

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday, May 18th, 1972

[The House met at 2:30 pm.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 80: The Gas Resources Preservation Amendment Act, 1972

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being The Gas Resources Preservation Amendment Act, 1972. There are two proposed amendments and they are merely for clarification. When a company made an application last year before the Energy Resources Conservation Board applying for the removal of ethane from the province in liquid form, it was accepted although it would deal with ethane as a liquid. Ethane is normally a gas and would come under the definition of gas within the act. A new subsection will make it clear that for whatever form ethane or methane is handled, it is for the purpose of the act a gas so that a permit would be required before it could be removed from the province.

The other amendment did give the Lieutenant Governor in Council certain powers when these permits are issued to attach conditions and to clarify the power of the Lieutenant Governor in Council to make sure conditions could be attached.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 80 was introduced and read a first time.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

DR. MCCRIMMON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the hon. members of this Assembly 40 Grade VI students from Ponoka Riverside Elementary School. They are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Massing and Mr. Erickson and by parents Mrs. Humell, Mrs. Kroning, Mrs. Turner, and bus driver Gordon Reese. I would ask them now to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you and to the hon. members of this Assembly some 20 Byemoor high school students from my constituency. They are sitting in the public gallery. They are accompanied by Mrs. Ferrand, their teacher, and several other adults. I would ask that they stand and be recognized.

53-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, again it is a pleasure for me to introduce to you and to the hon. members of this Assembly another class from my constituency. Today we have with us 27 Grade X students from Daysland. They are accompanied by their two teachers Mr. Corbett and Mr. Eman. These students are seated today in the members' gallery and I will ask them to stand and be recognized by this Assembly.

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you and to the hon. members of this Assembly 67 Grade XI students from the J. R. Robson School in Vermilion. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Bachmann and Miss Walton. Mr. Speaker, I know many of these students by sight and by name and the young man who resembles me so greatly, seated in the front row, happens to be my nephew. They are seated in the public gallery, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask them at this time to stand and be recognized.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to table Return No. 200, ordered by the Assembly.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Government House Leader could give us some indication as to when we could expect Return No. 195?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I'd ask that the Minister of Municipal Affairs might give further information he might have on that one.

MR. RUSSELL:

I wonder if the hon. member could identify it, Mr. Speaker. I've been trying to keep track of these things.

MR. HENDERSON:

I think probably the Government House Leader has the wrong minister. It concerns the report of the Environment Conservation Authority on Cooking Lake, Mr. Speaker.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, when the government accepted that motion, I made some remarks in regard to that report. I indicated that the government would table it during the course of this session. This is certainly correct, after the government had time to review the report and review the recommendations. What I said then, I repeat again, and it still stands, that after the government has an opportunity to review the recommendations and the report in its totality, it will be tabled during the course of this session.

MR. HENDERSON:

A point of clarification, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister advise us of whether he means before the recess, or is he leaving this open so that we can't expect it till next fall?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, if the government has time to manage to squeeze in an opportunity to review the report in addition to all its other work

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-3

and its hearings that are going to be held next week, then it will be tabled before the session breaks. But if it doesn't have time to review it in its totality before, then it will be tabled during the fall part. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that the indication is very strong that it will probably be in the fall part of the session.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table Motion for a Return, ordered by the Assembly.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Woods Christian Home

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. I wonder if the minister could advise the House as to the present status, as well as the future status, of the Woods Christian Home in Calgary, which was set up as a treatment centre for emotionally disturbed children some time ago.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc for giving me prior notice of his intention to ask that question. The situation at Woods Christian Home is that the pilot project or experimental program, which I believe is intended to last three years, is at about the midway point. No evaluation based on data up to this point is available yet. It is expected that a number of months more will have to go by before much evaluation, based on the data accumulated there, would take place.

The budgeting for the Woods Christian Home is proceeding in accordance with the original intent in this year's budget. The per diem costs are within the range that were originally experienced -- in the \$55 to \$65 range per patient per day. At the present time there are 22 children involved in the program.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Confederate Klans of Alberta

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Attorney General. Is it true that the Confederate Klans of Alberta, otherwise known as the Klu Klux Klan, was granted incorporation under The Societies Act, on April 7th of this year?

MR. LEITCH:

I don't know, Mr. Speaker. I'll check for the hon. member and let him know.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question. When the hon. minister checks, would he give consideration to whether the incorporation of the Klan is consistent with the aims and purposes of Bills No. 1 and 2?

53-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 13th 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

That might very well involve a legal opinion which the hon. member might seek elsewhere. The hon. Member for Drumheller, followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

Possession of Marijuana

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Attorney General. Would you agree that possession of marijuana, solely for one's own personal use, is a right of the individual to enjoyment of property, a right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law?

MR. HYNDMAN:

That's out of order. He's asking for a personal opinion.

MR. SPEAKER:

The question is not directed to elicit government policy apparently. It appears phrased as a question for the hon. minister's personal opinion which, in that case, would be out of order.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, in that case I will rephrase it. Does the hon. Attorney General have any intention of recommending to his government the policy recommended by the Le Dain Commission, namely that marijuana and hashish retained for the personal use of an individual should be carried out in Canada?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that I have no such present intention. The Le Dain Commission report came out yesterday -- at least the last report -- I think it is worthwhile observing that there were five people on that commission; they studied the matter for some years; there was a division of opinion, I think, in the principal recommendations of three to two. I would think that that probably reasonably accurately reflects the division of opinion on that subject across the whole of Canada. I would think that, when there is a division of opinion throughout the country of that nature, on that important a topic, it would take a good deal of thought and study before I, at least, would be prepared to make any recommendations to this government about it.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the removal of penalties for personal use not assist greatly in reducing the profits of the traffickers?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is disguisedly debating in asking for an opinion of this kind.

MR. LEITCH:

I would like also to mention -- which I ought to have done in answering the hon. member's earlier question -- that this is, of course, a federal matter. The legislation prohibiting the use of marijuana, hashish and other drugs is, of course, federal legislation.

May 18th 1972

ALBFPTA HANSARD

53-5

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there are apparently some 150,000 people in Alberta using marijuana, would the government consider taking over the total distribution of marijuana, thereby doing away with the traffickers, who are some of the worst offenders in this country?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, the obvious answer to that is no. The distribution of that drug is illegal in Canada. If the hon. member is suggesting that the provincial government, knowingly and deliberately, would breach a federal law, the answer must be obvious to him.

MR. HENDERSON:

Further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the hon. Attorney General if he could arrange to make copies of the latest Le Dain report available to the members of the House.

MR. LEITCH:

I will certainly consider that and look into it, Mr. Speaker. I don't have a copy of it yet and I am not sure of the distribution system that the federal government and the Le Dain Commission is following, but I will certainly consider the request.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Tax Write-Off on Farm Machinery

MR. RUSTE:

A question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Has the hon. minister made any representation to the federal government requesting that farm machinery be included in the fast tax write-off items announced in the federal budget for production equipment?

MR. GETTY:

No, Mr. Speaker, I have not done that.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Would the hon. minister consider making such representation which would assist the farmer in modernizing his equipment?

MR. GETTY:

Yes I would, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure, however, that perhaps the matter has already been discussed by the hon. Minister of Agriculture. If he has something to add I would suggest he do it now.

DR. HOPNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The department has made the federal Department of Agriculture aware of the views of Alberta in relation to income tax matters, both in regard to the question of production machinery, and also in regard to other matters that affect the farmer, particularly the capital gains tax, and additionally the new basic curb regulations. As a matter of fact we have set up within the department a man who is trained in both agriculture and law to help to advise our extension people in regard to the new Income Tax Act.

53-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

MR. RUSTE:

Further supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Have you made actual representation as to the fast tax write-off -- and I am comparing this to production equipment that is covered in the new federal budget?

DR. HORNER:

Well I will check and see what the actual representations have been, but they were included in the entire submission to the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Red Deer College

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Advanced Education and ask him if he is in a position today to make a statement with regard to the report on the Red Deer College, after he went to Calgary yesterday.

MR. FOSTER:

No, I am not, not at this time.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did the minister meet with the faculty, students, and board within the last two or three days? And in the course of that meeting, did he let the board, and the faculty, and the students see the report?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I had quite a day yesterday. I met with the junior administration of the college at 10 o'clock yesterday morning, the senior administration at 12, the faculty association at 2, the non-academic staff at 4, the students at 5, the lay members of the board at 6, and I got home at 12:30. I did not reveal to anyone the contents of the Byrne report or the Byrne recommendations, but I was in the college for the purpose of discussing the climate in the college and the atmosphere, and some concerns which I have, but I had no intention yesterday of making the report public to anyone. I am still giving the matter very careful consideration and I am sure, as my learned friend appreciates, this is a highly complex and difficult matter that I intend to deal with very carefully.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When the minister makes a statement on the report, does the minister plan to make the statement here in the Legislature?

MR. FOSTER:

That decision, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly hasn't been arrived at, because I haven't even determined whether or not the report will be made public. I want to reiterate my former stance on this, that I said before, that I feel strongly that matters of public affairs should be dealt with in public. While I am assessing the report and

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-7

its effect and ramifications, not only on the Red Deer College but the college system generally, I think it would be perhaps a bit presumptuous of me to make conclusions on which I have not yet got all the facts.

MR. CLARK:

Another supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister plan to make a major announcement in Red Deer tomorrow morning, afternoon, or evening with regard to the report?

MR. FOSTER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I have answered the question. I might make a major announcement this afternoon, but I haven't decided yet. I just don't know when I am going to be able to deal with this.

MR. CLARK:

Tomorrow?

MR. FOSTER:

I can't answer that. I don't know.

MR. CLARK:

Or even three days before Sunday, like today would be all right?

One last supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. minister at this time giving any consideration to amendments in the college legislation as a result of the recommendations in the report?

MR. FOSTER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I admire my learned friend for his persistence. I think to comment on whether or not there would be amendments to existing or proposed legislation is to comment on the contents of the Byrne report. And with great respect, Mr. Speaker, I don't think I can do that at this time, but I will make every attempt to do as much of this in public as I can, and to proceed as openly as I can.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, if I could ask the hon. --

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member said the last one was the last supplementary, and the hon. minister has already made his position abundantly clear.

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall followed by the hon. Member for Camrose.

Crime in Calgary

MR. HO LEM:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General. In view of the sharp increase of criminal activities in Calgary, has your department taken any steps to assist the Calgary police force?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order, order.

53-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

MR. HO LEM:

I am referring to the sharp increase of crime during the first four months this year compared with the corresponding period in 1971. Non-capital murders have doubled. Also three attempted murders have been reported compared with none during that period last year, and there are also 24 woundings, up from nine.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member ask his question directly without the preamble, even though it may follow the question?

MR. HO LEM:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Has your department taken any action?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, the statistics to which the hon. member referred cover rather a short period. This is not a new situation in the major cities of the province, or indeed the province as a whole or throughout the whole of Canada. Specifically as a department we have not in the past and are not now taking any particular action in the sense of increasing members of the police force and things of that nature.

The City of Calgary, as everyone is aware, has its own police force. It increases its numbers as it feels necessary to combat any increase in crime. As I indicated earlier in my speeches in this House I propose to meet with the chief officers of the various police forces throughout the province and with the representatives from the various commissions throughout the province as soon as we recess. We hope to develop programs that will help to combat what I regard as a very serious situation, not only in Calgary but throughout the whole of the country.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Camrose, followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

Pollution Legislation

MR. STROMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. In the light of the Crown bringing court action against a company that is polluting the environment, are the same privileges extended to a private citizen if he so wishes to do?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, if an individual has reason to believe that his private property or private person is affected he can certainly sue under civil law; this is my understanding. However, at this time no third party suits are possible, and by this I would indicate that this is where somebody sues the company on behalf of somebody else.

We have had several submissions made to us in connection with the consideration given to an environmental bill of rights. I think I have indicated in the past that it's our feeling as a government that this type of legislation is premature for the Province of Alberta at this time. The ramifications of such legislation have to be examined, and we feel that other jurisdictions should perhaps test this type of legislation where conditions of pollution and the effect on private citizens is much greater than it is in Alberta. I understand, of course, that certain jurisdictions in the United

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-9

States are giving consideration to this type of legislation. In fact, I do believe, if my memory serves me right, that some consideration is being given in this regard in connection with legislation in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Compensation for Wrongful Imprisonment

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the hon. Attorney General. What criteria were used when you recommended that the provincial government pay \$500 compensation to a young man who was wrongfully imprisoned for 20 days in 1970?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, that question raises a rather important matter, and I think the answer to it needs to go beyond the precise words of the hon. member's question.

The hon. member is referring to an article that appeared recently in the newspaper. If the provincial judge involved meant what the literal interpretation of the words would lead one to believe he meant, I think it would have called for very drastic action on the part of the government. I'm referring to a reference in the story that although he was convinced he couldn't find the accused guilty, he wasn't going to let him off that easily. Also a reference was made that the criminal court shouldn't be used for the collection of damages, but he was going to do what he could to ensure that the woman whose house had been broken into, got paid for the damage that was done. As I said, if those words, taken literally, were what was intended by the provincial judge, it would be a very serious matter. But I have studied the transcript and spoken to the provincial judge involved -- and, incidentally, this occurred nearly two years ago -- and I'm convinced that he did not mean what those words, if taken at their face value, would appear to indicate.

Firstly, on the question of, "I know you're not guilty but I'm not going to let you off that easily," or words to that effect, at that time the provincial judge was addressing himself as to whether or not the accused might be guilty of an included offence. What he was really saying was, "I'm aware that you're not guilty of the offence with which you're charged, but you may be guilty of included offences." That's a very common thing in criminal law, where someone is charged with one offence and the other offences are not named in the charge. If the evidence falls short of establishing the charge that is specifically referred to, the court may still convict them of lesser charges, which are known as included offences.

In this particular case the charge was breaking and entering, and some possible included offences were unlawfully being in a dwelling house, assault by trespass, and trespass by night; those are offences which might have been included offences. And these were really what the judge was directing his mind to when he made that comment, namely, "I'm sure you're not guilty of the offence with which you are charged but you might be guilty of the included offences."

With respect to the comment about damage, in the criminal courts there is always the problem of citizens using them in an effort to collect money, for example, in the case of someone with a bad cheque. They quite often endeavour to start a prosecution in the hope of collecting the money. Once the money is collected, they then lose

53-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

all interest in the prosecution, and that is something we, of course, frown upon in the criminal court system, and that was to what the provincial judge was, then, alluding.

However, there is in the Criminal Code, and this is what he was really directing his mind to, a provision that on a finding of guilt the court is entitled to order that the accused make good the damage he has caused. It was that provision in the Criminal Code that he was directing his mind to when he made the comments about damage. Therefore, while one reads literally the words in the transcript they don't, when you know what was happening in the court room, mean what a literal interpretation would indicate.

Then there came the procedural error which led to this person going to jail, and it occurred in this way. The trial had been completed when this discussion took place and the provincial judge then set it over for a month for two purposes: to make up his mind what to do and also to enable the accused to consider making good the damage, because that may have had something to do with the extent of the penalty imposed. The accused did not show up on the date to which the case had been remanded; a warrant was issued for his arrest and he came before the courts a further month later -- that is, some two months after the case had been heard. When he came before the court on the second occasion, his lawyer was not with him -- he had been represented by a lawyer up to that point. The Crown counsel who appeared on this occasion was a different one than the Crown counsel who had appeared during the trial.

The judge and the Crown counsel both assumed that he had been found guilty and was there to be sentenced, and that was where the error was made. The court assumed that a finding of guilt had been made and then imposed a sentence. The court assumed that the finding of guilt had been made, and then imposed a sentence which was a fine and, in lieu of payment, a jail term. The accused didn't have the money to pay the fine, or didn't pay it, then went to jail.

The provincial judge, and of course, the Crown prosecutor and the clerk of the court, one of the three of them, ought to have, because there is an endorsement on the information as to the previous disposition, realized that a finding of guilt had not been made, and the man couldn't be sentenced without such a finding. They made that error. He then went to jail -- it was a few days later that this was discovered -- the case was appealed by his lawyer, and the Court of Appeal, with as I recall, Crown counsel's agreement, promptly squashed the sentence. He was then released.

Then came the question of the compensation, and the hon. member asked the question, "How did we arrive at it?" I think I'm free to say that this was an offer that came to us, and as I said, I would recommend to the government acceptance of that.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker. Is it the policy of the government to provide legal aid to a person who has been wrongly dealt with by the law?

MR. LEITCH:

No, Mr. Speaker, you can't put the policy in those words. The legal aid plan is to provide legal aid for those people who are unable, through financial circumstances at that time, to provide legal aid for themselves. So it's not quite accurate to put it that way. If the government had made some error, and a citizen of the Province of Alberta wanted to take action against the government, and was unable to retain his own lawyer because of his financial circumstances, he could apply to Legal Aid for a lawyer and within the rules that Legal Aid follows, it would be granted.

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-11

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Status of Women

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Premier. Is it your government's policy to implement the recommendations of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women which fall within provincial jurisdiction?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to refer that question to the hon. Member for Rocky Mountain House. She may want to elaborate on it. There has been some study and assessment done by the administration on the matter.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, there was a committee formed by the last government that perhaps you are not aware of, and this committee's main function was to analyze the briefs and submissions pertaining to the Royal Commission on the Status of Women, and make recommendations to the government. Some of these have already been implemented, some of them are in the process of being studied and analyzed at the moment, and some of the recommendations will not be possible because at this point they are not economically feasible. But they will become part of an on-going study of this government. There are some recommendations that perhaps are not socially acceptable at this time, also. So this is the point, we have received the recommendations and, as I said before, they are part of an on-going study that we have in this matter.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What programs will be implemented to encourage women to seek elected offices, and what policy has the government to increase the number of women on provincially appointed boards, commissions and tribunals?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in response to the first one that I don't really think that is the sole prerogative of the government, although I believe I'm doing all I can to encourage them. I think it has to come, not only from this side of the House. Boards and commissions? We're working on it, but I think you will see some improvement.

MR. RUSTE:

Supplementary question to the hon. minister. She mentioned 'economically feasible'. Could you give me an example of that?

MISS HUNLEY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, day care centres.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the hon. minister not feel that in dealing with women's rights, that a hard, aggressive personality like the hon. Minister of Agriculture's would get better results than a woman?

53-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

Dr. Matthews' Report

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Attorney General. Some weeks ago Dr. Matthews' report on justice was tabled in the House and at the time the Attorney General did give us a few answers on what he thought about the report, but he asked for some time. I wonder if he is in a position today to inform the House as to whether he plans any further investigation or action on Dr. Matthews' report?

MR. LEITCH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated earlier we were doing some research on it. We've been in touch with the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and we have asked them to give us some information. I have been checking on that from time to time. It has been much slower coming than I had anticipated. I was talking to the officers of the department a day or so ago and learned that part of the delay is that a person in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics who is working on it has been out of Ottawa or will be out of Ottawa for a few weeks. That has been part of the delay, but I have been following it very closely.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. With the statistics that you have at the present time, has there been a great difference in what you received from Ottawa and what Dr. Matthews was quoting in his report?

MR. LEITCH:

I haven't received, Mr. Speaker -- and I didn't mean to leave that impression -- reports or statistics from Ottawa. We have been in touch with them but we haven't got anything back from them yet.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

Unit Train Grain Shipments

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. When can Alberta producers expect to benefit from the use of terminal elevators in Alberta for unit train shipment of grain as announced recently for Saskatchewan?

DR. HORNER:

I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, frankly. The question of the use of unit trains is one of continuing correspondence and negotiation with the Wheat Board. We would hope that eventually we would have that type of shipment from all of the inland terminals in Alberta and that there would be an expansion of those terminals to allow for unit train shipment to the coast. As my hon. friend appreciates, this is a very complex matter and it also deals with the question of the full use of the terminals that are now presently in Vancouver. We are

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-13

also hopeful that the anticipated port development in Prince Rupert will move ahead quickly, because I think we are going to need a combination of unit trains, better use of our terminals at the coast, better use of our terminals inland, and additional terminals, particularly at Prince Rupert.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Are you looking, then, at the use of larger trucks to haul grain at greater distances to these terminal elevators for assembly?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, this is involved, of course, in the study that the hon. Otto Lang has undertaken, through the grains group, of the entire matter of grain transportation and handling. That study is now in the hands of various governments and farm organizations. It is a very detailed and complex one. When Mr. Lang decides to make that study public we will, at that time, make a response to it as a government.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury followed by the hon. Member for Highwood.

Red Deer College (cont.)

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. Premier and ask if we could have the Premier's assurance that when the government does make an announcement with regard to the problems at Red Deer -- the college -- that that announcement will be made in the Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER:

I would respectfully suggest to the hon. member that this topic has been exhausted until the hon. Minister of Advanced Education has had a chance to consider further the report and the problems arising out of that situation.

The hon. Member for Highwood followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Hansard

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure to whom I should address my question. It has to do with the publication of Hansard. Could the hon. minister tell me on what the priorities are based by which the back numbers of Hansard are published? They are published on a hit-and-miss basis. How do they arrive at this, because they don't have any system of publication for the back numbers?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Perhaps I could shed some light on that, Mr. Speaker. I spoke to the editor of Hansard just the other day, and he indicated that the problem at the moment is that they are having some difficulty in keeping current on the daily Hansards as they are now appearing, bearing in mind the occasional nocturnal hours kept by the hon. members. He does say, though, that the Hansards are coming out more frequently. They have not come out on any pattern which has been decided upon by the Hansard editor, and I gather that there has been

53-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

some justifiable concern by the hon. Opposition Leader concerning some reprints of major addresses he made. But I'm going to be talking to him again today, and I believe insofar as we'll be very shortly approaching the Legislation estimates, at that time when the Hansard appropriation comes up we might discuss this more fully, and I'll get as much background information in the interim as I can.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation, followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Wildlife Habitat Fund

MR. SORENSON:

I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Has the government made any plans to establish a habitat fund -- a fund which would be used for the purchasing of land used exclusively for wildlife?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, roughly two years ago the legislative capacity for a habitat fund was established by the Government of Alberta. In the intervening period no action whatever was taken by the previous administration. The Fish and Game Association of Alberta brought this to my attention in rather thorough detail when I met them on December 20th, in their brief to the Fish and Wildlife Division and myself. I agreed to take this under consideration, and I am now doing so. But I would emphasize that the legislative capacity is there. It's just a matter of it never having been implemented as far as the intervening period is concerned.

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary question to the minister. How would you propose that the money be raised for this fund? Would a large segment of Albertans contribute to it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister has already replied that the matter is under consideration, and perhaps that should suffice for the time being. The hon. Member for Drumheller, followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

Ombudsman

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Attorney General, following the questions from the hon. Member for Lethbridge West. Is the door open for the said person to appeal to the Ombudsman if he's dissatisfied with the amount of compensation received?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a little hesitancy in discussing the negotiations that went on between the government counsel and this person's counsel. I take it that if, by agreement, the matter is settled, there is no dissatisfaction to take to anyone. And I take it that if there is disagreement, it isn't settled. So I doubt that the issue is ever going to rise, and as the hon. member knows, anyone is free to go to the Ombudsman with anything at any time. I should also say my hesitancy about discussing the negotiations between the government and the person involved arises out of a respect for his privacy in that area.

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-15

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Hospital Beds

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Mr. Minister, you recently announced that there would be no active treatment hospital beds built in Edmonton for some five years. Does this policy also extend to hospitals in rural Alberta?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, primarily the policy extends, I would think, throughout Alberta for a period of years, until the demand for beds on the overall provincial average catches up with the available supply. However, no intention was intended to apply a policy which was specifically related to Edmonton or, by a further assumption, to the rest of the province. I would have to say that the position for rural hospitals would be that it would likely be the same except where there are unusual areas of growth or unusual occasions of obsolescence where replacement might have to be considered. But on the whole the policy would be to try to contain our costs in this high cost area.

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, would the same policy apply to the replacement of old hospitals which have been in past years scheduled for replacement? Would that plan be followed out or is there a freeze on that too?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Maybe I can help the hon. member in this way. The greatest concern the government has in regard to active treatment beds is not the cost of a structure, but the obligation that is created for the public purse thereafter in regard to 50 or 100 years of operating costs, depending on the type of building that is constructed.

Current figures would show that with active treatment hospitals the capital cost is about twice one year's operating cost. When you get into nursing homes you find that the operating cost, instead of catching up in two years to the capital cost -- which can be seen to be a very expensive type of facility -- is about a ratio of 3 1/2 to 1 instead of 2 to 1. So the nursing home by comparison is a far more economical operation. Therefore, facilities like nursing homes, auxiliary hospitals, which are well known to hon. members, along with some newer concepts such as ambulatory care centres and home care programs, are the sort of things where the government is looking for cost containment.

In an area where obsolescence and complete dereliction of a building have brought it to the point where a decision would have to be made as to whether to replace it or not, I would have to say that that decision to replace it would not be regarded nearly so seriously by me as a decision to increase the overall number of active beds in the province.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

53-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

Tar Sands Policy

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. By way of information, Mr. Minister, Mr. Spragins, the president of Syncrude, has envisaged 50 oil sands plants in the next number of years. My question to you is, as your government reviews tar sands policy, are you considering in that review long-range development over the next 25 or 30 years?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to answer that. I noted with interest the comments by Mr. Spragins. We had discussed that with him previously. After our discussions we started our research on a number of plans, and our development policy. We did take into consideration this question. I can assure the hon. member that exactly what we are looking at in our policy is the long-range point of view to see how the tar sands can best be developed.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When you make your final decision on tar sands policy and make the announcement, are you prepared to table the supporting data and the study information in the Legislature this fall?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, our thinking hasn't projected that far. I would envisage what we are contemplating is another position paper, and in support of that position paper certain data that would be necessary to support it would be tabled at the same time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

Gas Co-ops

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister without Portfolio, Mr. Topolnisky. I understand you are in charge of rural development. My question is regarding gas co-ops. I was wondering if there is going to be any change because of the demand for rural people, and the ones I am particularly interested in, smallholdings outside our city? Are there going to be any changes in the regulations or legislation that would make it easier, and the gas available sooner?

MR. POPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, this hopefully could be the case, but we are looking for groups or co-ops in which it would be economical to have about 150 members, or in that vicinity.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the hon. minister. Does he feel that this is the ideal size, or wouldn't it vary in many parts of the province?

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-17

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would have to vary from one region to another, but the ideal size would be in the neighbourhood of 150 customers.

Pacific Rim Trade

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could respond to a question I had been asked regarding Mr. Chester Ronning and the suggestion made that we contact him relative to a mission we are anticipating making soon to the Far East. The reply that we have received from Mr. Ronning is most helpful. I think the nature of the reply is such that I don't feel we are in a position to table it, but I did want to inform members that it was the view of Mr. Ronning that it would be advantageous to the Government of the Province of Alberta, to become involved, either soon or in the fairly near future, with an extensive development of a trade relationship with China, having regard to the potential that exists for trade relations between Alberta and China. And we appreciated very much the reaction we have received by Mr. Ronning to our inquiry.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright.

Policy on Government Announcements

MR. RUSTE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Premier. What is the government's policy as it relates to the announcement of major changes in direction or decisions during the time that this Legislature is in session?

MR. LOUGHEED:

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I understand the import of that question.

MR. RUSTE:

What is the government's policy as it relates to the announcement of major changes in direction or decisions during the time that this Legislature is in session?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I am still failing to grasp the import of the question. Perhaps the hon. member could give me an example of what he is talking about.

MR. RUSTE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, what I have in mind is, if there is a major announcement to be made by the government, what is the policy of the government as it relates to that? Is it to make it to the members of this Legislature first, or outside of the House?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Well, Mr. Speaker, that would depend upon the subject matter. I would say in the vast majority of the cases, if the House was in session it would be made here. If, on the other hand, it is a matter that has developed out of a decision of the Executive Council -- I think last week we had an example of that, where the Minister of Health and Social Development had a news conference and described the background and the nature of some decisions that had been made in

53-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

Cabinet that day or the day before, relative to the compensation or charges that were no longer going to be required in certain facilities within the department. And each case has to be assessed on its merits.

Primarily it is our hope that these matters would be brought before the Legislature, but it would not be a hard and fast position the government would take. It would depend on the circumstances.

MR. SPEAKER:

The time has run out for the Question Period.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House would give me leave to offer information in respect to two matters I was asked about earlier during an Oral Question Period?

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. minister the agreement of the House?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Abortions

MR. CRAWFORD:

Thank you. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Calgary Millican and the hon. Member for Lethbridge West both asked questions last week in regard to abortions, and the present situation about hospitals in Alberta handling them.

The situation is that the hospitals which may handle abortions in the province must be accredited by the Canadian Council on Hospital Accreditation. This at once limits the number of hospitals that are able to perform therapeutic abortions in Alberta. The situation, taking that into account, is that 41 general hospitals are so accredited and may carry out abortions. There are 22 of those which do not permit abortions, 12 of them operated by religious orders, and 10 operated by municipal hospital districts. In the City of Calgary all hospitals undertake the procedure, and their abortion load is relatively evenly spread. The situation in Edmonton is different, in that the Edmonton General and the Misericordia Hospitals do not perform abortions, and therefore it creates the situation that has been referred to from time to time in regard to the Royal Alex.

Drug Treatment Centres

Mr. Speaker, that was one of the two questions I wanted to respond to, and the second one relates to a question asked by the hon. Member for Drumheller in regard to treatment centres for young people who are suffering a bad trip attributable to soft drugs, and also, in regard to this matter, the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo asked the question in regard to the one particularly in Calgary.

The situation is that since the closure of TRUST at the end of 1971 in Edmonton, there is no such agency. The Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission advises me that they are handling the situation, as it exists at the present time, directly through their own facilities at the commission, and that they would consider a street type agency as the changing circumstances may dictate.

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-19

In Calgary, however, the drug information centre is being funded again by the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, and is providing services of the type inquired about in the City of Calgary.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Position paper on Financial Assistance for Pollution Control

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government I am pleased to table today, a position paper on financial assistance for pollution control.

"The Government of the Province of Alberta finds no cause or need to offer direct monetary grants to industry for pollution control purposes. Such grants are considered to mitigate against the establishment of viable and responsible enterprises, as they distort the relative regional inter-provincial and even national economic character of such enterprises. Industry must consider pollution control costs as an integral part of the costs of production. It is the government's intent to generate a climate of responsibility and concern for the environment on the part of all enterprise. Furthermore, government will pursue performance on the part of industry through mutual co-operation, as well as through stringent enforcement of legislation and regulations. Only under the most extreme and extenuating circumstances will anti-pollution grants of any kind be considered for industry -- such being for rehabilitation of an existing industry, so that it may conform with stringent standards, while also preventing major loss of jobs. Provincial government loans for pollution control equipment and facilities will be made through the Alberta Opportunity Fund, in accordance with the provisions of that act. The Government of Alberta excludes by statute the assessment and taxation of all lands and equipment used for pollution control purposes. Furthermore, the Government of Canada provides industry the opportunity for accelerated write-off of the capital costs for pollution control equipment and facilities, in accordance with its accelerated capital cost allowance program.

It is the general policy of the provincial government not to assist municipalities by offering direct pollution control grants for the engineering design and construction of sewage disposal facilities and trunk line sewers, except under extenuating circumstances where severe health hazards may exist.

Under The Municipalities Assistance Act, the province provides unconditional grants to all municipalities for the conduct of their affairs. A revision to this statute in 1970 permits the province to direct a portion of such grants to alleviate or control pollution for which the municipality is responsible.

The provincial government also approves federal government CMHC loans for sewage disposal facilities. The federal government loans cover two-thirds of the cost of such facilities, of which 25 per cent is granted as a forgivable loan. Nevertheless, the provincial government recognizes that municipalities are reluctant to install modern and adequate facilities for sewage treatment because of the high capital cost of such facilities and the burden of existing municipal debt. The government recognizes that such facilities are particularly magnified in municipalities which fall in either of the following categories:

53-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

Category I - Rapidly growing communities which are requested or find it advisable to install sewage disposal facilities having a capacity far in excess --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Is it the hon. minister's intention to read the entire document which has just been tabled?

MR. YURKO:

No, Mr. Speaker. Just three pages for the record.

MR. SPEAKER:

The three page document which has just been tabled?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I'm reading the policy position paper which is three pages. The attached report is separate to the policy position paper.

If I might continue, Mr. Speaker.

"Category II -- Communities --

MR. SPEAKER:

It is best that the hon. minister should have the leave of the House to read a document which has been tabled.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the document shouldn't have been tabled until I finish reading the position paper.

"Category II -- Communities which are experiencing a rapid decline in population, but which are sustaining a high per capita debt incurred by the construction of modern sewage disposal facilities" -- [Interjections]

If I might continue, Mr. Speaker, one and a half pages left --

"'Municipality' means a city, town, village, county, hamlet, summer village, municipal district, improvement district, and special area, and includes a school district situated in a national park and such other administrative entities established under The Municipal Government Act.

The government of Alberta is committed to a program of balanced growth across the province. There is a recognition that if industry is to be established throughout Alberta towns, it is necessary to make as many towns as possible industrially viable. There is therefore a requirement to provide adequate transportation facilities, equitable power rates, water and sewage facilities, before towns can become suitable candidates for the location of secondary industries. The government of Alberta recognizes this fact and is therefore establishing a Municipal Finance Assistance Program, which will assist the municipalities in their ability to pay for sewage disposal facilities. The program will be administered by the Department of The Environment, with co-operation from the Department of Municipal Affairs. Funding will be administered by the Alberta Municipal Finance Corporation. Funds will initially be provided from the general revenue of the province, with the possibility of establishing a revolving fund in subsequent years.

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-21

The formula developed for this equitable province-wide program is detailed in the attached report. Basically, the formula is based on the per capita sewage treatment debenture load being carried by a municipality, less a pre-determined amount. Presently, yearly assistance will be made available to a municipality when their current per capita capital debenture load for sewage treatment facilities exceeds \$150 -- which debenture load is being carried at an average interest rate of 7 3/4 per cent per annum."

MR. HENDERSON:

Point of order! I wonder if we could have the next instalment on government time tomorrow instead during Private Members' Day today?

MR. SPEAKER:

I must find the hon. member's point of order is well taken, whether the document is to be tabled, or whether it has been tabled.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, this House has been open to the press during this session. Major position policy papers are generally presented to the House in their entirety. This position paper is two and a half pages long; I would think I could have the indulgence of the House to present a paper of this importance to the House without interference.

MR. LUDWIG:

To the points of order, are we debating whether he is breaking the rules? But he hasn't got a point of order.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, this is a point of order. This is of interest to the hon. members. I'm interested in hearing what the hon. minister has to say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. YURKO:

"The 'Municipal Sewage Treatment Assistance Program' will utilize as a basis for the program the guidelines currently used by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for their sewage treatment assistance program under Part VI B of The National Housing Act based on a debenture interest rate of 7 3/4 per cent --

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order -- I'm entitled to have my point of order!

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. minister is doing something that could not be permitted to happen again. He is making a mockery out of the whole proceedings and --

DR. HORNER:

State your point of order!

53-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, well the point of order is this; if every minister is to do this we may as well forget about Private Members' Day. It's against the best interests of this House. He's doing it on Private Members' Day and there are 22 ministers and if they are going to do this, the whole thing will become a mockery. The hon. minister knows this. We have already given up one Private Members' Day and now we lose one to a long-winded minister, and it definitely is against the rules of the House.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, surely, we had some information earlier in the Question Period today that the hon. gentlemen opposite were concerned about announcements being made in the Legislature. Then directly, almost immediately afterwards, we get this kind of nonsense from the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View. This is an important document that the minister is presenting to the House. We're doing it in the sense that we believe that whenever it's possible, these kinds of announcements should be made in the Legislature. That doesn't have any regard to whether it's Private Members' Day or Government Day. This is an important announcement, which I'm sure, if the hon. member will just check with his other members, they are very interested in.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. It's possibly unfortunate that the item was tabled before the hon. minister got through reading. But I suggest we are wasting more time in just discussing points of order than letting the hon. minister finish the reading, and then get on with the business.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on the further point of order raised by the hon. minister -- the 'Premier Number Two'. I would like to say that if he states that the minister has the right to do this, he should give us a citation and bring himself within the rules, not because he happens to be a minister and he wants to talk, that's enough authority. He has got to come within the rules and I'm saying he's without the rules.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Oh -- sit down.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. If there are objections by hon. members opposite to matters of this magnitude being presented, then certainly we are going to reassess our approach; and I'm going to reassess the answer I gave to the hon. Member for Wainwright.

MR. LUDWIG:

Is that right, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

As the minister has explained, this is a major position paper. As far as the Chair is concerned, although the matter seems to be of some length, I'm not aware of any rule which is directly in point which would limit the hon. minister in reading the statement. But when I made my earlier observations, I was under the impression that, since the document was going to be tabled, perhaps it need not be read. However, I'm prepared to put it to a vote of the House, and leave it to the House. But it would appear to me, from the comments that have been made, that by far the more substantial consensus is in favour of the minister continuing to read the statement.

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-23

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, It's necessary for me to say a few words before I continue the reading. We all recognize in this House that Hansard has come into this House this year, and that Hansard will, in fact, receive wide distribution, and this is a manner in which a policy position paper can be laid before the people of Alberta. And for the life of me, I can't understand what the argument or the debate is all about, Mr. Speaker.

"It is therefore policy of the government of Alberta to provide yearly assistance equal to the difference between the total current debenture cost of a municipality for all its sewage treatment capital costs and \$13.76 on a per capita basis. Such assistance will be carried by the province on an interest-free basis. Conversely, as the population of a municipality increases so that the current per capita debenture maintenance drops below the pre-determined amount, then the municipality shall return to the government on an annual basis the difference on a per capita basis until the municipality has returned all the assistance back to the government, or until the debenture is retired. Communities which are experiencing a declining population and qualify for annual assistance will continue to receive such annual assistance until the capital debenture is retired with no payback to the province. The grant portion of all CMHC loans for sewage treatment facilities will not be considered to be part of the debenture load of any municipality in qualifying for assistance under this program. The pertinent aspects of the program are as follows:

1. The Municipal Sewage Treatment Assistance Program will become effective in the fiscal year 1973-1974.
2. Cost of the Program to the provincial government initially will be approximately one million dollars a year.
3. The Program has self-liquidating aspects, based on the ability of a municipality to pay, and is not a "grant" program.
4. The maximum yearly cost per capita, for the provision of sewage treatment facilities will presently be established at \$13.76.
5. Sewage treatment (capital) costs would be spread more evenly over future populations.
6. A degree of cost equalization, for the provision of sewage treatment facilities will be provided throughout the province.
7. The program will help prevent financial hardships on the people that originate sewage treatment facilities, but which are also utilized by the future population.
8. The program considers the normal per capita cost necessary to provide secondary sewage treatment and sets a maximum per capita contribution for liquid waste treatment.
9. A per capita capital cost of \$150 is approximately the cost required for providing private sewage disposal systems (assuming an average family of four). There is thus an equalization of cost for providing sewage treatment facilities between urban and rural dwellers.

53-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

The attached report contains additional detailed matter regarding the formulation of this policy. The report contains a review of the municipal sewage treatment debenture load for each municipality. The per capita load indicated in the report is preliminary only and will be updated for each municipality before the Municipal Finance Assistance Program becomes effective in 1973. The onus will be placed on the municipality to establish and provide proof to the department of the amount of the current per capita debenture load being carried when applying for assistance under the program. Assistance to any municipality shall only be provided on a basis of a contractual agreement between the province and the said municipality.

All new sewage disposal facilities, additions or alterations to existing facilities will require Department of the Environment approval under the pertinent statutes and will be subject to the priorities established by the government. The provincial government will be establishing such regulations as may be necessary to properly administer the assistance program and shall make such changes to the program as from time to time it considers necessary.

The entire program will be administered under the statutory provisions of the Department of the Environment Act and the Clean Water Act."

Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for the permission to read this policy paper.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I move the withdrawal, for the time being, of Motion No. 204 standing in my name on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the seconder, the hon. Member for Drumheller, agree to withdraw the motion?

MR. TAYLOR:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree to the withdrawal of the motion?

HON MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion is withdrawn.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Pre-Audit Surveillance of Public Expenditures

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, Motion No. 1, standing in my name on the Order Paper:

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-25

Be it resolved that this Assembly endorses a continuation of the Pre-Audit system of surveillance of provincial government spending as generally described in The Financial Administration Act.

In speaking to this motion, I am going to start by saying that my constituents got a message which reads:

"Your MLA works for you. Forcefully and effectively he presents on the floor of the Legislature the issues set forth here. He represents you as part of a team. He is always on the job, his attendance record is outstanding. Let him know about your concerns."

This is not dated, but it is a very legitimate message because it is signed by no other than the Premier. I am going to try to live up to the announcement by presenting firmly in the House the issue presented. One of the issues was taxpayer's protection and an auditor general to ferret out waste and needless expenditure. I don't know whether the Premier, at the time of this announcement, felt that his government would so get out of control that someone would have to ferret out these things. But at any rate, I am partially in favour of his decision.

I was a little bit concerned, though, about something else that came out and this was in August -- this one is dated -- it says:

"He also renewed his call for an auditor general to replace the provincial auditor responsible to the Legislature and not to the Cabinet."

This is the part that upset me a little bit. I am not so concerned whether or not there be an auditor general to do just what was indicated. We have a system of controls under The Financial Administration Act of Alberta, 1968, which sets up under Part 3, Section 29 and succeeding subclauses, the controls which the Auditor has over expenditures. These, to me, are very, very important. Under an auditor general system, the Auditor General does a post-audit. He does, as the message indicates, dig into the expenditures made by departments of government. He finds it his responsibility to point out where expenditures were wasteful, where there was anything else wrong with the expenditure. Sometimes I realize, in making appropriations, you do make wasteful provisions in government, because you cannot always anticipate the exact use to which an appropriation will be put. Under the act, you are aware from the estimate that an appropriation covers certain votes, and funds can be transferred from vote to vote but not from appropriation to appropriation. The business of the Auditor, as we have it in the pre-audit system, I'm going to cover a little bit, as it comes from Part 3, Disbursement of Public Money.

"The Auditor shall, subject to the exceptions provided in this Act, ensure that no cheque or treasury branch order issues for the payment of public money (a) for which there is no direct appropriation."

Strange as it may seem, the Auditor has to exercise this authority every once in a while. I'm not suggesting that anybody is being dishonest or that anybody is attempting to do something out of order. But the departments themselves initiate expenditures and sometimes they err.

"(b) that is in excess of any appropriation, or (c) that is in excess of any sums that have been deposited with the Government in trust for any person."

Now if you want to study The Financial Administration Act, you will find that this does not mean that an appropriation cannot be added to by a procedure called Special Warrant. If an appropriation

53-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

is insufficient, if the government, in its wisdom, thinks that more money ought to be spent, then the money can be appropriated by an Order in Council, as a special warrant. The money will be spent and the Auditor will make sure that the House gets a full accounting for this money when the time comes. To go on, Section 30:

"Whenever an appropriation is exhausted, the Auditor shall at once notify the department to which the appropriation belongs, and the Auditor shall not sanction any further charges to an exhausted appropriation, except as provided in this Act."

These are pretty important duties of the Auditor, under a pre-audit system. Section 31:

"All balances of appropriations remaining unexpended at the close of any fiscal year, or other term lapse, and shall be written off, except in the case of liabilities incurred during the then expiring fiscal year, accounts therefore may be charged to, and form part of, the expenditures of that year."

Now this is one place where perhaps there is room for an Auditor General to do something. It was my experience, and I'm sure it will be the experience of this government, that there will be a rush to spend the balance of any appropriations which may be left in the last seven or eight weeks. In this rush unwise expenditures are made from time to time. This goes on in the university. It goes on in all branches, and for that reason perhaps an Auditor General will serve a useful purpose in pointing out what has happened in these instances. Section 32 says:

"If any difference of opinion arises between the Auditor and any department, respecting the appropriations to which any authorized expenditure should be charged, the matter may be referred by the department to the Treasury Board, and the Board shall determine in what manner and to what appropriation or account the expenditure is to be charged."

This simply means that the Auditor does not have complete control. His duty is to make sure that the government knows what is being spent, and if it needs to make further expenditures the Treasury Board can over-ride the Auditor. But their report would be presented to this House. Section 33:

"All disbursements of public money shall be made by cheque on a bank, or order on a treasury branch, and in the form determined by the Treasurer."

Cheques and orders shall be prepared in the Auditor's office, be signed by the Auditor or clerk appointed by the Auditor for that purpose, and then forwarded to the Treasury Department for the signature of the Treasurer or his deputy or any person appointed by the Treasurer for that purpose.

The signatures required to be upon a cheque or order may be engraved, lithographed or otherwise mechanically produced.

All completed cheques or orders shall, with all dispatch, be forwarded to the Treasury Department by mail or delivered to the persons entitled thereto."

Now these are not unreasonable controls. All this says is that the actual payments have to originate under the authority of the Auditor. I assure you that this relieves the government of a great deal of responsibility and gives them a protection which ought to be very much welcomed. It doesn't mean that the Treasury is not in control of the expenditures of government. Subsection (5) says:

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-27

"The Treasurer shall ensure that there is kept in his department a record in which shall be entered the particulars of all cheques and orders signed by him and which shall give in each case the bank or treasury branch upon which it is drawn, the date of issue and the serial number thereof."

These are important functions. Nobody could possibly do the Auditor General's function of ferreting these things out, were these sections not in the pre-audit system.

Section 34 says:

"(1) Subject to the section and sections 35, 36, and 37, no cheque or order for public money shall be issued except upon the certificate of the Auditor that there is legislative authority for the expenditure."

For the life of me I can't see how you could control this particular part of the business if you use only a post-audit system.

"(2) The Auditor or any other person authorized to countersign cheques or orders issued by the Treasurer shall, before countersigning a cheque or order, satisfy himself that the cheque or order is authorized under this Act.

(3) This section, and sections 35 to 38 do not apply to monies deposited with the government in trust for any purpose."

The whole purpose of the sections of the act which I have read is to place the responsibility on someone to see that the appropriations voted by this House are spent in accordance with the appropriation, that they are not over-expended, that the monies are not transferred improperly, that we know to whom the money was paid, at what date it was paid, and that we have a record of it.

If there is a dispute -- if the Auditor seems to be out of line -- Section 35 provides:

"If, upon any application for a cheque or order, the Auditor reports that there is no legislative authority for issuing it, then, upon the written opinion of the Attorney General that there is legislative authority, citing the authority, the Treasurer, irrespective of the Auditor's report, may cause the cheque or order to be issued."

These are safeguards so that the auditor doesn't become supreme. I think that is important too. Special warrants I have mentioned, but I am going to read the section.

"Where at any time the Legislative Assembly is not in session, the Treasurer reports that the minister having charge of any matter has certified that, in the public interest, an expenditure of public money is urgently required with respect to that matter, and reports either that (i) there is no legislative authority for an expenditure with respect to that matter, or (ii) there is a legislative authority for an expenditure with respect to that matter, but the amount of money so available is insufficient, the Lieutenant Governor in Council may order a special warrant to be prepared to be signed by himself authorizing the expenditure of the amount estimated to be required, which shall be placed to the credit of the appropriation account and against which cheques or orders may be issued in the usual form as they are required."

This happens many times. If there is an outbreak of fire in our province, and if the appropriation for fire-fighting falls far short, then an Order in Council can issue for a special warrant. But in each case the auditor is aware of it. And in each case the

53-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

government is responsible to the Legislature in the succeeding session to account for that expenditure.

Should the auditor refuse, section 37 covers it.

"Where the Auditor refuses to issue a certificate for a cheque or order of the Treasurer (a) on the ground that the money is not justly due, or that it is in excess of the authority granted by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, or (b) for any reason other than that there is no legislative authority, the Treasury Board, upon a report of the case prepared by the Auditor, shall judge the sufficiency of the Auditor's objection and may in its discretion sustain him or order the issue of the cheque or order."

These did not just come out of the air. All of the provisions in this act were put there after many years of experience, a great deal of thought. And they are pretty essential for the protection of the government of the people of Alberta.

Section 38 says: "The Auditor shall prepare a statement with respect to each fiscal year (a) of all legal opinions, special warrants and cheques or orders issued without his certificate, and (b) of all expenditures incurred in consequence thereof, which shall be delivered by him to the Treasurer, to be laid before the Legislative Assembly by the Treasurer at the time the Public Accounts for the same fiscal year are submitted."

This is a duty of the Auditor, and it places right back on this Legislature the opportunity and the responsibility for justifying these expenditures. Now if they are foolish, of course, perhaps an Auditor General could point that out.

Accountable advances is another thing that has often come up, especially in the federal government.

"The Treasurer without any further authority than is provided by this section, may from time to time, advance to any department or part thereof any sum required as an accountable advance for the purpose of making refunds for monies deposited or required to be deposited in the General Revenue Fund."

Now, once in a while it does happen that it is necessary to make an advance, a legally required advance, and authority is here, so again, though the Auditor is quite aware of it, he has no authority to stop it, and he has not usurped any of the power of the Legislature or the government.

Paying bills of commissioners. "(1) Every comission, rebate or refund paid under any Act shall, without any further appropriation, be paid out of the total revenues received, and shall be shown as a deduction from those revenues in the accounts of the Government. (2) All documents covering the payment of any commission, rebates, or refunds, shall be submitted to the Auditor for certification before being paid. (3) Subsection 2 does not apply to a refund from moneys advanced pursuant to section 40."

Now, a succeeding section makes it possible to make advances for expenses, which are sometimes required to be paid in advance of actual billing and invoicing of the government.

All I am trying to bring to the attention of this House is that in a thing as big as government -- and this government grows, as you know, and with so many departments responsible for purchasing and we have a purchasing agent who does most of the purchasing -- the services required, the expenditures to be made, are so numerous that there is every opportunity without a pre-audit for expenses to be incurred which are not legitimate, for the government to be subjected

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-29

to payments of money which are beyond the appropriations or which are not in appropriations, for the manipulating back and forth between appropriations of funds of the government.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I bring this motion before the House. I'm not concerned if in the next few weeks, or the next few days, the Provincial Treasurer brings in an act providing for an Auditor General whose business will be exactly what was intimated in the message, that of ferreting out. I don't think he has to do much ferreting; all he needs to do is read the accounts of the Auditor's report, but if he can point out to us that sometimes we are persuaded to approve appropriations which are a waste, which were not properly conceived, which are not in the best interests of the province, then the Auditor General too serves a very good purpose, because a little embarrassment is going to smarten us all up. And if he were to do that, I am not suggesting that the blame would all be on the government, because we sit on this side of the House, we approve these appropriations.

We rely on the Auditor under The Financial Administration Act. We rely on him to make sure that the money is spent for the purposes for which it is appropriated. But nobody can ever be sure -- that includes the Treasurer and the members of the front bench -- nobody can be sure that the appropriations which they are asked to make on behalf of the various branches in departments of government are always wise or necessary or useful.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that the present pre-audit system is the greatest protection a government can have or a Legislature can have. It is the greatest means of controlling civil servants, of making them aware of their responsibilities, of helping them, too, to overcome the objections of people in departments who are always anxious to initiate new things, to make new purchases, to start new systems.

I would be very loathe if anything happened in this Legislature to change the control of the pre-audit system as it is set forth in The Financial Administration Act. On the other hand, I reiterate if the government feels that an Auditor General would serve a good purpose I have no objection as long as it doesn't do what this one announcement says, that it does not replace the Provincial Auditor responsible to the Legislature. That little article intimated that the Provincial Auditor is responsible to the Executive Council and not to the Legislature. The act provides that he is appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, but he can only be removed by an order which is presented to the Legislature. So the present Provincial Auditor is the servant of this Legislature and is pretty independent to make those judgments which he is required to make.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to make the motion standing on the Order Paper in my name and I hope it will receive the very serious consideration of this Assembly.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion I would just like to indicate that I will take only a very short time, because I'm sure that the hon. Provincial Treasurer would like to respond to this motion, and undoubtedly accept the proposal put forward.

My colleague who has just moved and spoken on this motion has outlined very clearly and very logically why we should continue with the pre-audit system. All of Sections 57 through 67 of Part 6 of The Financial Administration Act, in particular, I think are very reasonable safeguards also that should be maintained, and it should be consoling to the government to have those sections in there as well regarding audits.

53-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

I see no inconvenience in this system to anyone, so let us not really entertain any notion of dropping the concept of the pre-audit system, because after all it's not going to be that hard to deal with for the government.

Now the hon. Member for Cardston, who is a former provincial treasurer, has had considerable experience as a treasurer, and in matters of this magnitude and in this area, I would certainly be one that would want to heed his advice, and I'm sure that you would at the same time.

I don't think that we need to spend a lot of time discussing this motion, because there are, as you can see, many logical reasons why we should continue the pre-audit system. It's sound, it's logical, it's practical, and I submit it should be continued.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the debate this afternoon I should like first of all to say that this is somewhat of a dry subject. Secondly that I am trying to participate without in any way commenting upon the personnel as they exist at the present time within our pre-audit system.

I am going to put myself in the position of repeating some of the comments made by the hon. Member for Cardston, particularly those items of reference to The Financial Administration Act. First of all I would like to draw the relationship very clearly between the Auditor and this Legislature. There are a number of relationships which should be kept in mind, and I intend to deal with them. First of all there is the relationship with this Legislature, there is a relationship to the Treasury Board, there is a relationship to the Provincial Treasurer, and there is a relationship to the department heads and the ministers. I think we have to have a good view of this in order to appreciate all of the arguments.

Section 57 of The Financial Administration Act says that "the Auditor shall maintain a system of pre-audit," which means that he shall examine, check and audit all accounts.

If we go back to Section 12 of The Financial Administration Act we find there the authority by which the Auditor is appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. We also find, in Section 12, that he may be removed -- as the hon. Member for Cardston has already indicated -- that he may be removed only by address to this Legislature. In other words, he cannot be dismissed by the Executive Council.

We find in Section 61 that "every appropriation account shall be examined by the Auditor on behalf of the Legislative Assembly", and that's a very key statement because it establishes very clearly the relationship of ultimate responsibility to this Assembly that the Auditor has.

It has already been recorded for us that in Section 38 "the Auditor shall prepare a statement with respect to each fiscal year of all legal opinions, special warrants," etc., issued without his authority and he shall present it to this Assembly.

Having identified the relationship to the Assembly, I would like to spend a moment looking at the functions of the Auditor in terms of his particular duties. Again, most of these were identified by the hon. Member for Cardston. He has indicated to us that the Auditor shall ensure no issue for public funds for which there is no direct appropriation. In other words, there has to be some appropriation accepted by this Assembly before any funds can be issued; that the issue cannot exceed the appropriation or the trust, whichever the case shall be. He also checks to see that there is legislative

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-31

authority for the expenditure and, as I read through, it seems to me that those two items are very much one and the same.

He checks to make sure that the issue which is requested is supported by appropriate records, by proper documents or proofs of services. He checks to make sure it is being expended for the purpose for which appropriation was intended in the first instance. So he has to check for the appropriation, for the authority, and then to make sure that we have actually received the goods and services.

He has another function, under Section 46, and Section 60. He is the guardian of the original records. Section 46 says, "The Auditor shall maintain the principal financial records", and that is a separate and distinct function from the others that he has.

He has yet another function in connection with the estimates. It is the Auditor who can require the estimates to be prepared in a certain form, or at least Section 55 says, explicitly, "Estimates shall be prepared in such form as may be approved by the Auditor."

Now in the relationship of the Auditor to the Treasurer, it is recorded in Section 25 of The Financial Administration Act that it is the responsibility of the Auditor to draw cases of improper retention of funds by a servant of government to the attention of the Treasurer. That is if any public servant does not deposit funds as he should do, or turn them over to government, it is the function of the Auditor to draw this to the Treasurer's attention.

On the other hand, Section 63 says, "If the Treasurer desires any account or document to be examined by the Auditor in greater detail the Auditor shall cause it to be subjected to such detailed examination as the Treasurer may prescribe." So we come now to one instance wherein the Treasurer can actually direct the work of the Auditor.

Most of my comments in relation to the Treasury Board are again of the type that I've just mentioned in relation to the Treasurer. The Treasury Board shall issue the administrative directives which are followed by the Auditor, and by the government. The Treasury Board is a committee of Cabinet, and, as the hon. Member for Cardston mentioned, the Auditor refuses to issue a certificate or a cheque or an order of the Treasurer on the grounds that the money is not justly due, or on the grounds that it exceeds the authority granted by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, or for any reason other than that there is no legislative authority -- the Treasury Board may over-rule the Auditor. It's true that these situations are to be reported to this Assembly, but I would draw to your attention that the Treasury Board may over-rule the Auditor. Also, the Auditor is required, under Section 47 to furnish the Treasury Board, monthly, with a statement of revenue and expenditure for the province.

There is one other relationship which I think should be brought to the attention of members, and it relates to the Attorney General and the Auditor. If the Auditor reports that there is no legal authority for a certain action, the Attorney General, under Section 35 of The Financial Administration Act, has in fact, the authority to over-ride the legal opinion given to the Auditor. This, I think, is worth bearing in mind.

So we find then that there is a whole series of relationships, the primary one supposedly to the Legislature. Secondary ones are to the Treasurer, the Treasury Board, and for that, I think one would have to assume that that is virtually the same as saying to the Cabinet.

Now I think it is important to recognize these relationships in terms of evaluating the independence of the Auditor. It's not, in my estimation, that much different whether it's a pre-audit or a post-

53-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

audit in terms of making sure that the money is properly spent, or in terms of checking whether sufficient vouchers are available to warrant payment, but rather in terms of the kind of situation that can arise between the Cabinet and the Auditor, and the Auditor and this Legislature. And this issue revolves around the independence of the Auditor.

It's my view that the Auditor, no matter what we like to think, cannot really be as independent in a pre-audit situation where he is in fact functioning as part of the administration. And the hon. Member for Cardston pointed this out to us. I was going to use the term 'admitted this' to us. Because he said, at one point in his remarks, that the pre-audit system relieves the government of certain responsibility, and I question whether, in fact, that is a desirable situation.

I think, in summary, on that point of independence, that it is extremely important that the Auditor feel unencumbered in any respect to report directly back to us. And I draw this again to your attention by alerting you to the kind of audit reports which are received by the federal government as compared to the ones which we receive here. This particular report for 1967, this one for 1970, contain very few statistics at all.

These are comments by the Auditor General on the state of the administration as he found it. As you will recollect, there are some gems among his comments from time to time. As an aside I might say to the hon. members that the pre-audit system tends to remove from us some of those genuinely embarrassing items which cause so much fun for the members of the federal parliament.

I, for instance, could draw to your attention that in the 1970 report of the Auditor General, on page 39, he draws to the attention of the parliament that a report was received too late to be of use. I know that some hon. members here will be quite keenly interested in this, having in mind some of the questions being asked about the Moir Committee report which we have yet to receive. I am not so sure it will be too late to be of use but it certainly is late. I am sure that it is a kind of thing that the Auditor General in the federal situation brings to our attention. It is a kind of thing which I am not so sure that an auditor, functioning as he does in a pre-audit situation, where he is in fact part of the administration can feel free to draw to our attention here.

There is another comment in that same report of the Auditor, where he reflects on page 52 upon the cost of the National Art Centre in Ottawa. He doesn't make judgments, he just lists facts. Hon. gentlemen, that reminds me of a situation which has happened in Alberta. That was the increase and escalation in cost of the Alberta Resources Railway. Here is something which I am sure an auditor functioning in the capacity of the Auditor General in Ottawa would have reported on for our attention.

I would like to say that the present system is one which allows us, as members, to dig and dig through the big blue book, and if we are members of the Public Accounts Committee, we may zero in and ask questions and perhaps we can dig some of these things out, if they are not immediately evident on the surface. But I am not so sure that that is a good check.

I would like to turn my attention now to some of what I regard as even more important reasons why one might consider a post-audit rather than a pre-audit. First of all, I think that the government, the administration, would be a lot freer and a lot more responsible. I think it is a bad thing to suggest, as the hon. Member for Carleton Place does, that we have without a pre-audit every opportunity for payments which are not legitimate, for manipulating back and forth. Hon. members, if that is the case, then I think we have got some real

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-33

problems in our public service and I don't think that situation exists. But my point is this, I don't think it appropriate to suggest that this might happen, because if, in fact, we have a public service which would do this and is only saved from doing this by the fact that we have a pre-audit system, how many other ways, how many other problems, may we have which are beyond the purview of the Auditor? This to me reflects a potential irresponsibility on the part of the public service and I can't accept that. So I would like to make the point most strongly that I think a post-audit system would develop a greater responsibility on the part of our public service. I think they would have to recognize and they would be well aware that they are responsible for the initial decisions. They are responsible for making sure that proper financial management is adhered to every step of the way. If they fail in this respect the Auditor will eventually be reporting their actions to the Legislature. I think that is a good thing and it will develop responsibility.

A second thing, it seems to me, that will develop is managerial capacity. I would suggest that we probably, in the pre-audit situations -- certainly if we make the assumption, as the hon. Member for Cardston does, that the pre-audit system relieves the government of responsibility -- certainly if we make that assumption, I think we tend to assume that we're not required to develop managerial capacity in a financial sense. That is in my estimation one of the drawbacks of a pre-audit. I think that we cannot divorce financial management capacity from total managerial capacity and development of that capacity. I think this would be a desirable feature of a different kind of a system.

A third element which should be kept in mind is that it would be much simpler to decentralize certain government operations under a post-audit system than under a pre-audit system. I refer again to one of the sections of The Financial Administration Act, was brought to our attention by the hon. member that all cheques have to be certificated or proved by the Auditor before payment. It seems to me that if we had responsible Public Service, which I'm sure we do, we could decentralize. We could have payments issued at outlying points. The Auditor, in instances where a full-time representative is not required, could come out on occasion, whenever a reasonable amount of work exists for them to review, and audit the books in that particular location. I think that would be a very beneficial development, for it would lead to what I regard as a fourth advantage of a post-audit system. And that is, speed in terms of payment -- speed in terms of the government's ability to meet its commitments and to carry out its responsibilities.

I would like to conclude with a strong disagreement, if I may, with the hon. Member for Cardston. I think he gave us to understand that the pre-audit is a more certain system than the post-audit in terms of government expenditures. I would disagree with that. I would suggest to you that the post-audit gives us a more certain control of financial management than does a pre-audit for reasons which I have tried to bring out before. The fact is that we would have a more responsible public service which would, in fact, do an internal audit on itself. I suspect this is being done even in the pre-audit system that we already have. So we would, if you will, have an internal check by the operating line management service people, and then we would have a second check by the auditor, not just the one check which we presently have.

I have not heard as many arguments as I hope will come forth from the Assembly on this particular matter, but I would like to say that the one argument that I see in favour of the position taken by the hon. Member for Cardston is that the pre-audit system is perhaps more economical in the sense that the Auditor functions as a part of the administration. But I again repeat, in summing up, that I think we would have a more flexible system, a faster system, a system which

53-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

would allow us to decentralize and regionalize a system which would develop a greater responsibility in the public service, and a system which would develop greater managerial capacity in the public service, as well as a more certain system of audit if we had a post-audit system rather than a pre-audit system.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I doubt that this matter will come up again on the Order Paper in this session. I would have spoken to it, I thought -- if the House would like to hear from me as Provincial Treasurer, I would be happy to speak to it, otherwise that is fine. But I will need three or four minutes past 4:30.

Mr. Speaker, may I first of all say to the hon. Member for Cardston that I have felt a oneness with him from the time that he has been in the Legislature, because, as a former Provincial Treasurer, I respect his remarks and advice and was very interested to see his private member's resolution on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker, may I say at the outset that Alberta has been extremely fortunate in having a Provincial Auditor for the past 30 years, one Mr. Keith Huckvale, and the success of the pre-audit system in Alberta has largely been due to the tremendous competence and integrity of Mr. Huckvale, and I cannot over-emphasize that.

Mr. Speaker, there are advantages and disadvantages to the pre-audit system. One of the advantages is the fact that under the present system, Alberta has one of the better commitment control systems. However, there are disadvantages. As an example, the hon. Member for Jasper Place indicated that in fact it discourages decentralization of government payments. This is, of course, a desirable policy from the point of view of the government of Alberta. I think it was also indicated that under the pre-audit system there is no provision for the Auditor to, in fact, report on wastages and inefficiencies that exist in government. This was indicated by both the hon. Member for Cardston and the hon. Member for Jasper Place.

Mr. Speaker, coming from a professional auditing background, I would have to indicate to the House that the term 'pre-audit' is really a misnomer, in that in financial and accounting circles it would more appropriately be described as the internal control function or comptrollership function, which is that all expenditures are bonafide and you ensure that all expenditures are bonafide, prior to their payment. Pre-audit does not describe that function properly.

Mr. Speaker, in professional accounting circles it is argued that, in fact, there is a limitation on the independence of the auditor if he is placed in the position of having to approve the expenditure on the one hand, and subsequently expressing his opinion on the accuracy and propriety of revenues and expenditures as indicated in the provincial public accounts. In other words, how can you approve it and then subsequently come along and report that it was all right, there is some conflict of independence in that role. This has built up in Alberta over the period of some 30 years, and has placed the Auditor in that role, but I am just trying to advise the pros and cons it has caused over that period.

Most provinces, Mr. Speaker, have dispensed with the pre-audit system. Since the auditor can be a much more valuable servant to the Legislature and to the citizens of the province by allowing him an expanded role, which would include not only reporting on the propriety of government expenditures, but on inefficiencies and wastages as well, or the Auditor-General concept as indicated by the hon. Member for Cardston.

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-35

In order to be effective in this kind of role, the pre-audit cannot be confused with the Auditor General role. You cannot be both, because it would not ensure his independence on the one hand if he is expressing his opinion, and on the other hand, actually being involved in the expenditure of public monies himself.

Mr. Speaker, to conclude because I don't want to take too much of the time of the House, at the present time, out of 11 government jurisdictions, there are now eight that have dispensed with the pre-audit and have gone to the Auditor General or similar concept. But I would like to indicate very clearly that there is no decision in my mind at the present time, or in our government's mind, although we feel that as with other things in government, we have a responsibility to look at this and consider the pros and cons of whether in fact, it is a pre-audit or whether, in fact, an auditor general's role would be preferable. Government decentralization is a very important thing that we would like to accomplish in the future, and pre-audit hampers that.

Basically, pre-audit would require that in a regional office there be a full-time stationed member of the provincial auditor's office. And this could create a tremendous amount of, in effect, wastage of time, because you don't require, say in a small regional office, a full-time person to do that function. Whereas if the audit was done post, you can just assign a person for a period of a week or two weeks, as is done in the case of industrial auditing and corporate auditing. All the auditor does is go in for the period that is necessary to check that all expenditures and revenues have been bonafide and in accordance with the interest of the shareholders, in the case of a private company. Now in Alberta, our shareholders are the citizens. The Auditor must be independent from government, whichever role he is in, whether it is a post or pre-audit role. And he must report to the Legislature. That is the single most important consideration. He must report that, in fact, government expenditures have been made within the intent of the Legislature when they approve the expenditures. In my view, whether the expenditure is examined by the Auditor in fact before or after, is really academic, as long as the Legislature receives a report from the Auditor regarding the propriety of government expenditures, and the adherence by our government to the intention of the Legislature.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Can the hon. member have leave to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT ORDERS
(Second Reading)

Bill No. 203: The Family Homes Expropriation Act
(Adjourned Debate)

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, when this bill was before us last time, I had just initiated some remarks, but they were rather rudely interrupted by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc. I did want to make just one or two comments in regard to the bill. We appreciate that this is a strategy of the hon. Member from Mountain View to regain some political stature -- [Interjections]

53-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I am up on a point of order, and the hon. minister is to sit down and give me a chance to state my point of order. The point of order is this, that no one knows better than the hon. minister that he cannot impute a motive to me. I think that perhaps he is accusing me of playing politics, and I wouldn't dare accuse the hon. minister of playing politics. He has never played politics since I have known him. Notwithstanding, Mr. Speaker, he cannot impute a motive and he should withdraw that statement. He has been in parliament a long time and he has been here a long time. He knows the rules, but there is no indication that he does know them. But he mustn't impute a motive. He is definitely wrong, Mr. Speaker, and I want you to rule that he withdraw that imputation and carry on with his debate if he has got anything to say.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is now saying that he, in fact, is not a politician --

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed. Agreed.

DR. HORNER:

-- and I would like to know what he is doing here really --

MR. LUDWIG:

...to check on the ability of the minister --

DR. HORNER:

-- because in my view, one should be proud of being a politician provided one enters into that profession with some degree of integrity, and with some honour and the dedication to serve one's constituents. Then I would suggest to the hon. gentleman he shouldn't be touchy about being accused of being in political action. Because that's what we're all about, this is political action. I say again, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of withdrawing what I said because I simply stated the fact.

MR. LUDWIG:

I didn't say that at all.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I think there's a very valid point here. It's not a question of whether the hon. member is a politician on this side or not, but the hon. Deputy Premier imputed that there is some loss of stature implied in the member of this House having shifted from that side to this side. I think there's very definitely a question of imputations involved here, and I think he should withdraw it; it's an insult to any member of the Opposition, every member of the Opposition.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, they are awful touchy about the change that has taken place, but that was at the request of the people of Alberta and it's not up to this Legislature on a point of order to change that. There has been a change in the stature of the hon. gentleman for Calgary Mountain View -- much to his chagrin -- but much to the pleasure of the people of Alberta. I suggest again, Mr. Speaker --

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-37

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, is the hon. minister still debating the point of order, or is he on the bill?

MR. HYNDMAN:

If you'd take the wax out of your ears.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I'm attempting to speak on the bill but apparently the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View doesn't want me to speak on the bill because he continues to interrupt.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We did not get a decision on the point of order. The hon. minister definitely imputed a motive -- the rule prohibits it -- and it is your responsibility Mr. Speaker, to ask him to withdraw, otherwise I don't think that we are playing the rules in this House and it could be a pretty rough House if we abandon the rules. So I'm insisting on a ruling from you whether he withdraw or not. There's no question as to the fact that he imputed a motive, if we understand the spoken --

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I appreciate the point of order that was raised by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View. I have to accept the hon. Deputy Premier's explanation that he feels that he didn't break any rule, and that he doesn't intend to withdraw it. I would suggest that the Assembly continue on with the debate on Bill No. 203, and that the hon. Deputy Premier present his debate on the bill.

DR. HORNER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View continues to interrupt. Does he want to have a debate on this bill, or does he want to try and and protect --

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to appeal your ruling to the Assembly. It's definitely a mistaken ruling.

MR. MINIELY:

What nonsense!

DR. HORNER:

Again on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can't do it on his own.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, an appeal of the Speaker's ruling is not debatable, and the hon. minister ought to sit down and keep quiet. Your ruling has been appealed.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, there's no ruling on the point of order. The hon. gentleman doesn't know what he's talking about.

53-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, your ruling has been appealed and it isn't debatable. What's the minister complaining about?

DR. HORNER:

I'm on the point of order.

MR. LUDWIG:

No you're not.

DR. HORNER:

I certainly am, and I'm speaking to the point of order and the hon. gentleman either has a great deal of ignorance about the manner of parliamentary performance, or is deliberately establishing some sort of nonsensical appeal when there is no appeal available on a point of order which is not substantiated. It is, in fact, not a point of order because I suggested to him that he had political motives --

MR. HENDERSON:

[Comment inaudible]

DR. HORNER:

What kind of nonsense is that?

Mr. Speaker, if I might then return to the debate on the hon. gentleman's bill and have some comment in regard to it.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going along with this at all. You ruled, I appealed your ruling to the Assembly and you have to take the necessary procedure. The appeal is not debatable -- it's in the rules -- and if we don't, then all I have to say is that we are not complying with the rules.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I appreciate again the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View standing up. When I made reference to your point of order, I only indicated that I didn't feel that there was really a point of order in there. This is my explanation and the hon. Deputy Premier should continue with his debate on Bill No. 203.

I feel that if the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View would go back to the records in Hansard, unfortunately that would take a little time because I do not really recall the exact words that were used by the Deputy Premier and I would beg that the Assembly accept this and continue with the debate on Bill No. 203.

DR. HORNER:

Well, at the risk of encountering, again, the ire of the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, I wonder if it's all right for me to continue the debate and to suggest, again, that the hon. member brought forward a bill for political motives. I hope he doesn't object to that, because most of the things I do on this side are for political motives, believe me, and I want everybody to be aware of that. The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View is having difficulty getting that across so I want to be very clear about my position.

Having regard to that, Mr. Speaker, and having regard to my definition of politics, as I outlined earlier, in that one has to be dedicated to the service of one's constituents, then I think that the

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-39

bill in its present form is not worthwhile. We've been having in my department and under my jurisdiction some considerable discussion in regard to the entire matter of expropriation. In regard particularly in that area, of course, to the question of expropriation of farm land for natural resource development, some of the things that have happened in expropriation proceedings over the years; just haven't been right, proper, or fair.

One of the better things that the previous government did was to refer the entire matter of expropriations to the Institute of Law Reform at the university and this is, as I said, one of the better things that they have done. Because this is a complex matter, Mr. Speaker, and it shouldn't be dealt with in a haphazard, hastily constructed bill, put forward for political purposes, in an attempt to show the people in Calgary Mountain View that he's all for them. That's fine, Mr. Speaker, I hope that he can continue to show the people that, but I have some doubt about whether or not he is going to be able to do that.

I say that the bill is not complete and it is not good enough for the simple reason that it doesn't take into consideration any compensation for the inconsiderations that happen to people who are expropriated. Just to say, "We'll get you another home down the road," isn't good enough, because there are those inconveniences and those hardships, those emotional things that are very hard to measure in dollar terms, that have to be compensated for. The question of whether or not the home might have some family significance dating back a number of years; the question of the inconvenience of children, for instance, relocating in another school; the hardships that this might put on a variety of people because of the expropriation. All of these matters have to be covered in expropriation proceedings that are far more detailed than this piece of paper that has been put forward by the hon. member. In my view this bill, then, as I said at the outset, is nothing but a political exercise but, unfortunately, a very poor one. It doesn't meet the requirements that the people in the province of Alberta are entitled to. And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in saying that I, for one, can't accept this bill because of its nature -- it just doesn't do the job -- and it doesn't do the job I would like to see done for my constituents in the whole matter of home expropriations, whether it be by Crown or any other agency. I would hope and I know that we will, having regard for the ability of the present Attorney General, come forward with a new expropriation act after he has received his report from the Institute of Law Reform and we will be able to come forward with much better legislation in the expropriation field.

However, I did want to make some comment before I conclude Mr. Speaker, in regard to the hon. Member for Cardston's contribution to this debate, because normally we enjoy the hon. member's remarks in regard to many subjects. But I think he was being a little bit facetious and I hope he won't get up on a point of order and try and interrupt me, Mr. Speaker. I think he has a little more ability to bounce than the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

However, I want to take issue with something the hon. Member for Cardston said, that he was a little bit surprised that after seven months the 'now' government hadn't straightened out some of these inequities and so on. I want to suggest to the hon. Member for Cardston that when he makes that statement he is leaving himself wide open -- and I hope, again, he won't be upset -- to a rather stinging political attack, if I was so disposed; because there are 36 years that we could go over very carefully and talk about the inequities that have been in this field for that long a time. I'm sure the hon. member doesn't really want me to do that.

But I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this is a complex matter, and it isn't one of those inequities that can be changed by

53-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

an Order in Council, or changed by sitting down and quickly disposing of the matter. I want to point out to him that there have been a great number of inequities that have been changed in the last seven months, those that could be changed quickly and were obvious, and didn't require a great deal of study and examination as to their long-term effect. Those inequities have been changed, in a lot of the time.

So I want to assure the hon. Member for Cardston that he should be very careful of his language, and I appreciate his language, it's one of the nicer ones to listen to in this Legislature. But when he starts making statements like that, then the value of Hansard comes out, Mr. Speaker, because it's been written. Well, I would refer the hon. member to Hansard, April 13th, page 28-44, in the first paragraph of the hon. member's remarks. It was one of those days when he was being a politician also, Mr. Speaker. And I say again, that is not really a bad thing provided one has some liking for the profession, and feels honourable to be in it. And certainly I've always felt that way, Mr. Speaker.

So again I say to the House that this Bill No. 203, is inadequately prepared, doesn't go far enough, doesn't cover the situation. And therefore should be disposed of by either delaying it further into the session or voting it down.

MR. WILSON:

It's all well and very good for the hon. Deputy Premier to criticize, condemn, complain, and make light of the sincere efforts of those of us on this side of the House, who are concerned for the well-being of families being dispossessed, and to assure that they end up with a comparable home when their property is being expropriated. Bill No. 203, The Family Homes Expropriation Act, very clearly states:

"that where it is decided to expropriate a family home the owner shall receive such compensation as will insure that the family unit is in no worse position as a result of the expropriation."

In other words, that he will get equivalent accommodation. And I don't think that this is a matter that we should poke fun at, or laugh at, or to make light of.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there is some considerable precedent of former concern by some members opposite in days gone by. As a matter of fact, last year, Bill No. 141, An Act To Amend The Expropriation Procedure Act was submitted to this House by the hon. member, Mr. Dickie, who is now a Cabinet Minister in a position to implement his bill.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He's a Liberal, isn't he?

MR. WILSON:

And I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in the explanatory notes to this bill that was presented by Mr. Dickie last year, it states,

"The purpose of this amendment is to implement what is colloquially referred to as a 'home for a home' principle. The Expropriation Procedure Act does not spell out the basis of compensation, and value to the owner has been applied."

His explanatory notes to go on to say,

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-41

"this amendment has the effect of replacing the value to the owner principle with 'home for a home' principle, and specifically includes complete indemnification for loss of income, moving expense, business interruption and complete indemnification for the costs of expert witnesses and counsel."

Well now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps Bill No. 203 doesn't go so far as to pay for legal counsel, and to pay for loss of wages in business interruption, but it's a step in the right direction. And I'm sorry that the hon. member, Mr. Dickie isn't here to comment on his thoughts on this bill in comparison to the bill he submitted last year.

But if the government members are sincere in their thinking along these lines, I think they should feel free to amend Bill No. 203 and make it more onerous if that is really their wish and desire.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to point out that during the recent campaign, none other than the hon. Premier, Mr. Lougheed said,

"As a further assertion of the rights of the people, a Progressive Conservative government would ensure that whenever a person had his home expropriated by the government, he would be compensated by the fiscal equivalent of such a home. The concept of a home for a home" -- Mr. Lougheed told a Calgary news conference on June 18, 1971.

Well, Mr. Lougheed isn't here at the moment to make comments on this, but I would think that there is some pretty good precedent there for the support of Bill No. 203, The Family Homes Expropriation Act. I am quite concerned that when the hon. members opposite go on record on these positions, they do not follow through. When the hon. Deputy Premier pokes fun at the members on this side and their comments about their very sincere and heartfelt concerns for people who are being forced out of their homes against their wishes, I would like to know whether these statements made in the months gone by, by some of the hon. government members, were made sincerely or not. I think that we have an opportunity here today to determine whether or not they were sincere judging by the way they vote on this bill.

There are a couple of areas, I think, where this act would be of considerable significance, Mr. Speaker. In several areas we have VLA lands where the assessments were frozen. This has tended to set an unrealistically low value on the properties and I think that when VLA lands are being expropriated, there should be consideration of a home for a home along these lines and not just market value determined via the assessment route. There are many instances, Mr. Speaker, when property is expropriated for a road and then a few years later, after having taken part of a person's property away, they decide to come back and widen the road and take more land. In some instances, the initial taking has depreciated the property value, so that when they come back the second time, it is not worth as much as the first time around. And it is in areas such as this, I think we should be concerned and take cognizance of. I think that this bill, The Family Homes Expropriation Act, would be of considerable assistance in this regard.

In the first go-round of debate on this bill, Mr. Speaker, there was a newspaper article that I thought summed it up very nicely. It says:

"The government feeling was summed up by Ron Gitter from Calgary Buffalo who recognized the problems, but said the bill should have included persons living commonlaw, and those in communal dwellings."

53-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

Well, I would suggest that if that is the government attitude and if the hon. member, Mr. Ghitter, has summed it up adequately, then they should introduce the two amendments as suggested in the newspaper article, that we should vote and support Bill No. 203, The Family Homes Expropriation Act.

MR. GHITTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I also mentioned hippie houses as well and I would like that included in the statement.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the mood of the House I thought I would get up and take a shot at everyone. Let me begin on a very mild note by saying that I am in agreement with the principle of the bill, but have very, very serious objections to its passage in this form or any amended form.

This is, so far as this province is concerned at least, a new concept in the law of expropriation. I think any time we embark on a new concept in a field of law as important as this -- and it is unquestionably important -- that we should do it thoroughly and we should do it well. In those two last respects, the bill falls far short. This is by no means a simply or easily dealt with field. As has already been mentioned in the House, the matter was referred to the Institute of Law Research and Reform up to two years ago. They have been working extensively on it since then. I have had discussions with them about their report. They had divided it into two parts, first of all the principles, and the second part procedures.

They were of the view that once they had settled the principles involved in expropriation which are many and difficult, they would have gotten most of the way through the task and they could follow with the procedure in rather short time. But somewhat to their surprise -- and it's one of the reasons why this bill has many defects -- the procedure for the expropriation has given as much difficulty, and perhaps more, than the report on the principles of expropriation.

I met with them shortly after coming into office, and they have given me an undertaking to have a complete report by the end of this year. It seems to me that this institute, which is funded in part by the university and part by the government, has been assigned this task. They've worked on it for something on the order of two years now, and it seems to me that introducing any legislation in the very field in which they are working, prior to getting the report, is certainly premature.

I don't want to go through the bill and point out all the deficiencies that exist in it, but just to give this House some idea of the matters which I consider to be greatly deficient in the bill, I'll take, first of all, an example of principle. It deals with expropriation of homes, and says a home for a home. What about a business for a business? I'm thinking of the small businesses. There are a number of them that are run out of homes, or at least out of buildings adjacent to homes, and they are a profitable function solely because of that particular location and that particular building and the people that are there running it. If you expropriate them, they cannot duplicate it in another area for anything like the fair market value, which is the normal test now for expropriation. That, too, is an important thing to people, particularly the small tradesman and the small businessman. It's quite wrong, in my submission, Mr. Speaker, to pick one area of this field and try to remedy it, and leave all other areas -- there are many of them -- which have equal difficulty, without dealing with

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-43

them also. That's just one example of principle. I can think of a great number of others which this bill does not cover.

Then I'll take one example of procedure. I draw the hon. member's attention to Section 6, in which there is a provision for appeal to the Supreme Court of Alberta. That's all it says, there should be an appeal. I ask anyone who has been involved in such an appeal if that is, by any stretch of the imagination, enough to adequately get this kind of a matter from the board that's hearing it, or the arbitrator, to the courts. There is no reference in there to time at all. Presumably the appeal could be 10, 15, 20 years from now. Any other legislation that provides for an appeal always provides the time limit within which you must appeal, so that the parties to the proceedings know when you are finally finished with it. This says nothing about the time. It doesn't say anything about who can appeal. It doesn't say anything about the form of the appeal. In short, technically, in that little area, it is wholly deficient.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and pick out a number of examples, as I indicated earlier, where it's deficient in principle and where it is deficient in procedure, but I don't want to delay the House with that. I simply conclude by saying that I'm in agreement with the principle. There is a major study on this that we are going to get in a few months. The legislation, if it's appropriate, can follow that rather quickly. For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't support the bill at this stage, or in its present form. Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment of the debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It's been moved by --

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of people who want to speak, and we've had only a few minutes on this bill. I believe that this would be absolutely improper to adjourn the debate on the bill at the present time. It's nothing short of being strictly political. Vote it down if you want, but don't adjourn.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

There has been a motion by the hon. Attorney General that the debate be adjourned. All those in favour say aye. Those opposed say no. I'm going to have to ask for a standing vote.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, you don't need that. The noes had it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Just to record it. Just for the records, not for division. The no's came fairly loud, and I'm sorry, I have to do it. Would all those in favour stand, so we could have it for the record?

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, you are in the Chair as Speaker, we are not in committee. You should make a ruling and then if somebody wants to argue with your ruling this is fine. They can ask for a standing recorded vote on it. But it is not necessary to go into what you are asking.

53-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 13th 1972

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

In that case I will accept that the 'ayes' have it. Motion carried.

[A recorded vote was requested, and the House subsequently divided as follows:

For the motion:

Messrs.

Adair	Foster	Miller, J.
Appleby	Getty	Miniely
Ashton	Ghitter	Moore
Backus	Harle	Paproski
Batiuk	Hohol	Peacock
Chambers	Horner	Purdy
Chichak, Mrs.	Hunley, Miss	Russell
Cookson	Hyndman	Schmid
Copithorne	Jamison	Stromberg
Crawford	King	Topolnisky
Dickie	Koziak	Trynchy
Doan	Lee	Werry
Dowling	Leitch	Young
Farran	McCrimmon	Yurko
Fluker		

Against the motion: Messrs.

Anderson	French	Notley
Barton	Gruenwald	Ruste
Benoit	Henderson	Sorenson
Buckwell	Hinman	Speaker, R.
Clark	Ho Lem	Strom
Cooper	Ludwig	Taylor
Dixon	Mandeville	Wilson
Drain	Miller, D.	Wyse

Totals: Ayes - 43 Noes - 24]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The motion I declare as carried.

Bill No. 202
An Act to amend The Election Act
(Adjourned Debate)

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I wonder if we couldn't deal with the Billards Room Amendment Act so that we can get another lesson in dirty pool from the government.

DR. HORNER:

On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman from Calgary Mountain View shouldn't be quite so thick-skinned if he is going to continue as a member in this Legislature.

MR. LUDWIG:

What was eating you at the time?

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to continue if all the dirty pool players have had their say.

Mr. Chairman, I had come very close to concluding my remarks the last time Bill No. 202 was before the House. I think perhaps it would be well to summarize very briefly. The hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona had stressed the need to include in expenses all

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-45

of the resources which might be available to a candidate. In other words, one of the points which he was making, and which I was making was that a limitation on the amount of financial expenditure is not necessarily a limitation on the resources available to a candidate, and that a limitation on financial expenditures or a loan would not go very far.

To perhaps back up my argument, I note that in a recent report from Ottawa on the proposed disclosure of election costs, there is, in fact, an attempt to limit to 6 1/2 hours the amount of paid political time available to parties for TV, radio, and cablevision stations. So in fact, they have attempted to put limitations on real resources and not just financial resources which could be used to buy real resources.

In that connection, Mr. Chairman, I made a point when I was speaking last day, of the attention of the hon. members to the fact that some candidates are able to feel large elements of support of human resources, and that I consider this to be a very good part of the political process as it involves many people, but there is no way of controlling this and making this kind of resource even or equitable among all candidates inasmuch as some of this could be contributed, and usually most of it is contributed.

I had also made the point last day that one of the most effective controls on election expenses is the constructive and vigilant attitude on the part of the public in general. In fact if the electorate is not vigilant, and if it is not involved in the political process, then I think that no matter what kind of limitation of financial expenditures which one tries to develop, it will not be possible (a) to enforce it, and (b) there will be no understanding even if it is enforced, no conviction on the part of the public that the process is above board and that votes are not being bought, or that candidates are not being bought. I think this is a crucial issue that the bill was trying to remedy.

I have also, last day, mentioned that the Barbeau Commission stressed the need to define a realistic amount for campaign funds, and that failure to do so would inevitably lead to a violation, or attempts to bypass any limit on election expenses. I think that is a crucial point and one which this bill deals with in a very inadequate manner.

I would just mention in concluding that there are other means of control which might be examined. For instance, a limit on the amount of newspaper space which we could use, although I don't know how one would measure that. But again, it is one way of trying to make sure that candidates get an even opportunity.

The same could be said with respect to signs, I suppose, although I happened to have in my own case, last election, the experience of two parties engaged in the campaign who had their signs out for several weeks and nothing was heard from two other parties. Suddenly one morning I awoke to a telephone call from some of my constituents who had gone to work and discovered that a third party had entered the race overnight and emblazoned the median along the major thoroughfares in the constituency with that particular candidate's signs. Even though they were illegally placed they were there, as they later appeared on other illegal positions and other structures they were not supposed to be placed on, according to city bylaw in the constituency.

So I know of no way of really effectively controlling, by a limit on financial resources, the expense that a candidate will go to, or the opportunities one candidate has vis-a-vis another. Further, some candidates and some parties will go to this kind of limit to proceed in a manner that will convince the public that everything is as it ought to be. The only way I think that that

53-46

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

could happen is by all of us involved in the process making very sure that we have a vigilant electorate, and vigilant campaign workers.

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on Bill No. 202. When the bill was debated last time it was stated that the bill in fact by setting regulations on election expenses would be more in the democratic process.

Mr. Speaker, I feel if we regulate campaign spending we are getting away from the democratic system. The federal government has now introduced a bill which would limit campaign spending and it will be interesting to see what type of debate is brought forth in this. I don't know how this would work provincially and I don't think it will work federally.

I don't agree with the amendment to Bill No. 161. Many people, of their own beliefs, give to political parties of their own free will. We as legislators can't and shouldn't have the power to publish the names of any supporters. What will this be leading to? Will we be next asking public documentation of lists of people who give to churches of their own free will?

Mr. Speaker, I just had a few words to say and, before closing, I think the amendment to The Election Act is premature since the Assembly now has a committee of nine members who are studying the complete act. I move to adjourn the debate.

MR. NOTLEY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect to the hon. Member for Stony Plain, I wonder if he would delay that, or not introduce it at this time, because there are only 10 minutes left and there are still one or two people on this side who would like to speak. Surely 10 minutes to debate the next bill on the order is inadequate?

MR. PURDY:

Yes, I will withdraw my remarks. The reason I asked for adjournment was because it seemed that nobody else was going to rise to speak on the matter.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I would ask if we have the unanimous consent of the Assembly for the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that action on the part of the hon. member because if these bills are going to be adjourned when there are a number of people still wanting to speak it will, in effect, deny the privilege that has been given to us to discuss these bills. Every member has the right to vote on them and to vote them down and so on, but the other method (the device that was used in the last one) really denies a lot of us from speaking who are ready to speak on that particular bill and would have done so here had the hon. member not withdrawn. So I appreciate the action very much and I think this is the purpose of debating these bills. Every member still has a right to vote for it or against it but, certainly, I don't think we want to deny debate or discussion on the bill.

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-47

I would like to support Bill No. 202 in principle. When I say that I can't say I could subscribe to everything in the bill from clause to clause. But I think the principle of limiting to some degree election expenses is very sound. If each candidate from every status of life is going to have a reasonably equal chance to present his platform to the electorate then there has to be some limitation on the amount of money. Because otherwise we're making things very unequal. The labouring man can't find huge sums of money with which to fight an election campaign, compared to a man who happens to be wealthy -- and instead of saying a 'labouring man' let's say a 'poor man', whatever category he happens to be in. He might be a doctor or lawyer, too, some of them are poor, maybe not very many but a few of them are poor also. But a poor man cannot find the same kind of money -- large sums of money -- to fight an election campaign from his own resources compared to a wealthy man. When it comes to contributions from other people the poor man may have a wider scope and may be able to secure more money than a wealthy man, but it is questionable whether he could secure sufficient money to equal that of a wealthy man who is determined to be elected by the amount of money he has.

Now I can't follow the argument that says this is a sound principle but it can't be enforced. I know there are a lot of difficulties, but surely to goodness we are not going to say we won't approve something because it's going to be difficult to enforce. I would suggest that at the present time, many items in the Election Act are difficult to enforce, and I question, as a matter of fact, whether some of them are being enforced. I don't think there is any checkup following an election to see if every member included every item in his expense account. I know of no such check. I know of candidates who have spent money that was not put in the account. I suppose they have their own reasons for doing that, but certainly under The Election Act, everything should be in there. I know of candidates who have others pay the bills for certain events during an election campaign, which, in my view is contrary to The Election Act. So when we say that this would be difficult to enforce -- the present Election Act is difficult to enforce, and, in fact, many sections are not being enforced, because nobody is keeping a rigid enforcement practice over it.

I think the principle is sound today particularly when the amount of money available to a candidate is a very important item as to how many advertisements he puts out. And I'm talking about legal ones -- not the ones referred to by the hon. Member for Jasper Place putting bills, etc. in places where they are not supposed to be. I've always considered that an unfair advantage when candidates do that, when they put them in places where other candidates don't, because the other candidate wants to follow out the law of the land. And I think it's pretty bad when a candidate 'running for election' deliberately flaunts the law of the land, whether or not he agrees with it. I don't think that's the point. I have seen, while driving throughout the province, candidates of almost every party, who paid no attention to where they should put their posters and where they should not. I also saw other candidates of every party who were rigidly careful to make sure they stayed within the bounds of law. I think those who did that are to be commended because they are setting an example to the people in the area that they realize the law is there to be obeyed, whether we agree with the law or not. If we don't agree with the law, let's stand on every soapbox in the country and have the law changed. But while it's there -- I don't know how we can take any other attitude except to say the law should be enforced.

Yes, this would be difficult to enforce, and there might be all methods of devious ways of getting around it. But I think I would again come back to the point raised by the hon. Member for Jasper Place in a previous debate this afternoon under the audit, where he mentioned that there has to be some respect for honesty in people

53-48

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

generally. And I agree with that. I think there has to be some respect for honesty and I think it would be so that the large majority of candidates, once the law is set out, will endeavour to carry out the intent of that law. I think this is right. I don't suppose there is any law in the country that somebody doesn't break. But by the same token I think that 99 per cent of the people or a very large percentage of the people in any part of Canada, in any part of Alberta, try to obey the law, whether they agree with the law or not. Once in a while I hear young people say, I don't agree with that law. Well, that's fine, but if we are only going to obey the laws with which we agree, the whole law-making field comes into question and into catastrophe, because the whole basis of it is that once laws are made by the representatives of the people, they are binding on everyone -- not just on those who happen to agree with the law. And the same thing I think would apply in connection with The Election Act.

But the primary principle, I think, is one that concerns the people themselves. Are the people going to secure an understanding of the platform and the things for which each candidate stands? I think that is the criteria, and I think that is the whole basis. Because if the people are going to vote for a candidate, or for a party, whichever one they decide to vote for, I think they are entitled to know what that candidate stands for and what that party stands for. The way it is today the party that has the advantage as to large sums of money is able to get its platform before the people in a much more realistic way, in a much more picturesque way, in a much more exciting way, than the candidate or the party that does not have very much public funds.

This is fine for those who happen to have large sums of money. But is it fair to the electorate itself because they are subjected to more than 50 per cent of the time from the party that has the largest sums of money? The decisions today, or the methods of trying to get to the people, vary. A poor man can knock on doors just the same as a rich man. The poor man can have workers knocking on doors the same as a wealthy candidate. The poor man can hold public meetings and the people can go or stay away as they wish. The same applies to the wealthy. But there are other fields in which this is not quite the same. A poor candidate has to watch very carefully the papers in which he puts his advertisements and how many he puts in. Because advertisements today, particularly in dailies, are very, very expensive and even in weeklies it amounts to a lot of money. The poor candidate has to be pretty careful about how many radio broadcasts he undertakes, because every one costs a lump sum of money. These are becoming quite an expensive item, if you are going on a number of radio stations. In my own particular constituency I think I was very fortunate, because there was one radio station that pretty well covers the big country, as we call it, that pretty well covers my constituency. Some of the stations from Calgary and Red Deer are used, but not to the same extent as the Dinosaur station. So it is a case of getting your speeches and your platform to let the people know --

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member wish to adjourn the debate at this time, being 5:30 p.m.?

MR. TAYLOR:

If there is any chance of it coming to a vote, I would say I won't bother adjourning. But if it is not going to come to a vote, I would like to adjourn.

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-49

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It has been moved by the hon. Member for Drumheller that we adjourn the debate on Bill No. 202. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It now being 5:30 p.m., the House stands adjourned until 8:00 tonight.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker left the Chair at 5:32 pm.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Deputy Speaker resumed the Chair at 8:00 p.m.]

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply for consideration of the estimates.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It has been moved by the hon. Deputy Premier that I do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker left the Chair at 8:03 p.m.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair.]

Department of Public Works

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of Supply will now come to order. Page 74, Department of Public Works.

Agreed to without debate:

Appropriation 2601 Minister's Office \$ 36,820

Appropriation 2602 General Administration

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks concerning the department and I will be very brief. It concerns two or three matters and if I should miss one I will deal with it on Total Income Account.

53-50

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

One matter particularly concerns me and that has to do with the Remand Centre in Calgary and the agreement entered into by the government and the city. I had posed a question to the hon. minister about some protection for the funds of the people of the province insofar as inspection of this particular building is concerned. The minister had advised me that this was well provided for in the agreement. I had gone through the agreement again carefully and unless there is some specific arrangement in writing otherwise, it is my submission that we did not protect the Government of Alberta in this regard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps there is an explanation for this. I am not going to draw any allegation, but unless there is a provision made that if we are going to shell out \$5.5 million dollars and give it to the city and let them manage the whole project, that we are not discharging our trust the people placed in us to see that the money is well spent. I know that the --

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order --

MR. LUDWIG:

-- that the matter was --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Just one moment. What is your point of order?

MR. FARRAN:

My point of order, Mr. Chairman, is that the hon. member is imputing dishonest motives to the City of Calgary.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Carry on, Mr. Ludwig.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I probably wouldn't do that even if the hon. member was a member of Council.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

That's fine, carry on.

MR. LUDWIG:

I think that the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill could be properly ignored. He has a habit of interrupting everyone on a point of order --

DR. HORNER:

Ho, ho!

MR. LUDWIG:

-- on a point of order and hasn't learned what it means. He is almost as bright as Premier No. 2 here, who is also heckling me at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, I think it is a legitimate request that the Minister of Public Works should explain why we gave that contract to the City of Calgary -- no, we permitted them to be the project manager. I am sure that there are some valid reasons and

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-51

that he perhaps was well advised. But the hon. members don't know this. As I stated, \$5.5 million turned over or allotted to the city for the construction of a remand centre which, in fact, was entirely paid for by the province, and another \$80,000 to the city to manage the project, sort of impresses me that this is a precedent.

I am always under the impression that the Department of Public Works is staffed by some very competent engineers, architects, and administrators, men with a tremendous background in construction, far superior, in my opinion, to that of the City of Calgary. I fail to see the reasoning behind permitting this to be turned over to them, notwithstanding that it may be a joint urban renewal project. But certainly, if we did do that and if there are some valid reasons for doing just that, then the hon. minister should give a full explanation to satisfy us that we are discharging our trust.

I will not say anything more, except to state that I would like to be informed as to where, exactly, have we protected our position by permitting for arranging by contract that we have the right to inspect the construction of the building and not rely on the city standards. It's provincial funds -- provincial revenue from the whole province -- and I'm satisfied that DPW standards are high enough in this province. But it isn't up to me to say, "well, because that is good enough, city standards are good enough for me also." I don't buy that at all, and I don't think that we should.

I think we should take this as a serious departure from the practice, and if anything should have been done the city should have agreed to give us the authority to -- in fact, we didn't need the city's agreement, it was our responsibility, our undertaking, our money, and once again we are staffed perhaps better than any firm in the province to do a good job. That's question number one.

The second problem that disturbs me a bit is the matter of the awarding of the contract for catering services in the court house. Frankly, I don't think that we have had the explanation that it is the proper thing to do. This Mrs. Lappa -- I'll use her name because it's in the correspondence -- ran the court house operation in Calgary. Her background is nothing but a caterer. She's a caterer and I don't think that she's got any professional background in this field. About the time that the John H. Bowlen Building opened and the Land Titles office moved, she sold that business that she got for a dollar a year lease, to another lady for \$1,500. I was not at all satisfied that she turned over all the assets that she had taken from the government to the purchaser. I was very disappointed to see someone get a dollar a year contract from the government and then turn around and make a profit on it. I didn't think this was fair. I was in favour of letting her cancel the contract if she wanted to, because it was almost a gratuitous contract. She got the equipment, and was just given an opportunity to cater in the court house. I was personally never satisfied with the standard of food and catering in the court house at that time. This went on for several years.

What disturbs me about the fact that she got this contract -- it may be perfectly legitimate -- but I'm not satisfied that it is. I'm not levelling any charges at the minister. But she was highly recommended throughout by judges from Calgary and one from Edmonton. I want to know and I want to be satisfied that this was not a situation where the judiciary prevailed on awarding a contract like this. I have correspondence here that Chief Justice McLaurin recommended her, another justice recommended her, the Chief Justice of the province recommended her and lo, she's got the contract when other people wanted it.

I'd like to have it really laid out on the table -- was she the highest bidder? If she wasn't, and if there was any influence used in granting that kind of a contract, it could turn out to be a tremendously profitable venture.

53-52

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

If we are going to choose anyone to do it, other than the highest bidder, then it should have been the CNIB. The CNIB has a special status, as far as I'm concerned, in this province. The CaterPlan has brought them a lot of revenue, and we have gone out of our way to give them a break. If anybody should be faulted for that probably the previous government should, but I recommended it and I stood by it. If we're going to give anyone a break in that operation, let it be a corporation or an institution that has a charitable aspect to it, and not individuals. I must say that when I heard that Mrs. Lappa was given this contract, I think it's only fair and proper that we inquire. I think it's our job -- not only in the Opposition, but all hon. members from Edmonton and elsewhere -- to see that the right thing was done. All the hands should be on the table.

When I posed a question to the minister about this issue, I didn't know that she got it but I was quite convinced from what I knew of the background, that she was going to get this contract, notwithstanding the many people wanting it. I would like the minister, if he hasn't got the information, not to give it now but to bring it. I want to know who was the highest bidder, all the people who bid on it, and which committee awarded the contract. Because from what I have now -- I'm not afraid to say so, I have the greatest regard for the judiciary -- but I would never tolerate nor should any member tolerate any politics from the politicians in this kind of thing, and least of all, from anybody else.

So this is, I believe, a burden placed on the hon. minister to really convince this House that this was strictly above board, and that she was the right person to get it, because if she isn't I believe I would go so far as to think that a committee on elections and privileges ought to review this thing. I don't like it from where I see it now, and if a minister satisfies me I am prepared to drop it, but I don't like it because she was highly recommended by the judiciary. I want an answer from the hon. minister whether this had any influence on her getting it. Because there were other members, other contractors, other caterers equally as good, if not much better, bidding for it.

If they are going to do this this way, as I made my position clear, it has either got to be the CNIB CaterPlan or the highest bidder, unless for some reason the highest bidder is utterly incapable of fulfilling his contract. I don't think that that is the case in any one of the bidders.

Those are just two of the items, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make one more reference while I am on this vote about the remand centre in Calgary. There were a lot of problems with it. One incident took place that I think I would be justified in clearing. Last year a lot of pressure was brought to bear from some of the hon. members in the front row. About January or February of last year a resolution came from City Council deploring the fact that this government -- and particularly myself -- were not able to get this remand centre and provide some winter work in the last winter. That is well and good.

I got together the facts and reasons that perhaps a great part of the delay was due to the fact that this was an urban renewal centre; there were a lot of problems involved and I wasn't faulting anybody. The correspondence showed that if anything I pushed too hard on this project. I got criticized for maybe moving it too fast. But there were many people to satisfy and I got to the position where I gave instructions to my department to get on with it. We had stalled long enough. Let us break clean; let us get on with the job. I felt the criticism was partly justifiable until more than a year later I got a letter from the present Minister of Public Works. I regret that I have to use it in a political sense, but I have no choice in the matter.

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-53

A year and one half later he tells me that the whole structure was delayed because of some problem with the city, and I appreciate the problem he had. But what I think I ought to raise now is that this was a unanimous council resolution. There wasn't a man in the whole council then decent enough to inquire into the facts and at least reply to the letter that I wrote explaining the situation. This was nothing more than a political hatchet job from Calgary, and the arch-mover behind the scene of iniquity was the mayor. Forgive him, because that is his level of politicking and he is entitled to it. But the surprise I have is now we have an hon. member here for Calgary North Hill. He never raised a voice to express what the facts were. He went along with it. I must say I hate to associate him with the hatchet men in City Hall at that time but I have no reasonable ground to dissociate him from them.

This letter is in writing and it is back-to-back, and there wasn't one of them who had the decency to say that the city -- they jumped on my back and had one round, and that is a reflection on everyone of them. I believe I have said what I wish to say in that regard. It was nothing short of embarrassing. About a year later when it was revealed from a minister who I think is very responsible and honest, that the city once more delayed it, there wasn't a sound from this whole group and I say it is a sad reflection on the level of politics as far as this issue is concerned.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. minister could perhaps comment on this. I don't think he needs to defend anything concerning the remand centre, because I appreciate his position. Nevertheless, there was a political injustice there, and I don't think that I in any way minced my words. I put the blame where it belongs, and I would like to hear from the hon. minister now. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Chairman, before the hon. minister answers, could I say a few words on behalf of the City of Calgary?

Mr. Chairman, I thought at first that this was the old paternalistic, 'Father Knows Best' speech from the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, but now I realize that he is motivated by a continuing feud with his own city -- but it's a feud that goes back over a couple of years.

MR. LUDWIG:

There's no feud between me and anybody -- but there's likely one to develop tonight if he keeps imputing a motive. The hon. member ought to know better. I associated him with --

MR. FARRAN:

Is that a point of order, Mr. Chairman, or is he debating? I think I have the floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Please continue, Mr. Farran.

MR. FARRAN:

He said that the province was more competent than the City of Calgary. He said that the Department of Public Works was far superior to anything in the City of Calgary. He said that you couldn't rely on the City of Calgary, that the Department of Public Works standards were higher than those of the City of Calgary, and then he ended it -- he climaxed all this sort of vicious attack on his own city -- with the words that they were dealing with 'our

53-54

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

money'. Now, what does he mean by 'our money'? I thought you were dealing with the money of the people of Alberta always? And that the City of Calgary does the same. It's public money, not your money at all, it never was.

He said that he distrusts the City. Well, there's no need for the City of Calgary, Mr. Chairman, to take second place to anyone. So far as I'm concerned it's the finest city in Alberta and the finest city in Canada. And if any elected representative around here from the City of Calgary doesn't think so, I believe he should resign.

Now let me get back to this past history. He talks about the efficiency of the Department of Public Works under the last administration. If the handling of the building of the Mount Royal College in Lincoln Park is an example, if some of the buildings at the University of Calgary are examples, if the Foothills Hospital that took three years to build is an example, I'd say that your ideal of high standards and efficiency is a much lower one than generally prevails in the City of Calgary.

Now so far as the remand centre is concerned, of course it's very easy for 'Father' sitting up with a paternalistic attitude in the high chair at the end of the table to put all the blame on the alleged subordinate, the inferior body. This is the inference you're giving.

You said there were constant delays. Well the first delay was because under the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View the province refused to conform to normal planning standards in the city. They wouldn't provide the standard of parking that is insisted upon for everybody else. They thought they could build a remand centre with only 50 parking stalls. Well that's not only for the judges and the lawyers and the guards and the spectators, but also for the witnesses and the press reporters. Fifty stalls for a major remand centre, for a major court! That was the first stall.

And the second one was an argument over land. And it was a question of whether the province was prepared to build their building within the available land or wanted to steal 10 feet from the public library in Calgary. Now this has been a fairly difficult problem to resolve, but it's finally being resolved by the present minister, by saying, "Look, you in the City of Calgary have a stake in both the remand centre and the Library. You resolve this question over 10 feet, we'll give you the money and you build it. You can build it to our standards." And I believe that is the wisdom of Solomon. That's the way it should have been done in the first place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

First of all I question some of the statements he made, and I get the impression that with hindsight he now knows a few more answers that justifies him being a Conservative -- great on insight but no foresight -- great on hindsight. I get the impression when he turns out to be an authority on everything that he reminds me of the three different kinds of politicians. There's one kind that knows everything and understands nothing; there's another kind that understands everything and knows nothing; and the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill is entirely different. He understands nothing and knows nothing. He knows a long-standing battle and the long efforts and negotiating to get this thing underway, and now he gets up and he has nothing but praise for the present administration that a year and a half later hasn't got the thing moving, and nothing but criticism for the previous administration.

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-55

As far as I'm concerned, I did not imply that the City of Calgary can do nothing at all, and I'm talking about Council, not the City of Calgary. I also agree that it's one of the best cities in North America, and I also wish to tell the hon. member that they deserve a much better administration than they have. That's my opinion, and I'm entitled to express it as a resident of Calgary. But the criticism levelled against the previous administration in public by the mayor and council is absolutely unjustifiable, unwarranted, and dishonest, in my opinion.

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View has had the opportunity to clear his name with regard to the remand centre and its delays previously. I think I might put down the criticism that may have been levelled in the past against him to the same political motivation that he used when he used the courteous response I made to his inquiries by publishing them, with the same political motives, when I was in the same position he was in.

However, to clear up the remand centre I do stand corrected as far as the agreement is concerned. The arrangement was so definite that I thought it was in the agreement, but we have a very firm arrangement whereby all the work done by the city on the new remand centre will be inspected by the Department of Public Works. It will be directly under the Department of Public Works' supervision. Also the hon. Deputy Minister must approve all contractor's progress claims before payments can be made from the deposit that has been made in the Treasury Branch in Calgary, so I can assure him that we do have complete control and supervision over the work being done there.

I hope he can trust to us the public monies involved in this matter. I can assure him that we wouldn't allow a large sum of public money like this to be handed over without adequate supervision and inspection.

The reason for doing this was primarily one of facilitating something that had caused a good deal of difficulty over a long period of time, as he was aware. There were changes in the plan and problems arising because of the development that was occurring all around the remand centre, and it was felt that by this method we could enable the City of Calgary to go ahead with the building of the remand centre under our supervision in a manner that could fit in with the rest of the planning.

To come to his second point, I can assure him that no underhand deals were employed in deciding that Mrs. Lappa was awarded the catering contract for the new court house. I am quite aware of his personal dissatisfaction with this person; I am also aware of the desire on the part of the judiciary to have Mrs. Lappa there. It was for this reason and because of a total of 19 applications for the job that I felt it should be put out on a straight bid basis.

We had a contract committee within my department -- without any members of the legal profession -- assess the bids, and in fact the bid submitted by Mrs. Lappa was the highest bid. Before they had the bids in they worked out a basis on which they would score the bids. These were in no way directed to the desires of the judiciary. They were based purely on the type of assessments that would be desirable in such a service. Then the various bids, when they came in, were assessed on a score basis with points for each of the various aspects of it.

In fact it resulted in Mrs. Lappa coming in with the highest score, and I regret to say at this time that CaterPlan came in with the lowest score on this occasion. Had there been a better score by

53-56

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

CaterPlan, one that was nearer to the top score, I think I might have used my jurisdiction to perhaps involve them and give them the job. On the other hand it was an open bid and because there was so much difference between CaterPlan and the highest bid I didn't feel it was right for me to over-rule the other 18 bids.

I think this clears up the two points that he requested there. I hadn't intended to make a speech, either political or otherwise, because I felt that our job was to get on with the estimates and assess those rather than develop any sort of political feelings.

I would like to say, however, that in taking over the Department of Public Works I learned the history of it, and I know that a number of years ago the Department of Public Works was a very big department with an overweight of personnel who were doing all their own planning. I think the province owes a great deal to Mr. Colborne who started an excellent job of reducing the Department of Public Works, making it more of a service department and introducing a much bigger policy of using the private sector. I think the good work that he started was, in fact, continued by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View and when I came into the department I found that it was functioning extremely well and I, in the major part, have continued to carry on with the policies that had been laid down.

I will, however, be happy to answer any deviations from these policies but I think I can say that certainly a very good and excellent department was handed over to me and I hope it will be as good or even better when I hand it over to the next minister.

MR. LUDWIG:

I am certainly prepared to accept the hon. minister's explanation as to the inspection services on this very huge and major project. I believe that was a concern I was obliged to express and I don't want the hon. minister to feel that I went out of my way to raise this but it is something the hon. members should know, that notwithstanding the fact that Calgary is entitled to a portion of the money, it is general revenue of the province as a whole, and nobody denies this.

With regard to the projects in Calgary, including the Mount Royal College, I believe that not only Alberta is proud of it but the whole country, the whole nation, is proud of that project. We need make no apology.

The Foothills Hospital that the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill felt was a bit of an embarrassment is another building that Calgary is proud of and all the people of this province ought to be proud of. We need make no apologies about it. Even though I criticized Calgary council with some good backing as to facts, I don't think that one needs to criticize the construction projects that we have carried on in Calgary through the years. You look at the campus, you look at the John J. Bowlen building, you look at Mount Royal College, you look at the Vocational College. You can look at dozens of buildings down there. There are some that could have been built more expensively but the dollar was a factor then as it is now. Everybody knows how to build elaborate, expensive, beautiful, buildings but you always have to pay strict attention to the money available. I think if you look at what is going on at SAIT, all the construction there and it is a crowded campus, look at the auditorium.

I think that one thing this past government ought to be proud of is its construction record in many areas, hospitals, schools, vocational colleges, universities, etc. We make no apologies. Even though the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View may have wanted to knock the things in Calgary, I can stand up and be awfully proud of them.

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-57

I accept the hon. minister's explanation with regard to the giving of the contract on catering if he advises us that Mrs. Lappa was the highest. That was not the impression I got before, but if she was the highest bidder I have no quarrel with the decision. But I believe this is one matter that should be kept under observation. It's an important one, and I would like to know -- I think the hon. minister ought to give us the details at a later date in any event.

Now one more item that I wish to raise that is of interest --

MR. FARRAN:

Point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think the confusion is understandable, but let's make it clear once and for all. He comes from Calgary Mountain View, I don't. I represent Calgary North Hill. He represents Calgary Mountain View. He was referring to me as the Member for Calgary Mountain View -- and it is not so -- you represent that riding.

MR. LUDWIG:

I'll be the first man to retract that statement and apologize for the terrible mistake I made. I'm embarrassed no end about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I appreciate that. As an MLA from Edmonton -- I don't know where Mountain View or North Hill is.

MR. LUDWIG:

You should take a trip that way.

Now, one more question -- [Laughter]. Yes. And I would also invite the hon. Minister of Public Works to drop in once in a while. It's a beautiful city if he takes a good look at it,

Now, Mr. Chairman, one question I have to the hon. minister, and I think it is of some concern to all members. On every budget, and on every vote in DPW last year -- I mean the construction votes -- the whole construction votes. The capital works money, I would like to have some indication as to whether any funds were left on each project that was underway last year at the end of the last fiscal year. It was something that was brought to the House in previous years, and it's of importance to see if any money was left in all the budgetary provisions at the end of March 31st, 1972. I believe that is a question that may require some work to be done, and I don't insist on an answer here. If the hon. minister undertakes to bring it, I won't ask that any vote be held up. That is, I believe a legitimate question.

DR. BACKUS:

One additional point I should perhaps make on the issuing of the contract to Mrs. Lappa. It was being aware of the problem that had arisen in Calgary. It was very clearly indicated in the contract that no profit should be made by the handing over of this contract to anybody at a subsequent date. So I think we have, I hope, satisfied your concern in this particular matter.

As far as the funds that are left from capital projects. At the beginning of the winter when they did a forecast of it, it was estimated that there would be somewhere in the region of \$14 million which would be surplus at the end of the year. It was estimated that this would be the amount left over at the end of the year. However, by developing as many additional projects as we could on relatively short notice, we have been able to engage a good deal of winter employment during the last winter. In the course of doing this, we

53-58

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

reduced that final total to something that is going to be in the vicinity of \$9 to \$10 million. The final total is not quite finalized yet, because the accounts haven't all been closed off. But it is going to be somewhere in that area.

MR. LUDWIG:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm satisfied with an estimate. Will this money revert to general revenue at the end of the fiscal year from the surplus?

DR. BACKUS:

I understand that this is the practice, or that it is written off, or whatever they do with it at the end. I leave that to the treasury -- I don't know what they do with that money. The accounting of the government is still a mystery to me.

MR. MINIELY:

Were you wondering about receiving the information, hon. member, on unexpended monies in public works? Or is that now committed to you?

MR. LUDWIG:

I inquired about any surplus that was in each building project, or each estimate at the end of the last fiscal year, March 31st, 1972. I wondered how much money was left over and how was that money dealt with. Did it revert back to general revenue?

MR. MINIELY:

As you know, basically all monies in all appropriations, which are unexpended at the end of the government's fiscal year, March 31st, revert back to treasury.

I know that the amount left on projects in Public Works, the net effect was very small, but we can provide you with the details of that if you'd like.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well, Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, just before we get on with the estimates, I would like to commend the hon. minister for this very splendid outline book of the projects. They say a picture will say a thousand words and I think this book will probably save Hansard 100,000 words. I think it is a very excellent book and I commend you for it.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister. Earlier in the session -- and we haven't got Hansard here complete to follow it through -- there was some concern expressed about staff in Public Works being laid off towards the end of the year, as budgeted for, and then rehired. I was just wondering if the minister had given any consideration to sort of getting away from the concern that these people have -- maybe I'm wrong, maybe I'm not -- in being laid off then being in the position where they don't know if they are back on again or not. Have you given any consideration to that?

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-59

DR. EACKUS:

I have very great concern for this problem of laying off. As you know the staff in Public Works are of two types; the salaried staff who are permanent staff and the wage earners who are employed on the basis of a wage which actually is a higher wage rate than your permanent staff or salaried staff, because of the uncertainty and insecurity of the jobs. The wage staff are normally employed when work is available and when there is no work available they are laid off. This, over the past, has been a practice.

Many of the people who worked for the Department of Public Works for 10, 20 years as wage employees, have, in fact, worked maybe seven or eight months out of the year and have been laid off for periods when the work wasn't available. This does produce and always causes a good deal of unhappiness amongst them because they are never certain whether they are going to be laid off or whether they are going to get their job back again. I am greatly concerned about this because of the personal aspect of it, the human aspect of it which I think is very difficult.

I don't see a simple answer to this because either you take on a bigger permanent staff than you need a lot of the time, and then you are paying out public monies to these people when they are sitting around on their hands with nothing to do. Or you try and develop an alternative technique of having a perhaps smaller permanent staff, and instead of taking on wage employees, you try and let out more and more of even your maintenance work to the private sector and encourage your wage staff, who are normally on your wage staff, to get onto employment with the private sector, and then contract out all your maintenance work and so on in this way.

There are two aspects to employing a large number of wage staff. Very often, these wage employees, because their wages are tied to the union rates and have gone up considerably over the last year or so, the last two years particularly, many of our wage employees are getting higher pay when they are working, than the foremen or supervisors who are permanent staff. For this reason you find a certain reluctance amongst the wage staff to go on to the permanent staff, because they see a big drop in salary if they go on to permanent staff. They hope that they will be able to continue as a wage staff indefinitely, but then when the layoff comes, we start getting a lot of complaints.

I can see that this is a real problem and it is one I would like to find a solution to. In fact, I have lined up a meeting with Dr. Hohol and we are going into this whole problem of wage versus salaried staff and see if we can come up with some solution that is going to take into consideration the human aspect of this and we hope some answers will come out of it.

Right at the moment, we're in the same position as we have been in the past, where people are laid off for a period, but when they are working, they are getting more money.

MRS. CHICHAK:

I'd like to ask a question of the minister, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the wage staff. It's my understanding, and I think you are aware of the problem to some extent, that some of the wage staff, when they are laid off from time to time, and rehired, and they've been rehired for a period of years, and then suddenly they are not rehired and they are not being told that they will not be rehired. Perhaps there is some reason -- their work may be slackening off, or their job capability, but they aren't being given any reason for this. Is there any way you have now determined to cope with this problem and to make these people aware, if it is not the intention to hire them back, to make them aware that they will not be hired back, so that they might look for something else? I think this is rather a serious matter, and one that needs some very deep consideration. You

53-60

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

may have already given that consideration, and I wonder if you have any comments on that.

DR. BACKUS:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have taken one simple little step in this direction, in that I have instituted the system whereby, when they are laid off and receive their separation notice, a full statement of the reason must be written on that. I've requested that a copy of this also comes up through personnel to me, because I feel it's most important to know exactly why this happens.

Wherever there is some uncertainty in this direction, I have tried to persuade certain of the MLA's who do hear these complaints from their constituents to get in touch with me, because whenever I do have a complaint of this type I follow it up and try and get a satisfactory explanation for them and try and give a reason.

I think one problem that does arise, and this is an explanation I've been given -- whether it's the complete answer or not, I don't know -- that the overall standard of employees in the province has, undoubtedly, improved over the years, with the use of NAIT and with the opportunities people have to improve their abilities, that we do have a bigger pool of people in the province, of a very much higher standard, than there were say 20 years ago.

The result is that when we are looking for re-employment of people, whereas some years ago the private sector took all the highly skilled labour and sometimes the department had to accept maybe not quite such highly skilled labour, certainly now with the increase of unemployment, there is available to the department a higher standard of labour to choose from. Because it is our object to try and employ in the department the best people available for the job, and capability is the one criterion that we use.

I have tried to encourage into my department just recently, taking into account -- I think maybe the government can do this where the private sector may not do it -- I've asked them to take into account the age of some of these employees, because I feel that probably younger men would have a better chance to get jobs in the private sector. Therefore, if we have had employees who have been with us for a long time, and who are getting up in years, say over 40, where they might have more of a difficulty -- I don't mean up in years, I'm over that myself -- but they would have difficulty getting a job in the private sector, that we should endeavour to employ those in the department, provided their ability is almost equal anyway to the younger people who have a better chance in the private sector.

These are the measures I have taken to date, but I would ask any MLA's, if they have problems with their constituents, please get in touch with me if they are not getting a definite answer on it. Sometimes we cannot give a definite answer because we don't know two months ahead how many more people we are going to need, until we start developing a long-range planning scheme. But if you have any people you want me to check out I will be happy to do it, and we will try to come up with a full answer for them.

I even encourage anybody to tell their people themselves not to hesitate to write to me or come and see me, because I am always very happy to see people.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the hon. minister. It is more for an expression of opinion. I notice in your estimates you are going to spend another \$200,000 on the old Misericordia Hospital to finalize alterations. I want to point to the fact that a lot of people get concerned. They say, "Well, they

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-61

moved out of the hospital, they left it for some reason, yet the government has the habit of taking over these old institutions and using them for something else, such as the Glenrose, and now the Misericordia in Edmonton".

I was wondering if you could tell me at this time what was the book value when we took over the Misericordia Hospital and what is the amount of money we have spent on it since we took it over? I know it was the former government that took it over, but I wonder if you have any idea of what the book value was when they took it over, and how much money has been spent on it to bring it up to date? Usually the argument is because of fire and safety regulations and all this, is why they want a new hospital. I wondered what was spent.

DR. BACKUS:

Yes, I agree with you. I think the government does have a tendency to try to help municipalities or the private sector or local governments out by taking over some of their buildings when in fact, if we were in private business, we would steer clear of them. They are, to some extent, a burden on government.

In the case of the Misericordia, we have held it for some time because there was some question of Edmonton actually wanting to take over that whole area because of some highway scheme they had going through there. For this reason we hadn't done anything very much about the Misericordia until the urgent situation arose whereby we wanted to get some beds in a hurry for the Red Deer children. Therefore, we did undertake a certain expense.

I don't have the figures in front of me, but I can obtain those for you. I think one must look on this as a kind of emergency measure. I don't think we are gradually going to take over the whole Misericordia, and have it this type of hospital. I think maybe a long way down the line perhaps the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development can probably tell you more about their long-term policy. But I think there is probably a policy to find more suitable accommodation for these children, but the Misericordia was there, and we wanted the beds, and we wanted them in a hurry, so we used it.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, one more minor matter to raise concerning this department, and that is the matter of park areas in the cities. Quite a good debate was had in this House concerning parks for the two cities. I think it is a very serious problem. One can never give too much attention to open spaces anywhere, particularly if the government owns the property.

I am particularly concerned about this area directly north of the Legislative building. I know the background of it, and I know there are many things needed by the government, but I am rather surprised that the Edmonton members do not make a bid for retaining that area. I am particularly attached to this particular piece of ground because it is close. It borders one of the finest centres in western Canada. It isn't just that few lots of land alone; it is what it adjoins that is so important. This building is probably the last of the beautiful spots in Alberta, as a beautiful building in itself and its surroundings, but the surroundings are very important. I would like to see a real bid made by the Edmonton representatives not to have construction carried on in that area, but to landscape it with beautiful trees. It will enhance the value of the whole area, including there. You might say that land is expensive. It is expensive everywhere.

Even if you do build an administration centre of a sort to cover part of that land, looking fifteen or twenty years down the line you

53-62

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

will still have to move elsewhere. So if we talk about long-range projects, let's leave that couple of acres or so where it is and let's make it beautiful. You might get criticized for it now, but I think in the years to come there'll probably be more people bless you than curse you.

I'm very disappointed in what the previous government did in this regard, in downtown Calgary. I know it's hard to fight the pressure from the public to do things cheaply, but my attitude was that even with the John J. Bowlen Building, which is one of the finest buildings in that city, that it would have been so much more valuable if they had had a couple more acres of land around it. This wasn't done. Maybe it was too late to plan it that way, but I continually exert such pressure as I can, and I think the Minister of Public Works can get a lot of support for this kind of reasoning now.

I think that an acre of land adjoining the Legislative Building would probably get more human traffic in it than ten thousand acres two hundred miles from here. It's that valuable and it's the environment that most people use. This is where most of the people live most of the days of their lives. You have a beautiful valley here, you have beautiful grounds, but this is an encroachment, and it will be almost a breach with the past if you permit a modern structure of any kind, whether it's squat or tall, or big in any way, that will detract from this building.

This building is indeed an historical site that could be preserved indefinitely. But it could get to the position where surrounding it with modernistic buildings, but particularly in destroying the wide open space will eventually make it meaningless to preserve this building. It will be lost in the concrete jungle.

I think that if you took the grounds away from this building, that in itself would reduce the value of the place. It's a tremendous public attraction, the people come here, and I don't want to take too much time, but I think it's extremely important, because you can't reverse yourself. You get beyond the point of no return and then you have to live with it for the next hundred years.

And I know that the department has had long-range views on this and necessary ones, but just as nowadays with modern transportation and the fact that the government had to decentralize a bit, they just can't all be within the Administration building within two minutes of this building, that it would be wrong in my opinion, unless it's absolutely unavoidable, to touch that ground. It should be landscaped and it should be made beautiful and let the people decide whether they don't want that kind of thing. But they've made a tremendous stand here that they want parkland. And I think the cities have always been the worst enemies in planning with regard to park space.

Now they cry that the land is expensive, but I think the land in Alberta is still cheaper than in most major centres. And I have had the pleasure of visiting London, England, and I can't understand how a city with millions of people, and they're crowded desperately, how they can afford acres of beautiful parks. Here we're in the wilderness, millions of acres surrounding Alberta, and we haven't got, outside of the river -- thank God for the river, otherwise we'd really be compressed -- that we really haven't done anything, and it's the MLA's here now that have that responsibility. If they don't stand up, I think the people aren't getting their true worth.

And the same in Calgary, that city desperately needs more open space downtown. And I think that when you look back, that the public will support that kind of a stand. I must say that I even got into a bit of hot water when I objected to a student's residence being built at SAIT on one of the finest pieces of land left in Calgary. I got the wrath of the whole council, including the hon. Member for Calgary

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-63

North Hill, that I was creating the worst unemployment situation in the history of Canada, and that it was bad thinking; and I can't today agree that that building should have been built there.

We desecrated several acres of the finest parkland that set off beautifully a rather beautiful campus. I think that a technical school is entitled to the same kind of buildings and beauty surrounding it as a university has, so I took a stand then and I want to make it known that we should fight for this. I think when it comes right down to it the public will agree to pay, and I'd like the hon. members to give the minister support for that kind of an idea, because we may have made mistakes in the past but I think it's wrong now to stick to those mistakes. We haven't gone past the point of no return.

I know that I was criticized for that little park by the court house. But that was an indication that we meant to recover some of the past mistakes of city planning. I think it can be done, but the pressure has to be from the top, because the civil service are well meaning but they are given responsibilities to bring in a tight budget, to bring in economy, to bring in convenience. But the responsibility for the final decision is here, and I think the hon. minister ought to take the lead with regard to what I said, and perhaps use his influence to see if we can regain some lost ground. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Wilson.

MR. WILSON:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister a few days ago in the Question Period I was asking the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development about the proposed structural changes to the Holy Cross Hospital in Calgary. He wasn't sure whether or not your department is involved. Could you tell me whether you are or not?

DR. BACKUS:

I imagine this would be involved through the Hospitals Commission. Normally, as far as hospitals are concerned, the restructuring we get involved in is more of the plumbing nature. We look after the utilities and parking lots and this type of work. Usually it's the Hospitals Commission that allocates funds to restructuring of the hospitals themselves. I could stand corrected on that, but I have seen no reference in any of our books to work on the Holy Cross Hospital.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Minister would you sort of give me your undertaking that you will check it out, and if you are involved would you let me know sometime next week. We could get together and you could answer my queries at that time. Thank you.

[The hon. minister nodded his head.]

MR. DIXON:

Just for clarification for the hon. minister, it has been pointed out to me that in Public Accounts the old Misericordia Hospital is listed at a book value \$1,400,000 so I don't need to bother you with looking it up.

53-64

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, I have just one question and one comment to the hon. minister. Could you elaborate, at this time, the situation as far as land expansion is concerned at NAIT. Secondly the comment, Mr. Minister, and that would be that unaccustomed as I am to always agreeing with my friend to my left, I agree very strongly with his suggestion that there be no additional government buildings built in the area of the government centre. This area between the Legislative building and the Administration building would be the site for a beautiful park area. I would urge you to seriously take this suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I'm sure that will make the MLA for Edmonton Centre really pleased to know so many support his cause.

MR. CLARK:

I'm just giving him a little direction.

DR. BACKUS:

I appreciate the esthetic recommendations of the hon. members. As far as this area north of the Legislative building, I think I can assure the Legislature that in fact I am rather looking forward to having a discussion in the Legislature of possible future plans for that area at some future date. You will notice in this budget that no funds are put aside for either erecting buildings there, or landscaping it. Even landscaping of this area would be a very costly business. You won't find anything in the budget for it, and I assure you there's nothing hidden in it.

As far as the Holy Cross Hospital is concerned, DPW is not involved in any way with it.

As far as NAIT, I think we are certainly looking in a forward direction towards possibly acquiring areas for NAIT. At the moment the situation is in a little bit of a delicate negotiating position, and I'd rather not divulge too much at this stage if you don't mind, because we are doing some negotiating around here. We are definitely looking, if you like, for a possible expansion of the area of NAIT rather than looking for building NAIT on a higher basis as was planned.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, not trying to question the hon. minister any further on the expansion plans, as far as additional land is concerned. If the minister would simply say that once negotiations are completed he would let me know what is finalized, I would be quite satisfied with that.

DR. BACKUS:

Agreed.

Appropriation 2602, agreed to \$ 198,120

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 2603</u>	Architectural Design Branch	\$ 722,040
<u>Appropriation 2604</u>	Engineering Design Branch	626,470
<u>Appropriation 2605</u>	Construction Supervision Branch	392,610
<u>Appropriation 2606</u>	Accounts Branch Administration	183,220
<u>Appropriation 2607</u>	Personnel Branch Administration	100,270
<u>Appropriation 2608</u>	Contracts Branch Administration	194,170

Appropriation 2609 Physical Plant Division Administration

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-65

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, on this one I would like, first of all, to commend the government on the progress they have made in reform in this area. I would also like to state that I favour the granting of caretaking and maintenance contracts to private firms and individuals where possible. I think there is no end to the amount of services that the government has to provide but, where feasible, I would like to see experimentation on granting contracts -- caretaking and maintenance contracts but, particularly caretaking -- in major government buildings -- although there is much argument against it -- I believe that if you take into account all costs, including administrative costs which are not reckoned into the average costs of maintenance -- that perhaps something could be worked out. I know that this division, particularly, is very well organized now and I'm sure that they are still working towards more reform, but there could be a trend towards more private enterprise. The whole operation is getting larger and larger and there is no way of stopping it because the demand for services is increasing. I wanted to express my stand on it. I think it should be tried and it can be tried, Mr. Minister.

DR. BACKUS:

I appreciate the hon. Member for Mountain View's view on that and we certainly will look into it.

Appropriation 2609, agreed to \$ 651,410

Appropriation 2610 Maintenance and Operation of Physical Plant

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, could I ask a question at this point, on policy. As we're getting more and more of the professional security people, I wonder if it's still the Public Works intention of retaining at least a percentage of the commissionaire-type of security guard, like we have here in this building? There is no thought of eventually phasing the commissionaires out, I hope?

DR. BACKUS:

No, Mr. Chairman, on the contrary. I think that having the services of the commissionaires is an excellent opportunity for the government to recognize these people who have either served our country in the services, or some of our more senior members of our community, and we certainly have no intention of phasing them out.

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 2611</u>	Edmonton Shops Administration	\$ 721,510
<u>Appropriation 2612</u>	Calgary Shops Administration	327,850
<u>Appropriation 2616</u>	Properties Branch Administration	180,130
<u>Appropriation 2617</u>	Government Leased Premises	6,123,620
<u>Appropriation 2620</u>	Government Automobile Service	116,100
<u>Appropriation 2625</u>	Grants for Construction of Police Buildings	220,000
<u>Appropriation 2626</u>	Grants to Municipalities in Lieu of Taxes	4,500,000
<u>Appropriation 2699</u>	Construction and Maintenance Salary Pool	Nil
<u>Total Income Account</u>		41,946,050

Capital Account

<u>Appropriation 2682</u>	Sites and Construction	\$38,088,400
<u>Appropriation 2683</u>	Furnishings and Equipment	4,500,000

53-66

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

Appropriation 2684 Heating Plants Equipment Nil
Total Capital Account 42,588,400

Treasury Department

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 2701</u>	Minister's Office	\$ 35,232
<u>Appropriation 2702</u>	General Administration	402,896
<u>Appropriation 2703</u>	Unforeseen and Unprovided For	Nil
<u>Appropriation 2704</u>	Refunds of Previous Years' Revenue	475,000
<u>Appropriation 2705</u>	Remissions	25,000
<u>Appropriation 2706</u>	General Government Grants	1,300,000

Appropriation 2708 Surveys & Commissions

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, I don't know if this is the right place to ask a question now, but I think the Provincial Treasurer will recall, the night the estimates for the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation --

MR. SCHMID:

Turn on your mike.

MR. CLARK:

Sorry. I didn't know he was interested in listening.

MR. SCHMID:

We are.

MR. CLARK:

Good.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Please start over, Mr. Clark.

MR. CLARK:

To the Provincial Treasurer. You will recall when the estimates of the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation were discussed, and the question of the Boys' Club project in Calgary was brought up. On that occasion, I believe, the hon. minister indicated that he didn't have any funds in his department, but some of the members asked that the Provincial Treasurer in the course of his estimates -- it could possibly be 2706 -- although I'll leave that to the hon. Provincial Treasurer -- the possibility of getting some assistance for the Calgary Boys' Club project for this particular year there. And so the purpose of my raising it now is, one, where can such application be made? And secondly, has the government made a decision on this yet?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, that's correct, the appropriation is 2706 -- we're on 2708 at the present time. I would say on 2706, if you'll notice, just referring back to it. The actual amount we spent in that appropriation last year was \$2,190,000, and along with the treasury setting an example with certain cutbacks, you will notice it is chopped by 40.6 per cent to \$1,300,000. Basically the policy we are following is that if the amount was provided, if the grant was paid or provided for in the 1971-72 estimates, we are following with the

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-67

same grant again in the same amount with no increase, and this is the general policy we are following on that.

As well, there have been some grants which have been automatic in the past which we don't see, frankly, the need to renew. We are reviewing individual grants as they come in and unless there is a good, sound justifiable, reason, we are not renewing it. I would have to bring back at a later date the specific request regarding the Boys' Club of Calgary.

Appropriation 2708, agreed to \$ 125,000

Agreed to without debate:

Appropriation 2709 Public Service Fidelity Bond Nil

Appropriation 2710 Workmen's Compensation Assessment

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, on Appropriation 2710, the Workmen's Compensation department, I have a question. On March 22nd, I raised a question in the daily Question Period to the hon. Premier asking him if it was the intention of the government to introduce legislation which would allow citizens to appeal decisions of the Workmen's Compensation Board to the courts and the Premier referred me to the estimates.

DR. HORNER:

I'm sorry but the hon. gentleman should have been here when the Department of Labour went through them because this is only government employees -- to pay the compensation assessment to the Compensation Board for government employees.

MR. DIXON:

That's fine. I wonder if I could ask a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is the hon. member Mr. Wilson --

MR. DIXON:

Are you all through? On this Appropriation 2710, I understand from what the hon. Minister of Labour said the other day that they were going to consider bringing prisoners under the Workmen's Compensation Board. So would it come under this vote?

MR. MINIELY:

This is just the public service, general public service proper.

MR. DIXON:

Who are they employed by then -- the prisoners?

MR. MINIELY:

The Attorney General's department.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, on this -- I mean the Deputy Premier answered that I should have been here for the Department of Labour -- but I think Mr. Wilson has been here about as faithfully as anybody and surely if he has a question here that he had avoidably missed at that time, surely it can be asked now and be answered.

53-68

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

MR. MINIELY:

The thing is I think all hon. gentlemen realize that as Provincial Treasurer I am not going to discuss the policy in this area. I think that is the policy of the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. If you wish to ask him in the Question Period at some time you are free to do so.

MR. WILSON:

Well I did bring it up in the Question Period and I was here during the Department of Labour estimates and I did ask questions during that estimate. But I am sorry if I picked the wrong vote to ask the question. If you would suggest some other means of advising me what your policy is in this regard, I would try to oblige. But I did not miss the Department of Labour estimates and I was here and I did ask questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Wilson, would you be prepared then to ask them in the Question Period tomorrow, seeing that the estimates have been approved for the Department of Manpower and Labour?

MR. WILSON:

I did! That's where I raised it originally. I was referred to the estimates, Mr. Chairman. I see the hon. Provincial Treasurer is on his feet and I think he could shed some light on it.

MR. MINIELY:

I just want, while I'm on my feet, to say again it is not a matter on which I am trying to duck the question. It is a matter that, as Provincial Treasurer, I do not indicate government policy in specific programs that are related to the expenditure of public money. I think that if you think awhile about that you will understand why I would not. Because my responsibility is to embrace overall financial policy of the government and certainly not to comment on areas that are policy and which require the expenditure of public money on a specific program. That is clearly the reason that I decline to comment.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, if I remember correctly the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour indicated that such questions might be asked in Committee of the Whole when the Workmen's Compensation Act is before the House.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Chairman, as I recall it the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour said that there would be a total review of the Workmen's Compensation Act during the course of the year with a view to fetching in substantial amendments to the act next year. He specifically said that there might be a review board and all these questions would be gone into at great length at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Werry, did you still want to add something?

MR. WERRY:

No, the question has been answered, Mr. Chairman.

Appropriation 2710, agreed to

\$ 650,000

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-69

Appropriation 2711 Mailing - Government Cheques

MR. DIXON:

I should like to ask a question at this point to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. I understand that the government has changed its system where they are having a full pick-up -- say to Calgary delivered to Edmonton. I wonder if the hon. minister would outline his plans and could he tell me who has the contract and who is doing the work?

MR. MINIELY:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. Basically what we found was firstly that, in spite of the fact that people think that we have a modern communications system nowadays, that there were instances where, in fact, it was taking three or four days for government mail to go from either Edmonton to Calgary, which are our two major centres, or from Calgary to Edmonton. So we started to explore.

As all hon. members know, postage rates have increased at a tremendous rate in the past two or three years, so I had my department commence exploring the possibility of a courier service which would deliver departmental mail from Edmonton to Calgary each day. The other advantage of this service was that, whereas with the postal service we had to cut off at 2:30 each day, with the courier service we're able to run it to 4:30 each day and a lot of mail gets out in that extra couple of hours and improves the communication. As well -- this has happened since we presented the estimates -- my department estimates substantial savings by utilizing the courier service as opposed to using the mails, and the contract was Loomis because they were basically the only ones who had a daily courier service for that purpose between Edmonton and Calgary.

MR. DIXON:

Did you ask for a bid?

MR. MINIELY:

I would have to bring that back to you. My understanding is that they were the only ones in a position to handle the courier service.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, that service will only be from Calgary to Edmonton, and vice-versa, and not out to any of the other areas?

MR. MINIELY:

That's a good question. I suppose if we could find out some economic justification for handling it to Calling Lake and Barrhead and to --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Hanna-Oyen.

MR. MINIELY:

I think you understand that it has to be a high volume of mail in order for it to be economically justifiable. Between our two major urban centres, Edmonton and Calgary, it turns out that way. At the present time, at least, they are the only two centres where it becomes economically justifiable.

53-70

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the post office people have more time, then, to look after our mail in the other areas, if they don't have to look after the mail between Edmonton and Calgary.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, this seems rather a strange thing, in that we have a national post office service. Was any representation made to them to point out these delays? I'll admit they are there, because there has been talk about mailing at a certain time of the day and they'll be there the next day at a certain time, but this doesn't always work out. But was any representation made on that basis?

MR. MINIELY:

I don't think it was our position to tell the federal government how to run their postal service. I think we felt it was simply a matter of comparing efficiency with what we had through the postal service and as well, cost. A good part of the reason was cost, frankly. We anticipate that we're going to save at least well in excess of half of Appropriation 2711 as a result of having made this move.

MR. SCHMID:

On a point of interest, it was in tonight's paper that Don Mazankowski brought it up in the House of Commons -- the same question -- and asked the Postmaster General what happened.

Appropriation 2711, agreed to \$ 50,000

Appropriation 2712 Public Service Medical Insurance Benefit

MR. NOTLEY:

There is a question I'd like to ask on both 2712 and 2713 --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I'm sorry, Mr. Notley, I didn't --

MR. NOTLEY:

-- and perhaps the minister could answer both of them at once and save time. Respecting 2712, I notice that we're budgeting \$890,000 for employee fringe benefits. Last year the estimates called for \$995,000, although the actual amount was \$890,000. In view of the normal increase in the size of the public service, I'm wondering whether this \$890,000 figure is realistic, or whether we should be looking at last year's estimates?

The second question, to save time, is the \$500,000 figure on 2713. I'm wondering how you arrive at that. Is that a traditional figure? I realize that you can't possibly forecast the results of collective bargaining agreements or tip your hand, but are you calculating half a million dollars in some specified percentage, or just how do you reach it?

MR. MINIELY:

The answer to the first question is, you're correct. Although there was \$995,000 provided, actually only \$890,000 was spent. There is no increase provided for in the 1972-73 budget over the actual expenditures in 1971-72.

That is due to the fact that the Treasury Branches, the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission and the Alberta Hospital Services

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-71

Commission in this current year are administering their own costs in this particular area of benefits.

With respect to the salary contingency there is no provision this year for that. It has been historical, and you have really hit on the reason. No. 1, we cannot forecast what it is. No. 2, I do not think that it would be wise in any event, in advance of negotiations, to attempt to make any forecast of what it should be. It should go through the negotiation stage.

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 2714</u>	Unemployment Insurance - Employer's Contribution	\$ 900,000
<u>Appropriation 2715</u>	Alberta Resources Railway	7,415,000
<u>Appropriation 2716</u>	Canada Pension Plan	1,910,000
<u>Appropriation 2719</u>	Public Utility Income Tax Rebate	9,570,000
<u>Appropriation 2720</u>	Budget Bureau	155,000
<u>Appropriation 2721</u>	Central Mailing Branch	Chargeable
<u>Appropriation 2722</u>	Estate Tax Rebate Act	7,042,440
<u>Appropriation 2724</u>	Alberta Gazette	99,400
<u>Appropriation 2725</u>	Purchasing Agency	284,525
<u>Appropriation 2727</u>	Tobacco Tax Branch	53,575

Appropriation 2728 Fuel Oil Tax Branch

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, one question to the hon. minister on this. Is there any consideration to changing the regulations in regard to this? We have The Fuel Oil Tax Act as such, but is there any contemplation of changes in the regulations?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, you know we have an amendment act introduced. The only thing we are taking a close look at at the present time with respect to the regulations is basically the enforcement provisions and the collection provisions with a view toward attempting to streamline the paper work that is involved, that is placed on the dealers in the various areas. At the present time I cannot tell you the exact changes that may be made, but we certainly are reviewing the regulations applying to The Fuel Oil Tax Act with that view in mind.

Appropriation 2728, agreed to \$ 398,875

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 2730</u>	Group Insurance	\$ 311,500
<u>Appropriation 2731</u>	Workmen's Compensation Board Pensions	1,000,000
<u>Appropriation 2750</u>	Public Debt - Administration	199,520
<u>Appropriation 2753</u>	Public Debt - Interest	21,000,000
<u>Appropriation 2755</u>	Debt Retirement	3,640,500
<u>Total Income Account</u>		57,932,463

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, the comment on Treasury was a rather -- I believe you received a copy of it, or at least you went to a federal representative -- with regard to the senior citizens' lodges and their association where they have to pay the tax they can get a rebate on it. Some federal tax rebate. Have you made any representations on that to the federal government? It is a --

MR. MINIELY:

Which vote is this?

53-72

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

MR. RUSTE:

I am on Treasury. I received this from -- I will discuss this with you privately afterwards.

Capital Account

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 2781</u>	Previous Year's Refunds	\$ 35,000
<u>Appropriation 2783</u>	Bighorn Storage and Power Development	450,000
<u>Total Capital Account</u>		485,000

Highways and Transport (cont.)

Capital Account (cont.)

Appropriation 1582 Secondary Roads Construction (cont.)

MR. MANDEVILLE:

I have several questions I'd like to ask the hon. minister on this vote. My first question is, how are you going to be establishing priorities on the secondary road program as far as the projects are concerned? Will there be input from the local government as far as, for example, purchasing of right of way on the grid roads? Will local government be supplying the right of way for the secondary roads? And where local jurisdictions have been going ahead and putting in the sub-grades -- and they've got a lot of the subgrade in on the secondary road program -- will they get recognition for this? And will there be some priorities in this area?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, firstly, Mr. Chairman, the priorities will be determined in regard to the opportunities that we have to establish a viable centre in an area. I explained this the other night. Also the grid road system is registered and this was the planning and input that went in in the early stages of the planning of the rural roads all over the Province of Alberta. Last year was really the first year that there had been any great amount of input into the grid road system as such. Before that, there had been other warrants used but they were amalgamated under one program which was called a secondary road system.

Last year the municipalities were to acquire the necessary right of way and a great many of them found a great deal of difficulty because each municipality did not have the same sort of guidelines to acquire right of way. And I think some of the municipalities, particularly around the urban centres, have found great difficulty in bargaining for right of way because a great many of them had a policy that they would trade right for way for fence. This doesn't go over too big where the land is quite valuable, consequently many of the councillors found themselves fighting with the people and there were quite a number of expropriations.

In these areas this year as a policy on the 900 series roads, the ones that would most likely become primary highways, we take over the acquisition of the right of way, buying them and dealing for the fence. It seemed to be one of the areas where there was a great deal of contention before it. I think that this goes to making a better communication between the municipality and the people and the government and the people, in regard to being fair. It's going to cost some more but I think that when you're trying to be fair to people you have to do this.

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-73

In this regard, any highway that is paved is going to be used by a lot more than just the local people. I think just the degree of fairness in itself is one of the criteria that makes the policy a sound one.

All the secondary roads are the responsibility of the municipalities. This is one of the fallacies that is showing up already in the grid road system -- in that many of the municipalities in some of their heavier travelled roads hope that the government will take the road. So they let it deteriorate far beyond what is necessary and they work on their other roads hoping that the province will take over the road. As yet we haven't quite decided on how to cope with this or what the policy should be in this regard. But before we start a second year -- a third year -- of programs on the grid road system, hopefully we will have a policy that will be sound and reasonable.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the hon. minister. Under secondary road construction I realize that there is currently no program to provide connecting roads from villages to secondary highways. In a couple of instances, of which the hon. minister is aware, villages will perhaps use these highways more than anybody else, and yet since there is no provision for connecting the secondary road with some pavement with the villages -- perhaps it's out of order to expect the hon. minister to say that he might go along with it -- but I would like the committee to consider whether when you are sending in contractors to build a considerable mileage of secondary highway, when nobody will be in there for a great number of years -- it would be a mistake not to connect these up. I'm told it will take about three and a half miles of hard surface, and the municipalities, of course, will contribute.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the point is well taken. The hon. member has brought this to my attention before, and it's a point well taken. Certainly come another year I hope we will have a policy comparable -- that is at least comparable or better -- to the policy that we now have in regard to urban centres.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask this question. It's more of a general policy and I think it might as well come under this vote as any other vote. It has more to do with the urban areas and roads feeding in from the main highways through the urban centres. As far as the City of Calgary is concerned, the hon. minister mentioned Tuesday night -- that three roads have been funnelled into 16th Avenue. Is there any disagreement at the present time between the City of Calgary engineers and the provincial engineers on some of their routes? Because there doesn't seem to be too much of a definite policy and even some question on the proposed routes. I was wondering if your department had any particular suggestions that you feel Calgary should consider?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, that's a very good question. Certainly -- because of our philosophy that the local governments should know best what to do in their own areas with the elected representatives that they have -- it does seem that there is some lack of planning in having three major roads like that all centering on one area. I would hope that the City of Calgary will move very quickly to spread some of this traffic by continuing the Blackfoot Trail south or north to join in that area to take, at least, the north traffic off 15th Avenue. I hope they make that decision.

53-74

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

MR. DIXON:

Another question to the hon. minister regarding one particular stretch of road. Has a contract been awarded yet for the road from Forest Lawn to Chestermere Lake? Are you going to widen the road or are you just going to improve the pavement on it?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, we decided this piece of road would help alleviate some of the traffic congestion on 16th Avenue immediately if it was finished. Now it's not going to help this year because it's going to be in turmoil. We are just widening it and putting parking shoulders on it, and it will connect at Chestermere Lake. I do believe that the contract -- if it hasn't been awarded -- at least is in the process of being advertised.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the hon. minister. Is a portion of this \$11,500,000 loaned to municipalities, and the balance to ID special areas, Indian reserves etc?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member knows very well that the grid road system is allotted to municipalities to the roads on the grid road system. The ID's have a special amount of money set up for their operations as well as special areas.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, is the hon. minister saying that there will be no money spent on secondary roads in ID's?

MR. COPITHORNE:

The hon. member is not saying that at all, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TAYLOR:

Well, Mr. Chairman, all I am trying to do is ask a simple question and all I am asking for is a simple answer. All I asked was, what proportion is allotted to the municipalities and counties?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is divided in the areas, not equally, and not in an election year either. It is divided amongst the municipalities. Not all of them get some of it -- most of them get something spent in their municipality. We are trying to do it out in economical units so that we get the best value for the dollars that are spent.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, apparently I am still not making my question clear. Secondary roads construction in Appropriation 1582 is done in ID's and it is done in counties and it is done in municipalities. All I am asking is, is there \$8 million or is there \$7 million that is earmarked for municipalities and counties, or what is the percentage earmarked for counties and municipalities?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, I haven't got that breakdown here right now. If the hon. member wants it at the end of the year it will be in the yearly report when it is all broken down.

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-75

MR. TAYLOR:

I would like to have it because I think it is an essential thing in road construction.

The next point then, is the hon. minister following the requests from the municipalities and counties in establishing priorities within those municipalities and counties? They might ask for five or six grid roads. Are you generally accepting the municipality's priorities?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, we're using their input in making decisions where the road might go.

MR. TAYLOR:

One further question. Will most municipalities and counties receive some grid road money this year?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, most of them will. There will be some that won't but, by and large, they may receive some primary highway work as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Clark.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, one question to the hon. minister. Dealing specifically with this vote, what are his plans for that road that goes from Cochrane north to Cremona, in the grid road system? Some ten miles was done last year.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, I'll deal with this specifically because we held in Cochrane, several years ago, a meeting in which the then Minister of Highways promised to build a road from Highway 1 to Cremona and the grading was done to Cochrane. Then there was some dispute about parks and historical sites and it is a tough area to build a road in anyway because of the hills. Then last year there was some grading done from Cremona south for approximately ten miles. This year we're going to pave that ten miles. We're hoping that we'll be able to grade at least another ten miles. We're trying, at this moment, to get some of the rights of way disputes settled.

I might say, also, that it is a very difficult area in which to do engineering because there is one very tough grade on a hill which has a considerable amount of rock -- the famous Cochrane Hill -- which runs from what they call Nose Hill west to Cochrane. It is a hill that runs contrary to most of the hills in that it runs east and west, rather than northwest and southeast. We are working to this end.

Then there is another area called the Beaver Creek area, or the Mortimer Coulee, is better known by the people who have lived in the area. This is a very steep coulee, and there is considerable trouble with engineering a road through there because, firstly, if you build a side-grade into it, you run into hill slipping and soil slipping problems, and there are some decisions to be made there that require possibly a fill, either through the valley or to extend the detour around somewhat farther. But this has not been settled yet and we're trying to come up with a reasonable grade on the area that will make

53-76

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

it a good road, because it is an important road. It is an industrial road, it will relieve Highway No. 2, and there are considerable timber resources as well as mineral resources in the area.

MR. D. MILLER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to direct a question to the hon. minister. I can't expect that you have all these roads and you can just name them off the top of your head that have a priority, but I'm interested in the road in the southern part of the Taber-Warner constituency. It runs east from Milk River, away out there in the Cypress Hills where all that ranching and all that grain is growing -- past Writing-on-Stone Park -- that is a grid road. And I was wondering if you can remember if there is any appropriation for it?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, there are many of these roads. I sat down two years ago and figured out with the appropriations that were made last year, and incidentally they were \$8 million, and they ended up at \$11.5 million. The appropriations that were allotted, I thought it would take about 60 years to finish the program at this rate. It's a very large program, and every grid road eventually I suppose will get done, but I don't think -- unless there is a very great acceleration in the program -- somebody will be building them long after I'm gone. I can't tell you at this time what the priorities are.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, the other night the hon. minister expressed concern for the people down in the southeast corner of my constituency and pointed out that the road construction or the road-building down there had really brought many of them to Lethbridge instead of to Medicine Hat, and suggested that there was a need for a connecting link to Medicine Hat. My question to him is, does he plan to complete the hardtopping of a grid road that will give this hardtop connection for the people in that area to Medicine Hat?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Chairman, as I told the hon. member the other night, I'm going to go down there this summer to settle in my own mind at least, because it's not settled in the minds of the people in the area, and I think the former minister also had the same trouble. I looked over his files as well, and I find that he had some of the same problems that I am having. Maybe we're talking to the same people. What I'd like to do is go down there -- I know the area very well, and I'd like to go down there and confirm some of our thoughts, because you know eventually they have to be faced up to and something done positively.

Incidentally, when a road is paved in an area, it's big news -- the day that it's started and everything. But sometimes it changes the whole pattern of people's habits and what they do and they find it a lot nicer to drive 20 miles on pavement than maybe two or three miles on a rough stony road. First, it may be partly to exercise their car, and secondly, because it's kind of nice to experience some of the nice smooth road after they have been on a rougher road. So consequently these things sometimes change the pattern of people where they trade. And I think this has happened in the southeast part of the province, where Highway 61 drew a lot of people off to Lethbridge rather than up to the 'Hat.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I agree that this happened and this is one point that we never disagreed on with the Medicine Hat Chamber of Commerce

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-77

who repeatedly made the point to us that we had given preference to the west and we were back to the old thing, of course, of how much can you build at one time. I'm aware of the problems that exist in the south, as well as the hon. minister, and I think I am reasonably well acquainted with them.

I'm sure that he is aware that there is a road started, of course, from Orion that will connect Orion-Seven Persons, that does give an outlet to that area. It may not satisfy everybody but it will satisfy a great number of them. My question really is, does the hon. minister intend to complete that particular road? Because I think it would go a long way toward satisfying the problem in the area. The only reason that I am pressing it, Mr. Chairman, it is that everytime I get into this House, it is one of the questions that I asked. Are we going to get a connecting link to Medicine Hat? Let me say too, in all fairness to the hon. minister -- and I don't want to put words in his mouth -- but I gather that what he is saying to me at the present time is that he is really going to go down and check this over, and so we can't expect anything further for this year down at that corner.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is having assumptions. I am going to look at it.

MR. STROM:

I'm happy that he is going to look at it, but is he going to do anything this year besides looking at it?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, actually I notice by the contracts that some of the contracts -- a lot of contracts last year -- were let in August. I as yet have not made up my mind either, which ones we will be letting and going at this time.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to follow it up with one further question, because the hon. minister made a suggestion that the grid road in areas would be contingent upon whether or not there was a primary highway built in the area. So my question to the hon. minister is, is he now saying that there is not a likelihood of any grid road system being built down there, but he is going to give us a primary highway?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, I'm doing some primary highway in the hon. member's constituency on Highway No. 41. That contract was let last fall in October because of its deterioration at the time. We wanted to save our investment. It was not finished and consequently it will be finished this spring.

MR. D. MILLER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was glad you brought out 61, hon. minister. I was saving that for Appropriation 1584. Highway No. 61 is from Stirling to Foremost and I noticed they were putting another coat on that -- bringing it up -- but they hadn't the last time I was over it. That was in April. They hadn't reached Wrentham yet. Is it intended to carry it right through because there is a limit that goes on that early in the spring and the fall. It needs a heavier road for the loads that go.

53-78

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, that particular road -- we do this on various roads throughout the province in order to protect the investment that we already have there. Because if you let them continue to deteriorate you will soon lose the total investment that you had in the base course.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Minister, I just wanted to ask a question. The thought that arises from these questions. Has southern Alberta been badly treated for roads over the past few years?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, it appears that there have been some areas in the past that lack some road building and construction. I think that the turns are going around. We are also repairing many of the roads that have had considerable use, maybe had base course, and now require additional courses in order to preserve the investment that we have.

MR. BENOIT:

I just wanted to see if I could get the terms straight. A secondary road and a grid road -- I mean a grid road is a secondary road also, isn't it? So when we talk about secondary roads, we may be talking about grid roads or other secondary roads?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes.

MR. BENOIT:

That's fine.

Appropriation 1582, agreed to	\$11,500,500
-------------------------------	--------------

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 1583</u> Bridge Construction	\$8,500,000
---	-------------

<u>Appropriation 1584</u> Primary Highways Construction	
---	--

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, in connection with bridge construction, I might say that I am very pleased to see that this is up 49 per cent, apparently. I think this is something the hon. members can well make use of. Possibly some of it is due to a decision we made, and the hon. minister later confirmed, in connection with a very expensive bridge in the north at Fort Vermilion, I think a very necessary one, too.

The point I'd like to ask is, has the hon. minister decided on whether or not the department will build the bridge at Lethbridge to the university, and is that in the program this year?

MR. COPITHORNE:

No, Mr. Chairman. The exploration part of the bridge is in the program, but that is all. I might say, in regard to the bridge at Ft. Vermilion that it is a very expensive bridge, and the decision to build the ramps was made by the former minister, but the decision on the bridge was made by this minister.

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-79

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to quibble, but the decision was made to build the bridge. You don't build the ramps and then leave them sitting there.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I hope the minister won't mind if I roam slightly between 1582 and 1584, because the question I want to pose relates to the question period the other day, Mr. Minister, when we were talking about the Mackenzie Highway. At that time the hon. Premier suggested that perhaps we had to take a closer look at roads in northern Alberta as a result of the proposed Mackenzie Highway. My question to you is, to what extent is the government giving any priority to the Clear River Road which will link the MacKenzie Highway at Grimshaw out through Hines Creek, Cherry Point, and Fort St. John, to the Alaska Highway? The importance of this road is, in my judgment, twofold. One, it reduces by approximately 150 miles the distance from the MacKenzie Highway to the Alaska Highway. The alternate route going down through Valleyview, over to Grande Prairie, and up through Dawson Creek, approximately 150 miles farther. I would think, from a commercial point of view, that the completion of this road makes a certain amount of sense.

Secondly, although I don't usually concern myself too much about security questions, the fact of the matter is that if we look at long range security, in the event of some sort of major outbreak of hostilities, the danger of the alternative route is that you have to go across the Peace River twice, whereas the Clear River route would be on the north side of the Peace and would link, at the southern extremities of both major highways, the two highways. I think that's something important to look at beyond the obvious advantages to the people in the northern part of my constituency.

The final question I would pose to you relates to Highway 49. There is approximately 35 miles on Highway 49 which is not completed, between a place called Moonshine Lake and the B.C. border. There seems to be some promise now that the road from the B.C. border to Dawson Creek will be upgraded and paved by the B.C. government. My question to you is, what priority will the paving of Highway 49 be given?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, I can understand what the hon. member is talking about. Last winter, in the winter works program, I think we did grind up a considerable amount of gravel in the area. It would be very nice to be able to do all the roads that people generally feel have priority, but we are going to reassess the priorities in regard to the developments that are going on and the number of dollars that are available. The hon. member's points will be well taken and considered.

MR. D. MILLER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On Highway 36 -- I want you to look more pleasant than that -- just for the record and for Hansard, that's six or seven miles. Are you going to finish that south of Gin Coulee this year?

DR. HORNER:

Sure, it's nothing.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, from Taber to Warner -- is that the one you're talking about? Yes, we will be doing a grade and oil job on it.

53-80

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

MR. WYSE:

One question, Mr. Speaker. The minister has announced a very impressive road program, I believe -- 202 miles of stabilized base course, 344 miles of asphalt and concrete pavement and 340 miles of seal coat, 750 miles of oiling. And I might say we in Southern Alberta are very disappointed that you are not, in fact, continuing with work on Highway 48 and Highway 3 this year. I think I have made my views quite plain to the hon. minister already. But I was wondering, what percentage of this \$40 million would be appropriated to southern Alberta.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, I have been reading the Medicine Hat paper where the hon. member has been giving a lot of information. I would gather by the reports I am getting from that paper that he has been trying to second guess exactly what we are planning to do in the area.

Mr. Chairman, I think by the questioning that I have been getting this evening -- I think we have a very respectable record in the area.

In reply to the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, usually they wait one year to read the annual report of what happens, instead they are getting it ahead of time.

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words about highways in the province, and specifically in my constituency. I don't wish to repeat some of the things I have mentioned -- I spoke on the budget and I spoke on the Throne Speech -- but I believe that Highway 41 and Highway 36 are top priority. I know that the Deputy Premier will agree with me, because he gave one of the greatest speeches he has ever given in Hanna in August, and he mentioned these two highways. He said that "If we are successful, and we don't do something with Highways 41 and 36, we will have our hides nailed to the wall." That was reported in the Hanna Herald in August.

If we are going to have rural development --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Sorenson, I wonder if I could get the Assembly to listen to you for a minute; there is so much noise here --

MR. SORENSON:

I don't care; just so the hon. Minister of Highways is listening.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I am afraid he might not hear. Fine. Continue, Mr. Sorenson.

MR. SORENSON:

If we are going to have rural development we must have highways and we must have all-weather highways. On my desk at the present time is a speech that I prepared some time ago. It was on The Alberta Opportunity Fund Act. For some reason or other I was not able to give it at the time that bill was up for second reading. But I certainly supported that bill. I know many others on this side who did not speak also support it. If we are going to have industry we must have highways. We certainly want industry in that particular area. If we are going to have tourism we must have highways.

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-81

I appreciated the title of that act, The Alberta Opportunity Fund. Someone has said about opportunity, "The reason a lot of people do not recognize opportunity when they meet it is that it usually goes around wearing overalls and looking like hard work." I know that the people in the eastern portion of this province are used to hard work. They will work hard, and they are. Both of these highways 41 and 36 have had active highway associations over the past 20 years. Thousands of miles have been logged by the members in meeting with the ministers, and other interested bodies. They are still prepared to do this if necessary.

I would like to propose that three hon. ministers visit this eastern portion of our province. I wouldn't mind if they all travelled together. I would go with them if I had the chance. I would like to see the hon. Minister of Industry, the hon. Minister of Tourism, and the hon. Minister of Highways. The hon. Minister of Industry would be amazed at the major oilfields of this area, the coal, the rape fields, grains of all kinds, the feedlots -- just to mention a few. The hon. Minister of Tourism would be struck by the tourist potential of that area -- the beautiful Battle River, the land of the Neutrals, the northern lakes, the vast amount of wildlife and the Badlands -- just to mention a few. The hon. Minister of Tourism would be impressed with the possibility of a circle tour there, but that is not really possible at the present time; not with Highway 41 uncompleted.

I noticed in the Edmonton Journal of May 11th, there is a circle tour around Drumheller. That is not really possible in the Consort area at the present time.

The hon. Minister of Highways would be amazed at a portion of Highway 41 between Czar and New Brigiden, which at present is ungraded -- a vital link that is missing in this vital highway chain.

We've been narrowing the gap over the years. Last year, some 6.5 miles, plus a bridge, were completed south of Czar, but it is imperative that we continue work on this road. I sincerely urge the hon. minister to continue to narrow the gap with a highway contract in 1972. Certainly the road to one of Alberta's major provincial parks, the Gooseberry Lake Park, should be built and hardtopped.

I notice that my hon. friend opposite is not here this evening, but the hon. Member for Whitecourt in his campaign literature is dedicated to many things. He mentioned one thing -- a \$100 million grid road system. I'm glad he's dedicated to that. I wish he was here this evening to speak on it. He's quite dedicated, and he spends much effort on the Alberta Social Credit board, and The Pool Hall Act. Now if he would expend half the effort on this, I would certainly go along with it.

In conclusion, and I want to end on a serious note, because highways is the major concern in my constituency, but I want to just quote something that one of my constituents wrote, and it's a little poetry by Alberta's country poet. It's not his latest, but I think it is his greatest. It's simply entitled 'Highway 36'.

If you travel on the highway that is known as 36
You are apt to see some nasty holes that someone ought to fix.
The loads of coal and cattle, and the tankers filled with oil
Have done their bit, and quite a bit, it's surface to despoil.

The scenery's as beautiful as anyone could wish
As it travels through the province all the way to Lac La Biche.
The landscape is a picture with it's valleys, lakes, and knolls
But you can't admire beauty when you're watching out for holes.

We have waited long and patiently, and tried to keep our cool
But we're going to start a-squawking and kicking like a mule.

53-82

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

So we are serving notice now, upon the powers that be
That we have waited long enough, now don't you all agree?

Come on you guys in Edmonton, you know our cause is right
And we don't want to quibble, or to quarrel, or to fight.
All we want is blacktop, you know, the old hot mix
And you'll make the people happy, who live near 36.

That was written by Tom McCracken. I do wish the hon. minister
would make some comment on 41 and 36, and especially that portion of
41 between Czar and New Brigden.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the hon. member is saying. For
the other hon. members in the House, Highway 41 has an organization
that's scattered from one end to the other. It was formed some odd
30 years ago, and they have been struggling with making
representations on getting Highway 41 built.

There must be a kind, compassionate group of people down in that
area when the hon. Deputy-Premier went down there and made a wild
statement there, and made a wild statement --

DR. BUCK:

A point of order! Another wild statement!

MR. COPITHORNE:

-- having his skin nailed to the wall, and maybe that was part
of the reason why our party didn't get much representation in that
area. Because of their compassion for the hon. minister.

I have already been in the area. Last fall I travelled a good
deal of Highway 36 and some of 41 and on Highway 36, I must say the
part that I travelled -- which was quite a considerable amount --
although it is oil, was in excellent condition. The oiling does a
good job. It's probably not as good as the pavement, but it does a
good job and we're spending quite a lot of money this year on both
oiling on Highway 36 on the parts that aren't oiled, and on the north
end of it as well.

I believe now you will be able to travel completely from Lac La
Biche to the border after the work is finally finished -- on Highway
No. 41. We are spending a considerable amount of money on it, or
hope to this year. It hasn't been all finalized yet, but we're going
to be working on it. The hon. member's point is well taken, it would
be nice to have, at least, one good arterial road out in that east
country that would be of a paved standard. Certainly 36, I think,
probably holds the highest priority, although I think there is about
65 miles that is not graded and that area I hope to visit this summer
and have a good look at it.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Chairman, my heart just bleeds for the poor people in the
ridings represented by the hon. members of the Opposition.
Apparently the road situation is deplorable in the eastern part of
the province and in the southern part of the province. From all the
questions being asked I just wonder if we should have a crash program
for roads maybe in the riding of Cypress, the riding of Drumheller,
because apparently the road situation is poor there and it couldn't
have happened overnight. The hon. minister told me the other day
that he had a book called Forty Different Ways to Cook and Eat Crow;
could we get 25 copies for the other side of the House?

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-83

MR. HENDERSON:

After that brilliant contribution, and in view of the effort we witnessed this afternoon, it seems to be an established procedure in this House to waste time getting things on the record for Hansard. While I haven't in the past got up during estimates and made an effort to place needs of my constituency on record regarding roads, it's obvious we have lots of time now in this Assembly to do these things. So I would like to bring two small matters to the attention of the hon. minister, and I'm going to ask him for a favour. One of these days when he's driving south to Calgary take a good look at the exit of Highway No. 39 from the town of Leduc. It's the only road that goes into the town of Leduc from the west from a distance of six miles north and six miles further south to the end of the town. It's an old narrow road and all slow moving farm machinery that has to enter the town has to travel on that road and there's an S bend in it as well.

I would like the hon. minister to take a good look at it, and sometime in the near future if he could find enough money to put shoulders on at least one mile of that road until you get out to the first north-south municipal road, I think it would do an awful lot for public interest and public safety. There have been a number of people killed in that section because of slow moving traffic, narrow grade, and the fact that the visibility is poor, but it's the only access into the area.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, I found myself in Leduc a couple of times when I didn't even want to go there.

MR. HENDERSON:

The hon. minister is mixed up as usual. He's got to go west to look at the problem, not in the town of Leduc to have to leave the town of Leduc.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, to the hon. minister. You mentioned some work on Highway No. 41. Will that include some grading on the section that hasn't been graded yet? There's some 40 to 50 miles I believe in there.

MR. COPITHORNE:

I'm not sure what part the hon. member is alluding to, but if he's alluding to the connection in 41 where there is a piece that isn't graded, there won't be any grading done this year.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this would be the proper place to inquire about a remark the hon. minister made about the Howse Pass road. I had the pleasure of riding that road on horseback from near Golden to the Saskatchewan River crossing. After you ride that long trail, fording rivers, viewing hills and trees, you get the impression that maybe it would best to leave it the way it is. I wonder if hon. minister would take a good look at that area to determine whether we need to open up that area at the present time. I know what I'm saying will not be popular with everyone, but it's one of the finer trail rides there is in this country. It could be turned into a road, I suppose anything is possible. I'm wondering just what is intended? Whether it's really intended to push a road through or just a jeep trail, or truck trail or something? It wasn't too much touched by human hands and it looked very beautiful and worthwhile the way it was.

53-84

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I hope that in the near future to have a meeting with the hon. Don Jamieson and at that time we will be able to discuss some of the problems that are mutual to us both, in the Province of Alberta, and this covers several areas. At that time I hope to be discussing with him, also, his intention towards the Howse Pass road.

MR. COOPER:

One short question, for the hon. minister. Will the widening of the Yellowhead route, that is Highway 16 from the Saskatchewan boundary to Edmonton, be completed this year? I refer to the short nine miles west of Vegreville.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, that piece of road, although it is very narrow, is not in very bad condition as far as the road goes. There will not be anything done with it this year.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, last summer the people of central Alberta -- the central Alberta Chambers of Commerce -- and I guess many of the people in Rocky Mountain House -- had very good timing as far as the David Thompson cavalcade was concerned because it was in August and they had the 'now' Premier and the former Premier both there. While I wouldn't want to put words in either of the gentlemen's mouths, many of the people who were there came away with the feeling that, regardless of who was elected, there would be some paving done on the David Thompson Highway this year. Seriously, Mr. Minister, do you anticipate doing some work on the David Thompson west of Rocky this year?

MR. COPITHORNE:

After reading over the files on that particular piece of road I discover that the former Premier did say that the road had a very high priority. The then Minister of Highways -- I read a letter he had written at that particular time -- didn't put such a high priority on the road. We are going to do some work on it this year.

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 1584</u>	Primary Highways Construction	\$39,975,000
<u>Appropriation 1585</u>	Planning Branch	1,195,800
<u>Appropriation 1586</u>	Wayside Campsites	50,000
<u>Appropriation 1587</u>	Weigh Scales	500,000
<u>Appropriation 1588</u>	Grants to Improvement Districts - District Roads	3,656,250
<u>Appropriation 1589</u>	Grants to Special Areas - District Roads	250,000
<u>Appropriation 1590</u>	Grants to Municipal Districts, Counties - District Roads	

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, on that one I have a question for the hon. minister. There is a problem in the southern part of the province in the vicinity of Calgary concerning these closed road allowances that lead to rivers and other recreation areas. I'm of the opinion that this issue has to be settled. A lot of people are unhappy about it and there is still the belief that some are illegally closed and, notwithstanding where the problem arose, there is a tremendous pressure to get something cleared on this issue.

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-85

I would like to support the view that -- as the hon. minister often likes to say -- these are people roads. But I can tell you that the opinion in Calgary and area is that these are people road allowances, and we want to use them. For some unknown reason the will of the majority of the people doesn't prevail. I know it's inconvenient for some people but many things are inconvenient to people. Sometimes a main highway is inconvenient to many people. These road allowances that are really reserved for the public use, even if they are not developed, should be opened, or as many of them as possible, to the use of the people who go outdoors. They can't all go into the wilderness and enjoy the outdoors, they have to try to find their recreation closer to the city. I have myself, on occasion, been requested not to take a walk across someone else's property when all the time I knew this was a road allowance.

I appreciate the fact that there are two sides to this problem, but I think the will of the people ought to prevail and the hon. minister should take a stand even though it can't please everybody. To take a stand; to clear these matters up along the rivers in the Calgary area and elsewhere, to do what is right -- open them up. I know the municipalities will complain, but we could do the right thing and, perhaps, the majority of the people should be allowed to enjoy the outdoors, closer to the city.

I would like to urge the hon. minister to give us a statement as to what he can do and what he proposes to do in this regard. It's an important issue. It's ongoing and sooner or later the issue has to be faced and I think that now is as good a time as any.

MR. COPITHORNE:

The point is well taken. It was a problem. We hope that in the next few years it will become a lesser problem.

In the beginning, the road allowances which the hon. member may or may not know, were set out in order to serve every quarter section in the province. Since that time there have been many roads forced and changed and many of the road allowances have not been used and will not, or maybe never, be used.

As far as having them all open all over the province, I think that policy would be a fallacy, inasmuch as in many areas I would hate to think that a mile 66 feet wide would be used as a recreation ground. It has turned out in the past that in many cases it has been termed as a dumping ground, but now that Calgary has adequate dump and refuse disposal area, perhaps this will clean up in some degree. I think the whole situation proved one thing, that there was not adequate development of recreation area in the Province of Alberta, and that we were not getting the maximum use out of the national parks. Certainly, sometime in the future these problems will be cleared up.

The municipality of Rocky View has a policy that any road allowances leased can be used for pedestrian traffic. In the municipality of Rocky View, the road allowance brings to the municipality about \$2 per acre per year, which could mean a revenue to them of well over \$60,000 a year. This could be pretty universal throughout the province. This is a fair amount of revenue and it has to be weighed very carefully as to its value. Certainly there are more roads being dedicated every day to areas that are being subdivided or being broken up into smaller areas. They have to dedicate more road which becomes public road. I think there has to be a reassessment and a general rethinking of the general use of road allowances, because there are many of them that are not open. It has been a policy that some of the people want to lease them to have better control of their property from seismograph crews, from hunters, from vandalism, and so forth. I hope that some of the legislation that is before this Legislature now will create an

53-86

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 13th 1972

atmosphere where it will not be as desirous to lease these road allowances as it has been in the past.

I can remember, Mr. Chairman, not too many years ago -- when it was the policy of the Department of Lands and Forests -- that if you had any lease land at all under your jurisdiction, you were required to lease all unused road allowances on your property, or you could not hold a lease. That was a general policy and that was not too long ago. There has been a change in this policy and a cry from the Alberta Fish and Game Association, and many other associations. But I think in time -- in time with new policies, that this will correct itself.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks the hon. minister made, but recently a few changes have happened -- and they have happened so rapidly that attention is focused on this very issue. It's not so much that a portion of a road allowance a mile long and so many feet wide would become a recreation area, but it's a means of getting to areas where the public wants to get to. As the City of Calgary grew from 150,000 to over 400,000 people, the population pressure and the demand for using these areas is growing. The problem will become more serious as time goes by because people do get out, some get out on bikes, and some in cars a few miles, and they see a road allowance, but they can't use it. It's an irritant to a lot of people who don't want to go too far, don't want to go on the highway to Banff, but still want to enjoy the outdoors. They feel it is something they are deprived of, and I'd like to urge the hon. minister to give this a lot of attention, and where possible, to take action and open up some of these road allowances. Thank you.

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 1592</u>	Bridge Construction, Municipal Districts, Improvement Districts, Counties	\$1,600,000
<u>Appropriation 1594</u>	Approach Roads Construction	700,000
<u>Appropriation 1595</u>	Roads to Provincial Areas	

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, once again with the view to getting something on record for the benefit of posterity and for comments in Hansard, and the importance that hon. members of this House place on this exercise, I would like to make a plea to the hon. minister to examine the provincial parks road policy. Before making my comments, I would like to say that I would hope I might be more successful in influencing the present minister than I was the previous minister in this regard, but I am not too sure I have any grounds for optimism.

When this program came into existence, I took the trouble to prepare a circular and send it out to every municipality in the province to try to find out how many municipalities -- rural municipalities -- had municipal parks in their areas which were heavily utilized by the public -- people outside of the immediate area of the municipality -- to which there was no provincial road and it was a significant problem so far as the municipality was concerned. I forget, but I think I got responses from about half the municipalities in the province. There was only one other municipality at that time that indicated they felt they had a problem of this type.

The plea that I make really should be made by all MLA's from Edmonton because this is where my problem starts, that all the constituents of the Edmonton members go out on weekends and tear off to Pigeon Lake. They raise considerable havoc with a municipal road

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-87

running off 39 south to the north shore of Pigeon Lake. I believe that some work was done last year as a start on improving the road under the secondary road program. On behalf of the Edmonton MLA's -- because it is of no direct benefit to me other than getting the County Council off my back locally -- I certainly think it would be indeed a popular move so far as all those members of this Legislature from the City of Edmonton are concerned if the minister could change the policy on provincial parks and expand the program to include roads to parks where there is a heavy traffic problem relating to public utilization and not just put the restriction of provincial parks on the problem. I think if he surveyed the problem, unless there has been a significant change since I did the province-wide survey, I think he would find there are only two or three parks in the province -- municipal parks -- that have this problem. It wouldn't create any serious difficulty so far as the department is concerned, in including these parks in this consideration, so far as public utilization and priorities on this road construction, either under secondary roads or under roads to the parks.

I close by saying again, it is really the Edmonton members who should be standing up and making this plea to the hon. minister.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Edmonton MLA's, I support that request. Let it be recorded.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman would be happy to know that a good deal of the road that is being constructed this year falls under this kind of a category. Certainly I feel for the people who try to feel their way through the dust to the parks that are available to them. I listened carefully to all the hon. members' speeches from both sides of the House and I found there is a very high priority on recreational types of roads. However, a very high priority will be given to this.

In regard to the parks that were founded by the municipalities -- they have found that in some instances a park does promote an industry in their area, but in some other instances they have found it a very expensive detriment to their taxpayers who get very little benefit from it. This has to be measured carefully in regard to where the facility is being put, the size of the park, the economics of servicing it and looking after it.

MR. BARTON:

Would the hon. minister mind outlining what parks will be paved in the north -- access roads?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Again we are getting down to specifics. I told the hon. member last night or the other night when we were into this category that we would provide him with that information as we made the decisions in the areas that we will be doing.

Appropriation 1595, agreed to \$1,200,000

Appropriation 1596 Grants to Cities for Transportation
Facilities

MR. LUDWIG:

In view of the sizeable decrease in this appropriation, I wonder if the hon. minister could tell us whether there is a decrease in demand for these funds, or is it just a case of budgetary problems

53-88

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

where you didn't have the money to go any higher? I'm concerned -- and I know there are a lot of MLA's from Edmonton who can well speak for Edmonton -- but I'm concerned whether the needs in Calgary, as in the past, are going to be met in this regard, or has there been a cut back regardless of the need in this budget?

MR. COPITHORNE:

As a matter of fact, in regard to Calgary, it has been treated very well by the Department of Highways. There will be no cutback on the budget for Edmonton or Calgary, nor the other cities in Alberta. The requisition will be exactly the same as it was last year. In the Calgary area -- as I explained to the hon. members the night that I was giving my first report, last Tuesday night -- because of the priority that was put on the Blackfoot Trail south into 16th Avenue, we gave Calgary, I think, \$5,100,000 beyond their \$4.5 million as well, last year.

MR. WYSE:

One question, Mr. Chairman. Are there any dollars in this appropriation for the Medicine Hat Maple Avenue bridge?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Is there any what?

MR. WYSE:

Are there any dollars in this appropriation 1596, \$11 million?

MR. COPITHORNE:

The City of Medicine Hat will be getting some dollars out of the appropriation, but at this time there has not been a decision as to where there will be any thing further for the Maple Bridge in Medicine Hat.

MR. BENJIT:

We're talking about the cities. Here and there is a decrease, but we just bypassed the towns because there was nothing in the towns' appropriation. There was a program at one time. Is that program completed now and is that why we don't have any more for the towns? Or are we just going by this way for a year?

MR. COPITHORNE:

The program for the towns was completed last year and there is no program in this regard this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Dixon.

MR. DIXON:

It's OK, go ahead George.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Oh, Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the hon. minister would tell us, is the government committed to a \$50 million program over a five-year period, or are you handling it year-by-year in our urban areas?

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-89

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this year we'll be able to come out with a comprehensive program for probably five years.

MR. DIXON:

I have a question which is more or less advice to the hon. minister, you could say. I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the minister has ever given any thought to getting together people in the major transportation industry in our province? I was thinking of, say, some head people from the CN and CP, from Greyhound, and from organizations such as that who could also work with the cities on mass transportation? For example, keeping in mind the hon. member's constituency of High River, where eventually that rail line could be used as a rapid transportation system which is running almost parallel with the highway, I was wondering if the minister had ever given any thought to using private enterprise people on a volunteer basis, as a group of advisers? I think we should go beyond just tying it down closely with the city itself. There is a real pool of talent in the transportation field. I think if it was called on, it could do a lot of good service for our province.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, in my short time in office I find out I get a lot of advice on where to build highways and how to build them and when to build them. I think we've had a good demonstration tonight from the opposite side of the House. The boys on this side are quiet right now, but I've had a deluge from them as well -- as from almost every organization in the Province of Alberta who have been to see me -- and they have given me advice. Some of them have been by my door three or four times. Incidentally, there has been a lot of good information coming out of it, some real good information. And I hope they keep coming by my door, because this is a good way in which to find and be able to set priorities.

Appropriation 1596, agreed to

\$11,000,000

Total Capital Account

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR:

I'm sorry, I thought somebody was speaking. I was going to give way to the page boy.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

No, Dr. Buck is sitting.

MR. TAYLOR:

He'd probably make a better speech than I'm going to make.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. TAYLOR:

I want to make two or three comments. In the first place I want to say it is rather nice in many ways this year to sit down and hear somebody else answer all the questions on highways and bridges. It's quite enjoyable in fact. I think I should say that it doesn't matter

53-90

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 13th 1972

how much money is voted on an estimate like Highways and Transport. It is literally impossible for the province to provide sufficient money to do all of the highways in a comparatively short time. Consequently I can feel very strongly with the hon. minister in making decisions, because decisions have to be made. But since there are always so many roads that can't be done, I think it stresses the importance of establishing very careful priorities in order to be fair to people in all parts of the province -- and I emphasize, all parts of the province.

I believe the hon. minister will agree that he has a very excellent planning branch where priorities are established. I am sure that branch will be of as much value to him as it was to me in connection with establishing priorities and attempting to be as fair as possible to all parts of the province. I think if a minister is able to do that, that is all anyone can expect.

The other point I would like to mention in connection with towns and villages -- I was a little disappointed to see that there was no new program for towns and villages. By the same token I understand that something has to be cut here and there. But I would hope that the hon. minister and the government in the next year would be able to provide some assistance for our towns and villages, because actually the towns and villages are unable on their own to meet the requirements of building strong roads to withstand the heavy traffic. They do require some assistance.

This one year following the completion of the five-year program, I don't think is going to be too serious; it will probably give the towns and villages a chance to do some pretty careful planning, which is very essential. So I would hope that in another year towns and villages might have some consideration in regard to some assistance for their streets, sidewalks, etc.

The other point I would like to mention is that of urban transportation. The former mayor of Calgary, Mr. Leslie, was instrumental in calling a national transportation conference on urban transportation about two years ago. I think Mr. Leslie is to be strongly commended on that move. At that move the first urban transportation conference in the history of Canada, I think some very great strides were made.

Arising out of that conference the Canadian government established a Ministry of Urban Affairs. I think that ministry is just feeling its way now. But I would hope that the Ministry of Urban Affairs will undertake to provide some type of land fund for our urban areas. This is badly needed. I think it is going to be very difficult for the provincial government to provide this type of land fund that is going to enable our two large metropolitan cities to buy up the land at the lowest possible price to provide for the transportation corridors. The Ministry of Urban Affairs in Ottawa, I think, can be a tremendous asset to the Ministers of Highways right across Canada, and also to our urban areas where there is a heavy concentration of people, and where the costs of transportation are really very heavy indeed.

That brings me to the next point. During the last year that we were in office, I urged the councils of both Calgary and Edmonton to forego urban transportation that particular year for two or three reasons. First, I felt that the Minister of Urban Affairs in Ottawa soon would become a reality. There was a good chance of establishing a land fund, where land purchases could be made, possibly by the federal department. At least that was being considered.

Secondly, technology in connection with rapid movement of people was still developing, actually is still developing. I have been told by some highly trained engineers that had the City of Toronto waited just one year before it started its rapid transit system --

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-91

electrical rapid transport system -- that it could have saved a very large sum of money through using a pneumatic tube, which was pretty well perfected the following year. I can understand any reluctance on the part of the provincial minister in rushing into rapid transit, but by the same token I can understand the feeling of the city people, who are being faced with more congestion every year, even though the congestion in Alberta cities is nothing compared to some of the congestion in the eastern cities.

But, I would hope that in the western cities, particularly our large metropolitan areas, we will not wait until we get two million or three million people, as did Toronto and Montreal, before tackling the rapid transit program. I think the hon. Member for Calgary Millican has a very excellent point when he suggests that we use rails that are already there. Particularly in connection with the CNR, the people of Canada have already paid for these rails and possibly 75 per cent of the time those rails are standing idle. I can see no reason at all why arrangements can't be made, without the cities purchasing those rails, to use those rails for rapid transit within the boundaries of their cities.

Now I can also see the extension of excellent transportation systems through the use of the rails as the Ontario government, through its Department of Highways, has developed. Now, I'm not suggesting that we can do it immediately, but I think it's something that has to be looked at. They have the go-trains, and I have ridden them in the company of their minister, and I was really excited with the service you get on those go-trains within -- I'm getting some static here -- I was excited with the service they get on those go-go trains for the few miles I've ridden out of Toronto.

You know there's a possibility here too. We have increasingly heavy traffic from Edmonton to the International Airport, and I hope that with the work that the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce is doing, that we will have even a greater increased traffic. And the time is going to come, I would think, in our time, when we're going to have to have much better transportation to our International Airport. And, really, the rail lines are built almost to the International Airport now, and while it's CPR, I can't see any reason why arrangements can't be made through the Department of Transport at Ottawa for the use of rapid transport on some of these rail lines to good advantage.

Similarly, between Calgary and Banff, and between Calgary and other areas, a go-train has a very strong possibility, to say nothing about the possibility between Calgary, Red Deer and Edmonton. These are simply things that are going to take place and I think before we go into heavy expenditures on some new type of rapid transit; and I believe our cities are doing this; they are examining what's there now and building from there. Because unless our cities do get into rapid transit within the next few years, we'll find ourselves in the predicament that Toronto and Montreal found themselves in by waiting too long. And also the predicament that Los Angeles and San Francisco have found themselves in by concentrating everything on one type of transport, instead of trying to become diversified in transportation, which is just as valid as the program advanced by the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Industry, in wanting diversification in industry and in farming.

The only other point that I would like to make in connection with the department is that since the capital program now is being carried out with borrowed money, I would urge the hon. minister to make sure that the borrowed money is used on projects that will be there to serve the people who will have to pay part of it in the future.

Total Capital Account

\$86,757,010

53-92

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

Legislation

The following was agreed to without debate:

Appropriation_1902 General Administration \$ 187,000

Appropriation_1903 Sessional

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask a brief question on 1903. Is there anything in this appropriation or in any other one -- and you're going to be surprised because I'm not going to say what you think I'm going to say --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Are you asking about task forces?

MR. GRUENWALD:

No. Is there anything in here or anywhere, a protection plan similar to workmen's compensation of any description whatsoever, for MLA's?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, no. This appropriation was increased by reason of the addition of 10 extra members in the Assembly. I presume that the hon. member's question regarding workmen's compensation relates to injuries received on the job, and while there might be a good deal of verbal abuse that one might receive it's not felt that it would be such that would put one in a position of requiring hospitalization or workmen's compensation by reason of his duties in the Assembly.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to carry this through a little further. What you are saying may be true and again may not be quite so true. I'm sure about the verbal abuse and that doesn't show, so there is no problem there.

Having served at the municipal level throughout the province in the last 10 or 15 years, I've been instrumental -- and I think rightly so -- in insisting that there should be at least an accidental death benefit for MLA's who are carrying out the responsibilities of their constituents. Now this is not an expensive thing, yet it is a very responsible thing. There are a number of great orators in this Legislature, but I submit that there are none of them who can convince me that -- and I look at some of the young fellows across there and some that are not quite so young here -- who have young families at home and if they were travelling across this province in the exercise of their duties as MLA's and if they should be killed or maimed in any way, or even lose an income, that you would have a hard time to satisfy your responsibility to those families by simply sending them a card or a bouquet of flowers.

I submit that it is a responsibility of the Legislature to arrange some sort of a plan that would provide against accidental death, some medical payments that are not covered under the medical plan, plus some sort of an indemnity. Now this is only for accidental purposes. I've done some homework on it, it would cost about one to one and a half per cent of that particular appropriation and I submit that this is really worthwhile. I'm saying that would give you about \$50,000 for accidental death, it would give you a couple of thousand dollars for medical payments, and it would give you enough of an income to pay the groceries, pay the mortgage and a

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-93

few things like that. It would give you about \$400 a month. So I submit that this a responsible thing that should be considered very seriously and I believe it should be done. There are few, if any, school boards in the province who don't have it. There are few county councils that don't have it. It just amazes me that the higher up in the level of government the less care and concern there is about its members. So I bring this to your attention.

MR. DIXON:

I was under the impression, Mr. Chairman, that we were covered under The Workmen's Compensation Act. For example if the hon. member was travelling to a position in his constituency on what would be considered legislative work, or to and from the session, he would be covered under The Workmen's Compensation Act which actually has more and lasting benefits than even what the hon. member is proposing. I think this came about with the tragic accident of the hon. Mr. Ure where it was proven that even the Cabinet ministers at that time were not covered. This is what brought all this on, and we had quite a discussion on it in the House. That is when the members were covered then by The Workmen's Compensation Act. There was one hon. member from one of the constituencies close to Edmonton whose leg was broken coming from the home of a constituent who had called the member on a problem, and it was covered. I just wanted to clarify the point that I don't think there has been any change and we are still covered under it.

MR. BARTON:

Is this General Administration or --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

No, Sessional, Appropriation 1903.

MR. BARTON:

I will go back to General Administration if I may?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Let's finish what Mr. Gruenwald raised.

MR. HYNDMAN:

On the subjects raised by the hon. member, Mr. Gruenwald and the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, I think those are very useful suggestions. My information is there is no coverage at all now for members under The Workmen's Compensation Act but, indeed, looking at the tens of thousands of miles, and when accumulated probably hundreds of thousands of miles that the hon. members of the Assembly travel going to and from the session and in meeting their constituents, I think that's a suggestion worthy of consideration.

Also, the consideration regarding a broken leg is, indeed, perhaps more reasonable than many would think because the number of platforms that hon. members on both sides would go up to and walk down from increase the risk materially over that which many people have. I think this is a useful suggestion and one which we should certainly follow up.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Chairman, do you think this could cover having your hide nailed to the wall?

53-94

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

MR. HYNDMAN:

That would involve double indemnity, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I wonder if the hon. member, Mr. Gruenwald, is satisfied with the answer?

MR. GRUENWALD:

Yes, I'm satisfied as long as he will accept the suggestion -- and you haven't made any commitment that you are going to put this into effect immediately -- but I hope that when this whole area of indemnity is reviewed you will give very serious consideration to this because it is a serious thing.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, while I think there is some basis for the suggestion made by the hon. Member for Lethbridge, it doesn't seem to me that any member in this Assembly should expect any coverage as a matter of public policy, other than what is available to the civil service, unless we want, as members, to pay for it through some sort of a group scheme. I know the cabinet ministers have access to the civil service group insurance plan if they wish it. Maybe this could be made available to members, but I certainly couldn't favour setting up special programs for members of this Assembly, unless we wish to finance it as a contributory scheme ourselves over and above what the civil service obtains.

I would have to agree with the hon. House Leader. I think you will find that we aren't eligible for compensation because of one main factor: when we've been on an indemnity basis there hasn't been a factor of loss of income relating to our legislative responsibilities. However, the extending of the group insurance might be of some interest.

MR. GRUENWALD:

I wish to point out that I disagree very strongly with what the hon. member has just said. The matter that they haven't done it in the past doesn't mean that it shouldn't have been done all the time, and I'm telling you it should be done. I know from travelling in the last 20 years, when I left home and left seven or eight kids there if I should have been killed at school board work, how in the world can you justify saying "It's just too bad you should have looked after yourself because you are on the services of the taxpayer." It doesn't cost very much and it should be done. I still think it's a responsibility.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, I am still convinced we are covered but I wonder if the Attorney General or the hon. House Leader could check this for sure, because I don't know how these other people collected if we weren't covered.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Dixon, maybe you could discuss that if you know the incident or the case that was looked after.

MR. MINIELY:

One of the most knowledgeable people in Alberta is sitting in the gallery, the provincial auditor, Mr. Keith Huckvale. He says we're not covered.

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-95

MR. TAYLOR:

Not even ministers?

MR. MINIELY:

No.

MR. TAYLOR:

Well, ministers formerly were covered because both in the death of the late Mr. Ure and the late Mr. Wilmore who died --

MR. MINIELY:

Well, there is a group insurance policy which we --

MR. TAYLOR:

No, they were covered by Workmen's Compensation because Mrs. Ure forewent hers in order to take a court settlement.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I think the substance of this is that we should find out (a) where members stand now -- what they do have and what they don't have, and (b) what are the options open to them? Are they payable from the public purse or payable by individual members in respect of monies of their own?

MR. BARTON:

I have a specific problem. General Administration is where our telephone passes come out of -- right? No? Is it complimentary or what? To continue, the reason is in my constituency I'm divided into two phone districts; one is the Athabasca, Westlock, Barrhead one; the other one is the Peace River one.

I was wondering if it would not be in order for the government to look into adding the member of the Legislative Assembly in all the towns in a particular constituency in the directory under Government, the same as you have your DA's and your Lands and Forests, etc.

MR. HYNDMAN:

That is something, Mr. Chairman, that is worthy of consideration. I know in the City of Edmonton I believe the City of Edmonton telephone people will not put initials MLA after any person who happens to hold that status. Whether or not that is a rule of the house at AGT I don't know. Perhaps the hon. Minister of AGT could point this out.

MR. WERRY:

Well, I'm not aware of any policy or restrictions on that as pertains to rural Alberta, except that I would imagine that the directory services would be willing to offer such a service on a fee basis. Normally when a subscriber has one telephone, he has the privilege of one free telephone listing only. You'll get one free from the Legislative Assembly and you pay for the other one.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister is not getting the point. The point is in my constituency, I have two different directories, and it's pretty hard for a person 50 miles down the way -- and I was just wondering, it might be a lot simpler --

53-96

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 13th 1972

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, my banker would like to know a very simple matter, and my banker would like to know if I'm going to get my indemnity now, or in the fall session?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, we can assure the hon. member's banker that the hon. member will at least get a substantial portion of his indemnity.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well. Are we agreed to 1903?

MR. ZANDER:

Just a moment. I was just going to check. If my arithmetic is right, Mr. Chairman, the \$591,000, certainly isn't going to be sufficient to pay the indemnity for 75 members.

MR. HENDERSON:

It isn't intended to.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Just some get it.

MR. ZANDER:

Can you answer this?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, if it's not enough we'll take it out of 1910.

Appropriation 1903, agreed to \$ 591,000

Appropriation 1904 Library

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, just before you proceed I'm wondering if I could put to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, whether any consideration has been given to keeping the library open more often than it is. At the present time during the evening sittings when we adjourn from 5:30 until 8:00, it's closed. I think there is some merit in having it stay open during the sittings of the session and beyond that. Have you ever given any thought to the idea of having it open period, so that members of the public can come in during the time the Legislature isn't sitting after the 4:30 closing?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, the library, strictly speaking, is under the purview and direction of the Speaker. However, insofar as the Privileges and Election Committee, is at the moment considering matters relating to services provided to members, I wonder if I might make a suggestion that the hon. member come to the committee which he is certainly entitled to do, which will meet, I believe a week Wednesday at 8:30 a.m. in this Chamber. The committee, I think, feels that the agenda can be expanded in respect to these matters which may come up, and that suggestion could then be raised.

I recall, I think, four years ago, arrangements were made to have the library open in the evenings, which I think had not previously been the case, and accessibility to the books certainly is, I think, a useful suggestion.

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-97

Appropriation 1904, agreed to \$ 87,171

Agreed to without debate:

Appropriation 1905 Auditor's Office \$1,175,816
Appropriation 1908 Data Processing Centre 2,702,520

Appropriation 1910 Leader of the Opposition

[Four government members rose to their feet.]

MR. GHITTER:

I'll defer to Mr. Lee.

MR. LEE:

I'll defer to Mr. Koziak.

MR. KOZIAK:

Is there anything in this appropriation for task forces?

MR. GHITTER:

My sentiments.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Chairman, I don't think we should pass over this so lightly since we have an increase of 58.5 per cent, when the former Leader of the Opposition, now leader of the province, only received \$24,600 for the maintenance of the office. Is there any explanation why there should be such a large increase in the Leader of the Opposition's budget?

MR. HENDERSON:

Ask your Government House Leader.

MR. ZANDER:

I wonder if the generosity would have extended further.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I think the question should be rephrased and checked with the Government House Leader because obviously the Leader of the Opposition didn't set it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

No. No. I think it's directed to the treasurer or the House Leader.

MR. MINIELY:

Well, I think without goofing around, there is a bigger opposition than there was last year.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

AN HON. MEMBER:

And a better one too.

53-98

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 19th 1972

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, a question; we have office space provided now. Is it going to be available right through the year? I mean with the session extended to both spring and fall. Are we going to have offices so we can come in here anytime and find them available to us?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Appropriation 1910, agreed to \$ 42,000

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 1911</u>	Ombudsman	\$ 147,339
<u>Appropriation 1912</u>	Office of Mr. Speaker	13,650
<u>Appropriation 1914</u>	Hansard	48,000
<u>Total Income Account</u>		4,994,596

Capital Account

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, we're going back to Appropriation 1981.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Page 8.

Appropriation 1981 Equipment for Data Centre

MR. DIXON:

Could I ask a question on this? It is a very expensive operation -- data processing. A lot of our municipalities are in it and hospitals that are owned by the province. Has there been any thought at any time to try and amalgamate a lot of those services in order that -- they are being paid for out of taxpayers money whatever level it happens to be? I wonder if the government has given any thought to other people using it other than the actual provincial government?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may just say, contrary to what many hon. members may think, the provincial government data centre has a very high utilization factor. As a matter of fact, the reason for additional equipment in Appropriation 1981 is that this equipment will improve the capacity of the data centre because there is a tremendous pressure being placed on it at the present time. Our government, as well, intends to try and provide a lot more provincial statistical information as you know in the case of the Department of Manpower and manpower planning. We will require more statistics. In fact, it would not be a correct view that this is not highly utilized. We anticipate that it is going to be extremely highly utilized. The amount of time available for anyone outside is actually negligible.

Appropriation 1981, agreed to \$ 342,930

Total Capital Account agreed to 342,930

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might just brief members a bit. We now have voted, of course, on every appropriation in the estimates that I presented in my budget on March 17th. We now require, if all

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-99

hon. members would turn to pages 102 of the Income Account Book, these represent the special warrants passed by both the former administration and by our government during the fiscal year and require ratification or in effect, a vote which will be read off by the Deputy Speaker Diachuk, and agreed to by the Assembly gratifying the special warrants. On the capital accounts, they are on page 16. When the Deputy Speaker reads them off, the resolutions actually combine the totals on income and capital into one figure by department as he is calling out the resolutions. I then would only say that we would save a whole computer run, I think it would only take us about ten minutes to introduce the Appropriation Act and take it right through to third reading if I could have the leave of the House. It would save us one entire computer run, not setting up the act we passed on Monday, another Interim Appropriation Supply Act.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I wonder if the hon. members of the Assembly would appreciate -- I have been expecting the Speaker back and he is not back -- in order to avoid confusion, I would ask Dr. McCrimmon to come in here as the Chairman of the Committee to proceed with this and I will then have to leave.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I was able to come down from the Speaker's chair here, but I couldn't report back to myself.

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

The following Resolutions were agreed to without debate:

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$55,125 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1971, for the Treasury Department.

1. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$1,412,190 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, for the Department of Agriculture.

2. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$1,206,750 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, for the Attorney General's Department.

3. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$1,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, for the Department of Education.

4. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$5,001,450 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, for the Executive Council.

5. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$9,120,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, for the Department of Highways and Transport.

6. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$231,500 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, for the Department of Industry and Tourism.

53-100

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

7. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$25,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, for the Department of Labour.

8. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$8,050,627 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, for the Department of Lands and Forests.

9. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$63,500 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, for Legislation.

10. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$26,750 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, for the Department of Municipal Affairs.

11. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$12,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, for the Provincial Secretary's Department.

12. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$34,351,594 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, for the Department of Health and Social Development.

13. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$1,953,980 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, for the Department of Public Works.

14. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$17,195,530.41 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, for the Treasury Department.

15. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$716,030 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, for the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation.

16. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$601,938 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, for the Environment Department.

17. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$14,781,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, for the Advanced Education Department.

18. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$80,500 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, for the Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs Department.

19. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$16,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, for the Minister of Telephones.

1. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$19,857,015 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Agriculture.

2. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$33,143,400 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Attorney General's Department.

3. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$254,651,800 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Education.

4. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$25,742,398 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Executive Council.

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-101

5. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$109,572,350 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Highways and Transport.

6. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$5,892,000 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Industry and Commerce.

7. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$11,328,625 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Manpower and Labour.

8. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$25,171,665 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Lands and Forests.

9. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$5,337,526 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for Legislation.

10. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$1,858,530 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Mines and Minerals.

11. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$81,696,275 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Municipal Affairs.

12. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$409,778,204 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Health and Social Development.

13. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$84,534,450 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Public Works.

14. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$58,417,463 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Treasury Department.

15. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$5,702,750 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation.

16. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$10,407,530 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Environment Department.

17. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$185,699,630 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Advanced Education.

18. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$291,920 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs Department.

19. Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$214,925 be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, for the Department of Telephones and Utilities.

MR. MINIELY:

I move the resolutions be reported.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

It has been moved that the resolutions be reported. Are you all agreed?

53-102

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 18th 1972

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Dr. McCrimmon left the Chair.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair.]

DR. MCCRIMMON:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration a number of resolutions, and taking them as read, I beg leave to report the same.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Taking the matter as reported, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. MINIELY:

I move the resolutions be read a second time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It has been moved that the resolutions be read a second time. Are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

MR. MINIELY:

Somewhere it's here!

Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and that the Assembly resolve itself into Committee to consider ways and means of raising the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor has been advised of the subject matter of this and recommends it to the consideration of the Assembly.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It has been moved by the hon. Provincial Treasurer that I do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Diachuk left the Chair.]

* * * * *

May 18th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

53-103

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair.]

The following resolutions were agreed to without debate:

Resolved that toward the making good of the supply granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1971, the sum of \$55,125 be granted out of the General Revenue Fund of the Province. Is it agreed?

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1972, the sum of \$94,847,339.41 be granted out of the General Revenue Fund of the Province.

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1973, the sum of \$1,329,298,456.00 be granted out of the General Revenue Fund of the Province.

MR. MINIELY:

I move that these resolutions be reported.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. MINIELY:

I move that this Committee rise and report.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Dr. McCrimmon left the Chair.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair.]

DR. MCCRIMMON:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means has had under consideration a number of resolutions, taking them as read, I beg to report the same.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Committee of Ways and Means has had under consideration a number of resolutions and begs to report the same. Do you all agree?

MR. MINIELY:

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

[The motion was carried.]

53-104

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 19th 1972

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS

Bill No. 4 The Appropriation Act, 1972

MR. MINIELY:

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

Hon. members, this bill officially endorses the supply granting the total amount of the estimates we have gone through over the past several weeks. I would ask leave of the House to take this through second and third readings this evening.

[With the unanimous approval of the House, Bill No. 4 was introduced and read a first, a second, and a third time.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The motion was carried without debate.]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until 2:30 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

[The House rose at 11:30 p.m.]