment because I had worked, in fact, with many small businesses and industries that had excellent ideas in the past and, of course, one of the first places they would come, if they did want to develop industry or business in the province, would be in fact, to a practicing chartered accountant.

It's amusing to me today to see a gentleman in the gallery who is the Director of the Alberta Commercial Corporation, because he and I had many dealings together, prior to the time I was involved in government; and I know we had many meetings in discussing industrial development in the Province of Alberta. And I know at that time I indicated my views to him with respect to what was wrong with existing provincial legislation. Working from the other side of those entrepreneurs and people who have bright ideas and are aggressive and will develop industry and business in the province, one of the real handicaps was the lack of flexibility.

The real danger in legislation, although you can see many times that it might be politically expedient to have restrictions in the bill, that in fact the more you actually tie up the flexibility within the provisions of the bill itself, the more you render the very objective of that legislation practically inoperative, and this is the stumbling block we would run across so many times. So, Mr. Speaker, I for one, am very, very pleased to see the bill in the form it is, covering all and for the first time a very wide variety, including any possible potential of development that we are interested in in the Province of Alberta.

The second thing, Mr. Speaker, which I must say that I've given a great deal of thought to during the course of this bill, developing through our government -- and which I believe is a first in the area of broad industrial development -- is the provision for guarantees which is included in the bill, for guarantees to financial institutions. The reason that I say that, Mr. Speaker, is that what the province can do directly in terms of direct loans is obviously limited to the extent of our budgetary limitations. But the potential exists for industrial development in the Province of Alberta if there is any way that we, as a government, can find to stimulate our financial institutions to release more funds for development and diversification of our industry in Alberta. In my view, Mr. Speaker, the limitations there are not nearly as great as they are on the limitations of loaning of direct public funds.

It was always amusing to me, Mr. Speaker, that in an area where we very much needed a diversification of industry, very much needed a higher degree of manufacturing and secondary industry which would employ a great deal more of our citizens that will be coming into the labour force, that the province had, at the time that we assumed responsibility for office Co-op Association Guarantees Acts, Potato Growers Guarantees Acts, Livestock Guarantee Acts, which provided the province with the authority to guarantee in these areas. Yet here is an area -- and I am not criticizing these because those are needed as well -- but in the diversification of our industry and development, which is one of our major challenges in the future, I am sure that all hon. members will agree with me that surely if we have them in these areas -- and when we consider the challenge -- then it is a first, I believe, in Alberta that guarantees of this nature are being provided on a broad basis of industrial development in covering the service industry and many other areas.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to see this in the bill. Of course, tied in with this, Mr. Speaker, there is a note of caution. We will be -- and I have talked many times with the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce -- we will be working very closely with the

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-33

financial institutions. We will be very serious in attempting to avoid the mistake the federal government has made with respect to their regional development programs and provision for guarantees; because we feel that the way we can do this is by, in fact, working closely with the financial institutions, monitoring the policy after the bill is passed, ensuring that we are receiving adequate feedback from the financial institutions on the success of the guaranteed provisions and the success in their ability to apply and loan money under the various provincial legislations, so that we can make modifications where necessary to ensure that this is, in fact, and can be realized, as the first real step in accomplishing the major challenge we have in diversifying industry and in developing more jobs for citizens in the Province of Alberta.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. Minister of Industry close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. FEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I didn't think this moment would ever arrive. I appreciate the comments, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues have made supporting this bill and also those on the other side. I appreciate the responsibility that we, as a government, are assuming in introducing this bill. I don't think that there is any bill that is a be all-end all. We are quite cognizant of some of the pitfalls and problems we are going to face with the introduction of this legislation.

I was particularly impressed by the comments that my colleague from Stettler had made regarding the problems confronting rural development. There is only one component we are talking about here today in this bill, and that is the capital component. There are some modifications to that capital component when we discuss management skills and research and development. But there are many other things in rural Alberta that are going to help the development and diversification of our secondary industry and in that area. Those, to repeat what my hon. colleague stated, were development of problems of infrastructure, proper power rates, water and sewage, roads.

But the most important component as was mentioned in this House on many occasions, has been the desire of the individual to do something about it. We firmly believe that there are enough individuals in rural Alberta appreciating the quality of life, as well as understanding something of the quantity that is required of life, to retain that rural habitat. They will be sufficiently motivated and helped, we hope, by this bill, to do the very thing that we're talking about, along with my colleague, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, in re-establishing and revitalizing rural Alberta without, as you know, distracting from, or discriminating against the urban areas. It seems to me, regardless of whether I am urban-oriented or not, that one of the difficulties of politicians has always been that you have to take from the haves to give to the have-nots, instead of realizing that the have-nots need to be brought up to where the haves are. I think one of the great significances of this bill is to do exactly that.

We are very, very pleased to bring this bill forward. I had a rather impassioned speech to give this afternoon, but because of the

49-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

lateness of the hour and the length of time that you have all been sitting here, I might just conclude with answering some of the problems that have been raised, and clarifying, if I may, some of the questions pertinent to this particular piece of legislation.

I think the criterion under which this bill is established is certainly clearly set out -- if you will read section two of the bill -- that the position of Canadian and Albertan capital is clearly stated in there and the priority that is given to Canadian residents in Alberta is clearly stated there. I believe that the inclusion of groups or such organizations as co-ops, is not prohibited from participation in the effects of this bill. I was particularly interested in a comment of the word 'may'. Being not a lawyer, I found that the use of this word has been traditionally accepted, and in fact, is used in last year's legislation under The Industrial Development Incentives Act.

In the powers of the corporation, arrangements for a Crown corporation to have these powers, if it is to operate effectively, is traditional. I think that the reference to section 15 relates to those areas that any corporation that is involved in the loaning of money must be protected, in the event of -- we hope never happens -- foreclosure or the necessity of taking over those assets, or what remains of them.

I think I might point out to this House that certainly -- in answer to the hon. Member for Drumheller, and the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest -- that it is certainly the intent of this government to bring before this Legislature each year the review of the effectiveness of this bill, and the economics involved thereof. It's a natural course of events that we will do this.

In answer to the member stating that we were looking for these thrusts in the areas of using more Alberta expertise and more capabilities in the areas of the professionals, I think our department has indicated that we're already aware of this problem. We have initiated a step forward in this area, on a voluntary basis, following the previous government's attempts in this area. And because we are by nature a free enterprise political party, we would like to have these companies, of their own free will and accord, come to the party and use Alberta expertise, capital and capital goods, where they can.

We also recognize that we are human beings, and having frailties, if we don't find the co-operation we expect in this area, it might be necessary to take other measures.

As far as our transportation policy is concerned, one of the outstanding problems facing the developing of Alberta's secondary industry -- and I am sure we are well aware of it -- concerns the inequities we experience with a landlocked province with regard to transportation and transportation rates, whether those transportation rates be in regard to rail, to air, or to the facilities of the airlines serving this province. We are dedicated as a government to do everything we can within our power. We recognize that many of these problems are of a federal nature; they are of a political nature; they are of a technical nature; they are many and deep; but we hope we see some light at this time in coming to you with a co-ordinated transportation policy that will make Alberta effectively competitive in the market place, particularly in the Pacific rim areas.

In closing, may I briefly outline our particular thrusts and what this bill will help us accomplish. With your support I think it is essential that every member in this House, every constituent, support it wholeheartedly. Our thrust is for the development and diversification of job opportunities in this province; to be able to absorb into the development of industrial enterprise in this province

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-35

some 20,000 to 25,000 young Albertans each year; to identify the development of that economic thrust in rural as well as in urban areas. We are doing it through such supporting bills as Bill No. 73 and Bill No. 50.

We hope that through our transportation policy we will be able to be in a position where we can expand the basic industries of the petro-chemical areas -- and possibly the basic steel -- and so enhance our position as a labour-intensive province, as well as a capital-intensive province.

I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals, that Bill No. 50 now be read for a second time.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent, and Bill No. 50 was read a second time.]

Bill 65. The Alberta Hospitals Amendment Act, 1972

MR. ASHTON:

The objectives of this amending act are several. One of them is to clarify the relationship between hospital boards and hospital medical staff, the objective being to minimize any problems. The amending act proposes to do this by more clearly defining the responsibilities of the hospital medical staff. It is considered that this will be of particular benefit to some smaller hospitals.

The second objective is to clarify some of the provisions of the existing act concerning the release of hospital records concerning patients. As the hon. members may be aware, one of the existing subsections has a blanket prohibition of the release of such records, and another subsection allows the release in certain instances.

Now this does leave a gap, because there may be a situation where either the hospital or physician may not be able to release; or even in another situation when they have the power to release, they may refuse to release information to the patient.

This amendment covers this gap by allowing the patient, or his legal representative, to apply to the court for a court order providing for the release of these records. I understand that the commission has had applications before, and it has considered these could be more properly handled in the courts as a part of a civil action.

The final objective of this amending act, is to provide for those situations where some hospital boards wish to withdraw from providing hospital service; it provides that the government, the minister, can in these circumstances also purchase their land. In the past, as the members may be aware, the cost of the land was excluded.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, to comment very briefly on the bill. In principle I certainly bring support to the proposed amendments. Last year I had taken steps to initiate a complete rewrite of The Hospitals Act, and it got to the first draft stage. I can appreciate the pressures which are on the hon. minister of the present government; the inability to proceed with the act in total. I can only add to that, that we'll certainly support the amendments. However, we hope that the minister would examine the desirability of introducing next year, or within the next year or two, a complete rewrite of The Alberta Hospitals Act.

49-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

In my mind, the act in total has a great many deficiencies in it which need clarification. Certainly one of the areas that I felt needed clarification, with which we had tried to come to grips in the first draft last year, was the question of the jurisdiction and basic responsibilities of the board, the hospital administrator and the medical staff. It was my experience that there are always about three small hospitals in the province where there was a real dispute raging of one sort or another within the hospital staff. Invariably it related basically to personalities, but also to a lack of clear direction from a statutory standpoint as to the basic responsibilities of the various levels of administration within the hospital.

One of the things that I had very definitely hoped to clarify was this question of staff responsibilities, board responsibilities, and the responsibility of the administrator. I'm sure some of the members recall the dispute that took place a couple of years ago at the High River hospital. One of the big factors there was the fact that basically the administrator wasn't running the hospital. The board had split the responsibility between the administrator and the head nurse, and we had a head nurse who was trying to give direction to the medical staff. It just didn't go over well with the medical staff. So there is I think a need for greater in-depth examination of the whole hospital legislation in these areas.

If one compares The Hospital Act of the province to The Municipal Government Act, you'll find a lot of deficiencies, at least in my mind, as far as defining clearly the responsibilities of the board, the responsibilities and authority of the administrator; and also the act doesn't really state too clearly at all the question of medical staff. This is certainly an improvement.

I think some of this is an evolutionary process, because in many cases the board is considered the secretary of the hospital; really to be just that, a secretary. The act doesn't make it very clear in many cases as to who is responsible for operating the hospital on a day-to-day basis. I'm making these remarks I should say, Mr. Speaker, with relationship to the small hospitals. You don't find these problems existing in the larger institutions which have far more sophisticated managerial capability. But in the smaller hospitals it has indeed been a problem. We are certainly pleased then, as I say, to see this amendment introduced into the House this year.

Also regarding the question of access to the files of patients for legal purposes, this also was an amendment that we had examined and I personally had concluded that it should be incorporated into a new act. I am certainly pleased to say that we support this amendment and I think the minister himself is going to find that it will relieve him of a lot of headaches in trying to deal with this particular problem. In the past the minister has been the party who has had the authority, but because of the complications, it is only with extreme reluctance that it is used. I found, personally, that every time a request came in for the files -- that is relating to use of them in a legal case, of prosecution on the part of a patient -- the recommendation of the solicitor to the Crown was that if they could get them from the local hospital, OK., but it was not desirable for the minister to order that they be released. I think this is, by far, a more acceptable way of providing authority or directive -- direction -- for the information to be released. Because, very clearly, in my experience, it was legal problems that led to the request for the information, and I think in keeping with that, it's indeed appropriate to leave the question as to legal technicalities of providing this information to the courts to decide.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would conclude by simply saying once again that we are pleased to support the amendments, and that I am personally pleased to see them brought before the Assembly. I would

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-37

hope that the minister, however, when he could find time, will place a priority on examining the entire Alberta Hospitals Act. I think it needs rewriting quite badly.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a few moments regarding this bill, because in the last provincial election, a candidate ran in Calgary North Hill for the sole purpose of coming to this Legislature to change The Hospital Act as far as admission of medical practitioners to practise in certain hospitals was concerned. Dr. Carl Reich ran as an independent candidate in the hon. member's constituency of Calgary North Hill. When I asked him what his program was, he said that this was what his program consisted of, and he had the support of the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill. Anyway, I am wondering if the minister, or the mover of this bill, could enlighten the House as to whether there are going to be any changes in principle on the admissions where by doctors are going to be allowed to practise in certain hospitals in our province. Many of the public come along to me, and I am certain, to other members, and they say, well, if a man is qualified to practise, he should be allowed to practise. If there is some reason that a hospital board feels that he is not qualified, well, then, his name should be turned in to the College of Physicians and Surgeons and disciplinary action, or whatever other action or recommendation that may be appropriate should be taken.

Anyway, this was quite an issue in the last provincial election in our City of Calgary, and has been a chestnut for the last two or three years down there. Of course, I am sure that, as a lot of members are aware, it is difficult for a doctor in a large city to practise in every hospital. It is just not practical. But the public are concerned when they see all the controversy going on, that a man is not allowed to practise in a certain hospital. And there is not a great deal of explanation from the board, or anyone else, as to why he is not allowed to practise. Today I would just like pass these few remarks along and, maybe, when the second reading -- or when the minister gets up to close the debate -- maybe he will have some ideas that will overcome this problem, that seems to come up every once in a while. This is the problem of doctors complaining that they cannot practise in certain hospitals within communities, in particular, here in Alberta, where most hospitals, if not all hospitals, are government-subsidized and, in many cases, owned either by the province outright or the municipality outright.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Chairman, I should outline the details of this particular case, since I am very well acquainted with it having not only sat as a trustee in the Calgary General Hospital, and deliberated on several occasions on Dr. Carl Reich's application, but also having encountered him on the hustings as a competitor. My own view, of course, tends to accord with that of the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, that the closed-hospital policies tend to distort the whole waiting list and active bed picture in certain of the major metropolitan cities, where the admittance privileges may be given to more doctors in one hospital than in another hospital, without any relation to the number of available beds. Really the basic principle ought to be that the doctor follows the patient, that is to say, that the patient doesn't follow the doctor. But, as things are in Canada the law is not that publicly supported hospitals should be open as they are in the United States. In Canada each hospital functions as a separate entity with its own separate house rules.

The College of Physicians and Surgeons and the local medical associations state publicly that it is extremely desirable for every one of their members to have a hospital in which to practise. But when it comes right down to the nitty-gritty they have nothing to

49-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

help hospital boards with, when one or two or more are left out of the fold, so to speak.

The case of Dr. Reich was a little different in that he had had a hospital in which to practise, which was the Holy Cross Hospital in Calgary. He chose to try to buck the system by wanting to transfer to the luxurious Foothills Hospital which is owned by the province. He resigned from the Holy Cross. He found he couldn't get into the Foothills Hospital where they claimed they had more doctors than they needed with admittance privileges and the Holy Cross, quite naturally I suppose, wouldn't take him back. He then wanted to apply for admittance to the Calgary General Hospital which has far more doctors per bed than any other hospital in Calgary.

There were other things, there were complaints that he hadn't kept his administrative functions up to date while he was at the Holy Cross Hospital and this was given as one of the reasons for not taking him back. Appeals to the College of Physicians and Surgeons were of no avail. You're quite right -- they don't help trustees in this sort of situation. A hospital is completely within its rights to refuse or to accept a doctor in Canada.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in response to the comments made by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican. I think the issue he put forward, or questioned, was whether there ought to be a hospital board which controlled who practised within its hospital. While there may be some merit to the point made by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill that every doctor ought to have a hospital to which he can admit patients and in which he can practise, that really wasn't quite the issue raised in the case to which the hon. Member for Calgary Millican referred.

The real issue raised there was what was he permitted to do within the hospital. The hospital boards have a qualification test. I disagree entirely with the hon. Member for Calgary Millican if he's suggesting that the fact that someone holds a medical degree means they are qualified to perform any type of operation within the operating room. Because clearly that isn't the case and the prime function of these boards is to determine the qualifications to perform any particular operation within the operating room.

I, for one, think that is a very sound principle and a very desirable thing to have. Simply because, as a layman, when I go to select a doctor to, say, perform some delicate operation on the heart or something of that nature, I rely, really, on the medical profession to show by their designation of specifications and by their admission to the operating room in a hospital, that the person that I go to for that kind of an operation has the necessary training, qualifications, and experience to perform it safely and properly. That's the prime function of the hospital boards and in my mind it's a very, very essential one -- and one that's very, very helpful to the public.

In fact, the legal profession I have often felt has been somewhat behind the medical profession in this designation of specified categories or specialties within the profession. It's not long ago that they appointed a committee within Alberta to review that and I was a member of that committee until August 30th. We found, when reviewing it, that this specialization even within the legal profession that is, a board to assess the qualifications, was something that is not now uncommon in various parts of the world and particularly North America, there being several states in the United States that have such a specialization designation.

I don't think it is nearly as important for the legal profession but I do think it's absolutely essential for the medical profession.

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-39

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the hon. Attorney General a question on this subject? Mr. Attorney General, is there not also a question of legal liability on the part of the board or the very definite possibility of it, in the event of a malpractice claim, or something like this, against the doctor involved who is using the hospital facilities to treat the patient?

MR. LEITCH:

I can't -- as most lawyers, or as is usually the case, when someone asks the lawyer a question -- I can't give a direct answer to that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LEITCH:

All I can say to the hon. member is that I think there is a possibility that he's right.

DR. PAPROSKI:

I would like to make a few comments, to follow up on the hon. Attorney General for some clarification for the members here; I have gone through this, naturally, at the hospital I was practising at.

Just for clarification and not really truly related to the bill, but indirectly, on the basis of what the hon. Member for Calgary Millican said ... as I understand it, and I stand to be corrected by the hon. minister, the board and the minister have the final authority coming through this Assembly, of the Assembly to the board and the hospital, and to the staff. The medical staff recommends the various doctors on staff according to variable factors across the province always considering expertise or the quality of the doctor: the number of doctors on staff, because if there is a large number, obviously it will become unwieldy; the personality of the doctor, whether he can get along with the rest of the staff, The teaching ability, if teaching is necessary, and the wish or the desire of the doctor to serve actually on various committees. If he misses any of these categories, and there may be others in some other hospitals, the medical staff may very well not recommend him.

I think many medical doctors feel that, by having a licence to practise in this province, this gives them the licence to practise in a hospital, and this is not true. The medical staff must make the recommendation and the board makes the judgment. The board, of course, could over-rule all this. But you realize that by controlling quantity of doctors, as well as quality of doctors, there is a controllable, optimal number in any given hospital. If you had an open-hospital technique, or policy, then obviously you would lose control and the medical staff per se, who are responsible for control, would lose this control. And it has been stated before and I'll state it here again, that if there is a better method, it certainly would be welcomed by the medical profession and I'm sure they would act on it.

[The Motion was carried, Bill No. 65 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 68 The Statutes Amendment Act, 1972

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Labour, second reading of Bill No. 68, The Statutes Amendment Act, 1972.

49-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

Mr. Speaker, I find it a little difficult to launch into a debate on the principle of this bill since it merely corrects certain class references, typographical errors and things of that nature in the existing statute.

[The Motion was carried without debate or dissent, Bill No. 68 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 76 The Credit and Loan Agreements Amendment Act, 1972

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, second reading of Bill No. 76, being an act to amend the Credit and Loan Agreements Amendment Act, 1972.

Mr. Speaker, there are four distinct areas covered by the bill. The first area would require credit grantors under a loan agreement, and under a time sale agreement, to supply a pay-out statement for a person who wishes to prepay the balance outstanding under the loan agreement.

In discussing the matter with the supervisor under the act, I have been informed that he receives complaints, approximately three or four a week, where people have asked credit grantors for pay-out statements and have been unable to receive these. This particular provision will remedy this problem and in addition will give debtors under loan agreements some idea, from time to time, of what their particular financial position is under a time-sale agreement or a loan agreement.

The second area of the bill, Mr. Speaker, limits the charges for extra interest which can be charged by credit grantors where there is default under the agreement; where the debtor under the agreement misses the payment by two or three days or what have you. Under those circumstances, the additional amount that the debtor can be penalized is restricted to either the amount shown in the contract or the amount which is permitted under the Interest Act of Canada, namely five per cent. So that unlimited charges, such as perhaps an arbitrary \$5 or \$10 will not be permissible under these amendments to the act.

The third area, Mr. Speaker, deals with credit cards and provides entirely new legislation which would prohibit the issue of unsolicited credit cards. There are two features of this particular section which would, of course, make it very unwise for a person to issue such an unsolicited credit card. The first is, of course, that the issue of such a card would be an offence and the issuer of the unsolicited credit card would be liable under section 24 of the act. In the case of a corporation, there would be a penalty of \$1,000 and in the case of an individual there would be a penalty of \$500. But in addition, the provisions under the amendments would provide that the recipient of that card would not be legally responsible for anything that might have happened because of the use or misuse of that credit card where it was received unsolicited.

The last area with which the bill deals is the matter of advertising and it is a step towards consumer rights protection. It provides that where a credit grantor advertises his charges he must disclose these charges in accordance with the regulations passed under the act and otherwise must just state that credit plans are available at the normal rate. It would prohibit, Mr. Speaker, advertisements which would contain misleading figures on credit, credit charges, monthly payments, down payments, and statements which the credit grantor would know would entice a proposed borrower into the establishment within which the credit grantor operates.

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-41

The provisions dealing with advertising would affect not only newspapers and magazines, but also advertising which would appear on television and which would be broadcast by radio, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I don't take issue with the bill. I have only one question. I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question on this?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

It has to deal with whether he has had any consultation or had any representation made to him as to the implementation of the act. I have no concern about the desirability of the legislation but it may have problems in implementation. Has there been any discussion with credit-granting institutions as to perhaps some dislocations or problems that may provide great problems in implementing it on the day that it is put into effect? We have had similar legislation in previous years and there appeared to be a lot of problems that perhaps the hon. members are not aware of in implementation.

MR. KOZIAK:

There are four specific areas; there is the area dealing with advertising, the area dealing with the prepayment statements, the area dealing with excessive charges on default, and the area dealing with credit cards. Which specific area were you concerned about?

MR. LUDWIG:

In the area of advising the customers as to the exact detailed charges that they are making. Specifically, did any credit granting firms request a hearing on this bill?

MR. KOZIAK:

To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, no. I've had extensive discussions with the supervisor under the act, and just as a matter of interest, in the area dealing with prepayment -- the amendments which would require a credit grantor to supply a pay-out statement. The supervisor informs me that on at least two occasions a day he is requested by debtors who have paid out the balances under such loan agreements, to verify the outstanding balance. The reason that he is put in this position is because there is no statement which is supplied. All that happens is that when the debtor wishes to pay out the balance of the agreement, he is given the figure without any explanation and is required to pay that figure. The debtor then comes to the supervisor and says, "Well, is this correct? Was I required to pay this amount?" The supervisor finds himself in the position where, twice daily, he is asked to verify these pay-out statements.

From the point of view of the consumer, the one who is paying out statements, the one who is borrowing, this is definitely required legislation. From the point of view of the credit grantor, of course it's probably restrictive, but it's not as restrictive, when we weigh the balance, as the benefit on the other hand, to the consumer who in some cases cannot even get a pay-out statement -- which is a complaint which is often brought to the supervisor, three to four times a week. That is no statement at all. In other words, the credit grantor just won't answer the request of the debtor for a pay-out statement.

49-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

The second common situation is where the credit grantor will give a pay-out statement, but not, say, as of the 1st of June, but as of the 1st of July, requiring the debtor to pay an extra 45 days interest, should he wish to prepay now, which is a common situation. The last, of course, which is the most common, is where the pay-out is made and the figures are then brought to the supervisor with request for verification. So, from the point of view of the consumer, I think this is much needed legislation.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, one question to the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona. No doubt there are good and sufficient reasons for curtailing the issuing of credit cards, and I assume this is so that they do not fall into the wrong hands. Secondly, what would be the implications of interprovincial issuance of credit cards? For instance, many credit cards come from outside the province. Is this in the purview of the Province, also?

MR. KOZIAK:

First of all, dealing with the first question, with respect to the rationale behind this -- the supervisor has received complaints of a dog in Calgary receiving a credit card unsolicited and an eight year old child receiving a credit card unsolicited. From those facts alone, you can see that there is very little checking being done by the people who issue these credit cards. But the matter goes further. These credit cards come in the mail without any contractual obligations set out. It's a pretty little card that comes, and it's very easy to use, but the recipient in all cases, may not know what his contractual obligations will be once he uses that card.

I personally have received all of my credit cards unsolicited, and I think I've got a dozen of them lying around. A person may receive these cards and use them without knowing full well what the implications behind the use of these cards will be, and find out only after their use. This could quite easily happen. The credit charges might not be shown, or if they are shown, they are shown in such small print that they are indiscernible. I think this is probably the main problem.

With respect to out-of-province issue of credit cards, I doubt that we can provincially impose any type of a penalty on a card that comes from without the province, because we don't have control of the mails in the same sense that the federal government does, and this would be the fashion in which these credit cards would arrive. The only thing we could do is this. Most of the companies that would be issuing these unsolicited cards from outside the province would have to supply the services within the province, for the card to be of any value to the recipient. So, in some way perhaps, pressure can be brought to bear, not on the actual issuer of the card, but subsequently that agent of the issuer in the province who is doing business, and under whose auspices the card must be used. I would think that a credit card that would come into the province which could not be used in the province, would be of little use anyway. It would be no concern of ours in legislating against it.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, with reference to an unsolicited credit card, would the person not be liable if he used it and signed for receipt of the goods, or upon receipt of an unsolicited credit card is it quite legal to go on a real marketing venture and not have to pay for any of it?

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-43

MR. SPEAKER:

We seem to be lapsing into a committee procedure on the bill. I wonder if the questions could be collected in some fashion, perhaps by the hon. members speaking on the bill, and then the hon. member deal with them when he is closing the debate.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I was going to comment on the procedures you outlined, I was going to say a few words but will shorten it up because of the lateness of the hour. The one concern I had was, when you are going to put a ban on these unsolicited credit cards, in cases where you have been dealing with a certain company and they automatically renew their credit cards which are not asked for, would this be covered under this particular act as well?

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. KOZIAK:

Dealing first of all with the question posed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, no, that situation is expressly excluded by the act by the words, 'but does not include a credit card replacing or renewing a credit card previously used by the person.' That is Section 15, 1, Subsection B. So, that problem doesn't exist.

Regarding the problem that was raised by the hon. Member for Drumheller, this problem has caused me some concern as well. There is a possibility that the act could be read in such a fashion that the recipient of an unsolicited credit card could take that credit card and go on a spending binge and then suggest that he is not accountable for the same. I have some feelings on the matter that perhaps the individual might be accountable under criminal proceedings, perhaps obtaining goods under false pretences if he had no intention of ever paying for them. Perhaps this matter could be dealt with further when it reaches the committee stage.

[The motion was carried, Bill No. 76 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 81 The District Courts Amendment Act, 1972

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Labour, second reading of The Districts Courts Amendment Act 1972.

Mr. Speaker, there are four amendments to The District Courts Act which will be brought about by this bill. The first increases the number of district court judges within the northern Alberta judicial district from six to nine.

The second, Mr. Speaker, removes two sections that are now in The District Courts Act, which are now unnecessary because of the increased monetary jurisdiction given to the district court by amendments made at an earlier session of the Legislature.

The third amendment deals with the technical matter in connection with the commencement of an action. As the law now stands one must sue in the proper judicial district when suing in the district court. One must sue in the judicial district in which the cause of action arose or in which the debtor resides. What quite frequently happens is that a mistake would be made and the action started in the wrong judicial district. Then the mistake would not

49-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

be discovered until an intervening limitation period had expired and the plaintiff had then lost his action because he wasn't able to continue with the one he had started. The court didn't have jurisdiction. He wasn't able to start a new one in the proper judicial district because a limitation period prevented him from doing so.

This amendment merely permits the transfer of action that has been started in the wrong judicial district to the proper judicial district or alternatively permits it to be carried out with consent in that judicial district in which it was started.

And the fourth amendment, Mr. Speaker, extends the jurisdiction of the District Court Judge to include matters that fall within the Federal Divorce Act, and I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is going to be a very real advantage because it is going to extend the number of people who will be able to hear divorce actions. I think it will to some extent speed up the disposal of those actions and it will take from the Supreme Court Judges, who are now hearing them all, some of the work load and transfer it to the District Court Judge.

[The motion was carried on a voice vote. Bill No. 81 was read a second time.]

MR. HYNEMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for consideration of Bills on the Order Papers, Nos. 6, 7, 9 and 10.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair.]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee will come to order.

Bill No. 6, The Alberta Loan Act, 1972

[Sections 1 to 3 were agreed to without debate.]

Section 4 (a)

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder at this point if I could ask the hon. the Provincial Treasurer if the government has any new thoughts on encouraging Albertans to invest in their own province? Now I know we tried it as a former government and at the time the interest rates weren't enough to encourage investment by Albertans apparently, but I'm sure all of us in the House are most interested that Alberta people do invest. In particular I can think of nothing better than helping to build their own province. I was just wondering if the Provincial Treasurer at this time had any new thoughts on it.

MR. MINIELY:

Right, Mr. Chairman. That matter is under review and I think it had been raised in the Question Period. Hon. members on this side of the House, I might say, have also been in consultation with me on

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-45

this particular matter several times and many of the members in our government have raised it with me. So I would say that we are taking a look at the ways and means that we might be able to achieve this.

I would just add one very interesting comment. And that is that the government, of course, would hope to encourage Albertans to invest in maximized equity capital to achieve some of our goals too. I don't think that one should simply say that we would want Albertans to invest solely in government bonds. Hopefully, we would like to provide some kind of leadership for them to invest in Alberta-owned enterprises, and some capital should be for that purpose. But certainly, it is under review, and we are giving it every consideration.

MR. DIXON:

One final supplementary question. Has there been any discussion at the federal level, to allow people who invest in municipal or provincial bonds, the right to write off any interest, so, in other words, they wouldn't be paying income tax up to a certain amount, like they do in the United States. I think it is up to \$5,000 on an individual that is income tax-free, if it is income tax from school bonds, municipal bonds, or state bonds.

MR. MINIELY:

If I may just clarify, you are saying that if they invested in provincial bonds, there might be some kind of a tax break, provincial tax break? Is that what you are suggesting?

MR. DIXON:

Maybe I can explain it too. In other words, if you made \$5,000 interest on that type of bond, it wouldn't be subject to income tax. I am just giving that as an example. It could be set at any figure.

MR. MINIELY:

Right. Well, I think that this is something, probably, that would have to be worked out on a national basis, as well as solely provincial, because one of the problems, under the present income tax system -- as we have spoken about many times -- is the fact that right now the tax-sharing is so heavily in favour of the federal government in any event, that in this particular area, provincial tax incentive becomes a very costly administrative thing. But it is something that I intend to be pursuing -- many of these kinds of things -- after the session is over.

MR. DRAIN:

One short question. Does the Alberta government do any treasury bill financing?

AN HON. MEMBER:

[Inaudible]

MR. DRAIN:

I was just asking about treasury bill financing. Is there any other short-term treasury bill financing done by the Province of Alberta?

MR. MINIELY:

Yes. The Treasury Department's policy -- you are talking about more short-term financing -- these are put out on a competitive bid basis. We are looking on a competitive bid basis with the various

49-46

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 12th 1972

financial institutions. I might add, too, that with respect to the incentives to Albertans in the area of equity capital that I was talking about, as opposed to the direct question from the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, that, of course, our hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona is also looking at this area through his select committee on encouraging Albertans to invest in the province.

MR. DRAIN:

I am very pleased to hear that, hon. Provincial Treasurer.

[Clauses 4(b), 5, the title and the preamble, were agreed to without debate.]

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 6, The Alberta Loan Act, 1972, be reported.

[The motion was carried without debate.]

Bill No. 7 The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation
Amendment Act, 1972

[All the clauses of this bill, the title and the preamble, were agreed to without debate.]

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 7, The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act, 1972, be reported.

[The motion was carried without debate.]

Bill No. 9 The Research Council Amendment Act, 1972

[All the clauses of this bill, the title and the preamble, were agreed to without debate.]

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 9, The Research Council Amendment Act, 1972, be reported.

[The motion was carried without debate.]

Bill No. 5 The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Amendment Act, 1972

[All the clauses of this bill, the title and the preamble, were agreed to without debate.]

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 5, The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Amendment Act, 1972, be reported.

[The Motion was carried without debate.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report progress and beg leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

It has been moved that we report and sit again. Is it agreed.

May 12th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

49-47

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Diachuk left the Chair.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee for the Whole Assembly has had under consideration the following Bills: No. 6, 7, 9, 5 and begs to report the same.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the report with respect to Bills 6, 7, 9 and 5, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree it's 5:30? The House stands adjourned until Monday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 5:30 pm.]

