

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday Afternoon, November 9, 1972

[The House met at 2:30 pm.]

PRAYERS

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

Select Committee on Foreign Investments

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour, on behalf of the Select Committee on Foreign Investments, of submitting a supplementary to the interim report which was tabled in the House on October 31, 1972.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 122--The Health Insurance Statutes Amendment Act, 1972

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being the Health Insurance Statutes Amendment Act, 1972. It is Bill No. 122. Mr. Speaker, this bill amends two acts, The Alberta Health Care Insurance Act and part two will amend The Health Insurance Premiums Act.

I would like briefly to describe the intent of this bill and how it applies to each of the acts separately. The intent of part one is to make registration a condition of entitlement for benefits, thus tying in with The Alberta Hospitals Act. It is intended also to improve the premium collection by authorizing the commission to withhold payment for out of province claims when the premium is in arrears. The bill also provides for regulations for obtaining information from practitioners for the purpose of processing and paying claims.

One of the more important sections, Mr. Speaker, is intended to establish, within the act, the mechanism for a professional review committee from each professional association. The purpose of this committee is to review the income profile of practitioners in their own profession and, when necessary, recommend that payments be reduced or even eliminated.

The bill also will provide for an audit of practitioners or a group of practitioners' books by someone appointed by the commission. It will also provide for a review of the patients' records but only after the consent of the patient is obtained. It also provides for the exchange of information between various government bodies when the information is necessary and relevant.

The second part of this bill, Mr. Speaker, pertains to the Health Insurance Premiums Act and deals again with the requirements for registration to make the acts consistent.

The main intent of the bill and, to me one of the most interesting, is the provision in this bill that will make it possible for dependents, who have been opted out by the resident, to opt in. Thus it will do away with some problem areas where sometimes people unwillingly have been opted out of the Alberta Health Care Plan. Provision will be made within this bill for them to opt themselves back in again.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 122 was introduced and read a first time.]

72-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

Bill No. 125 The Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Foundation Act

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Foundation Act.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a bill which relates to the establishing of a foundation. I will mention that it does not relate to the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, the names being very similar. The foundation established would have the authority under the act to raise funds, presumably from the private sector, in order to fund research into alcoholism and drug addiction, and in particular to fund one or more university chairs in regard to this type of study and research.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 125 was introduced and read a first time]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you and through you to the members of this assembly 20 students from Alberta College in my constituency of Edmonton Centre. Today, Mr. Speaker, they are accompanied by their group leader, Mr. Peter Preston. They are seated in the members' gallery, and I would ask them all to rise now and be recognized by the assembly.

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and through you to the members of this assembly 28 senior citizens from the Town of Morinville. They are accompanied by their convenor, Mrs. Rose Martel, who does a tremendous amount of work in the Town of Morinville for the senior citizens, and their bus driver, Mr. Jerry Pelletier. Would they now rise and be recognized by this assembly?

MR. STRON:

Mr. Speaker, we have in your gallery today a man who has spent a number of years in this legislature. He has served as the M.L.A. for the constituency of Warner, later Warner-Taber. He has served as the Minister of Welfare and the Minister of Agriculture for a number of years. He is interested in parliamentary procedure and is back here to see how we are doing things today. I ask Mr. Halmrast if he would rise and be recognized.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce to you and through you to the members of this assembly a group of Grade IV students from the Calvin Christian West School in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. L. Strikwerda, and by four mothers. Mr. Speaker, we have on a number of occasions discussed the enthusiasm and effort of groups such as these to maintain their own school, and it is my privilege to ask them to rise where they are seated in the public gallery and be recognized.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Cost of Living

MR. STRON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier. You mentioned earlier in the session that the government was concerned about the rising costs of living, and given that the consumer price index was up again in October, I am wondering what special steps the government is going to bring in to decrease housing, clothing, and food costs?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the government is not in the position at this time to make a definitive answer to the hon. Leader's question and, as was mentioned in the remarks earlier in the fall session by the hon. Leader, of course this matter is primarily the responsibility of the federal administration. To some extent it is very difficult for us to move in any particular way at odds with, and not in

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-3

tation with, the federal government in this important area. It is quite clear that until the federal Parliament reconvenes, and we don't at the moment know the date of that, and until they are a little more definitive about their policy it is difficult for a provincial government, other than in certain isolated ways, to deal with the general problem.

We are, of course, as I mentioned in my remarks, very alive to the concern about the question of inflation and costs. I particularly mention food costs that we are watching with interest; as I mentioned further, the situation with regard to the charges against a certain food organization by the federal government combines branch; in addition to that we are re-assessing the Batten Report. But insofar as any definitive answer at this time, I am not able to provide the hon. Leader with one.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, if I may ask a supplementary question to the hon. the Premier. Is the government giving any consideration to a program which would freeze or limit the rate of increase in the cost of rents?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the difficulty of isolated freezing of any particular item of our free enterprise economy is simply that when you get involved in one item, you have to assess the validity across the board. As I mentioned in my remarks, and I hope the hon. Leader and others have read it, the remarks that are quoted in the October 25 Hansard regarding the fact of wage and price controls -- our concern is that the people who are perhaps going to suffer the most from an across-the-board wage and price control are certainly going to be those people in the lower income levels within our society. Unfortunately, they have the least bargaining power, they are involved in a situation where they are pretty well required to deal in service factors that have one of the highest degrees of inflationary impact. For that reason we are very cautious about a move in that particular direction, and of course, as I remarked, the jury is still out, relative to the effectiveness of such a program in the United States.

Tax Cuts

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In light of the rising consumer price index, and also the announcement today of the Economic Council that governments can hold the line on taxes and even reduce them, is the government prepared, at this session, to introduce some tax cuts to the people of Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Agrimart Site

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, my question today is again centered on the Agrimart controversy in northeast Calgary. Present in the gallery are representatives and the president of the Vista Heights Community Association and also representatives of the 24-25 group. They are, of course, vitally interested in this issue as it affects the residential area. My question today, Mr. Speaker, is directed to the hon. the Premier. Has the Agrimart been instructed to stop construction at the Vista Heights site in view of the fact that the government has indicated to the House that they are, in fact, seeking an alternative site, and if this search is going on, is there a time limit on this search?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the matter was fully discussed, the exact question, was it 24 hours ago? I think so, but I would be happy to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs if he can throw any further light on the identical question.

72-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, by way of further explanation, as I understand it after having spoken with representatives on both sides in the dispute, if I can put it that way, the situation is this. The Agrimart people are proceeding with the stripping and grading of their site which they have in the City of Calgary, legally as I understand it, under the terms of a development permit which they have. They are doing that recognizing that two things may happen: number one, that a decision of the courts, which is now pending, may rule against them, and therefore that work and that investment could be wasted; and number two, that there is a possibility that the province will come up with an alternate site somewhere other than in the City of Calgary which would be acceptable to the municipality concerned, and also the Agrimart people.

I can report at this time, that I believe a favourable degree of progress has been made in trying to find an alternate site somewhere else in the province. We have had several representations from various members, particularly, Mr. Lee, of Calgary. As I said yesterday, we are proceeding with all energy in that regard.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, is the Minister now prepared to request the Calgary Regional Planning Commission to advise Agrimart that its approval is being withdrawn pending the court action which you made reference to, and peeling the search for an alternate site?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the matter is not before the Calgary Regional Planning Commission. The development permit was issued by the Calgary Municipal Planning Commission, an autonomous body and we certainly don't wish to interfere, and have indicated that we would not interfere in a local City Council matter or a local planning matter. What we can do, I think, is take the initiative in trying to find an alternative site elsewhere in the province, and I am encouraged by the progress that has been made to date in that regard, and I hope before too many days pass, to report some progress in that area.

MR. HO LEM:

One more supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill has a supplementary. There are two supplementaries and I believe the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill was on his feet first.

MR. FARRAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am always very quick on my feet. Mr. Speaker, my question is on the same subject to the Minister of the Environment. Mr. Minister, has the Agrimart Company, Alberta Livestock Co-op applied for a permit from the provincial government under The Clean Air Act?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, on November 3rd, the Director of Standards and Approvals in my department wrote to the principals of Agrimart and informed them that they would need a permit to construct and a licence to operate under The Clean Air Act. My understanding is that the organization has mailed some of the data that is required, and I believe it arrived today, and that they will be meeting with the department on Tuesday to make a verbal presentation of their proposal.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall, I believe, has a supplementary also.

MR. HO LEM:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, one more final supplementary. What responsibility will the government take if the Agrimart continues construction, and the court rules in favour of the people at a later date?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's supplementary is definitely in the area of speculation.

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-5

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Premier or either of the hon. Ministers. Since Agrimart has started construction without the necessary approval from the Minister of the Environment, is the government going to issue instructions to Agri-Mart to cease construction immediately, or is Agrimart going to be permitted to defy the law?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I might answer that. It is true that the legislation under The Clean Air Act permits the Director of Standards and Approvals to request that construction be halted pending an approval under The Clean Air Act. The question that is of paramount importance here is to what construction actually is. The question of whether or not a site has been graded for improvement is whether or not this implies actual construction of the facilities that are required for approval, or whether it is simply an improvement of the site that they own. There is nothing to prevent them from improving their site.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker --

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this topic. It seems to me we are dealing over and over again in the question period with topics that are of scope beyond those for which the question period is intended. The purpose of the question period, as I understand it, is to deal with short questions which permit short answers on topics of immediate concern.

MR. TAYLOR:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is a current topic. It is of vital concern to 30,000 people at least and here we have an industry that is apparently defying court orders and acting in defiance of the government. We consider it is a fitting and proper --

HON. MEMBERS:

Order. Order.

MR. TAYLOR:

I'm speaking on the point of order. Mr. Speaker, the hon. members want to put a zipper on their members, that's fine but not on mine.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege --

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Opposition House Leader on the point of order, please.

DR. HORNER:

I am speaking to a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and it supercedes his point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Deputy Premier is dealing with a point of privilege which takes precedence over a point of order.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Opposition House Leader has now impugned the character of a number of people and I would suggest that he be very careful about his language. He has now said that the Alberta Livestock Co-op was in contravention of a court order that was in contravention of governmental orders, neither of which is true. I know that he doesn't take very much care with the truth, but, Mr. Speaker, he should be in this House made to stick to the facts.

72-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Deputy Premier has not a point of privilege. A point of privilege must involve the privileges of the House and its members. May the hon. Opposition House Leader continue with his point of order?

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My point of order is simply that in my view the question and the supplementaries are in order because it is of current interest and concerning a lot of people. Apparently the company is acting when there is a decision pending before the court, and they have not yet received a permit from the Department of the Environment and at the same time they are more than simply cleaning their site. Consequently, in my view, the supplementary is in order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Opposition House Leader is expressing a legal opinion as to whether someone outside the House is proceeding in a legal manner. As far as the urgency of the matter is concerned we have a special rule, No. 23, for dealing with matters of that kind. I must reiterate that the question period is intended only for topics of immediate concern which may be dealt with by short questions and short answers.

MR. TAYLOR:

I have one more supplementary, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the hon. Minister of the Environment that if the work goes beyond merely cleaning the site will he then order a stop to the construction?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Opposition House Leader's supplementary question is a questionable supplementary. It is speculative.

MR. TAYLOR:

May I phrase it another way then, Mr. Speaker? At what point will the hon. minister order a stoppage to the work?

MR. SPEAKER:

I must say that the supplementary is still not in order. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the hon. Member for St. Albert.

Fort McMurray Housing

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. What immediate steps are being taken to relieve the very serious housing situation in Fort McMurray?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, that is an extremely complex question with so many parts to the answer that I don't believe I could answer it today within the bounds of the question period. However, I can say that there are presently under construction in the town of Fort McMurray two temporary mobile home sites which we hope will be finished within two to three weeks. This will supply immediately in the neighborhood of 30 additional mobile home sites which is the very pressing demand. There are extensive studies and reports and planning underway with respect to the direction of expansion that the town of Fort McMurray will take, and this includes, of course, many aspects of housing. But to give a complete answer would require more time than is available in the question period, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY:

Is the government now actively considering a land assembly scheme, similar to ones in Slave Lake and Grande Prairie?

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's one of the items that is under consideration.

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-7

MR. NOTLEY:

One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: I understand that through the Alberta Housing Corporation we have a rudimentary land assembly scheme where municipal units asked for it. Is the government at this time giving consideration to expanding this into a province-wide land bank scheme proposed by the Dennis Report?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well Mr. Speaker, the enabling legislation is fairly generous in its terms and there are many land assembly projects of a variety of sizes under way throughout the province, but it is that kind of legislation that is being considered as one means of assistance by this government for the town of Fort McMurray.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for St. Albert followed by the hon. Member for Highwood.

Athabasca University Site

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Speaker, my question affects probably half a million people in this province, and if we're going to direct our questions we should have lots of supplements to this one. My question is directed to two ministers, the Minister of Advanced Education and the Minister of Lands and Forests. I have been asked from time to time how my suggestion for a provincial park on the one-time site of the proposed Athabasca University is progressing. If the ministers had been considering use for this site could they bring us up to date on this matter?

AN HON. MEMBER:

It was discussed in caucus.

MR. JAMISON:

It wasn't discussed in caucus.

MR. FOSTER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can go first and if my hon. colleague wishes to respond, I am sure he will. I can confirm my earlier remarks in this House concerning the future of Athabasca University, and the conclusion of this government that Athabasca as a university would not be constructed on the site at St. Albert. However, I have no input directly into the future use of that land, and would require other comment to answer the question adequately.

DR. WARRACK:

Yes Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that this is a matter that is under active consideration and, as a matter of fact, it is under active consideration in the light of the important resolution on the order paper that received some considerable discussion in the spring sitting of the 1972 legislature, sponsored by and spoken effectively to by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, Mr. Farran, and the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, Mrs. Chichak.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Rocky Mountain Insurance Co.

MR. BENDIR:

Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Attorney General. Yesterday the hon. minister assured us that the shareholders in Rocky Mountain Company would be looked after -- the policyholders, I'm sorry. My question is to deal with the shareholders, Mr. Minister. Can he give us the same assurance with regard to the shareholders in the company?

72-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

MR. LEITCH:

No, Mr. Speaker, I certainly can't. This is a company that embarked on a business venture, the same as any other company or business. The people who purchased shares in that company took the same kind of risks of loss and chances of profit as purchasers of shares in any company. So the shareholders and the policyholders are in completely different categories, and it's the policyholders that the government felt it had its obligation to, and for that reason provided the guarantee.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Government Vehicles Insurance

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question today to the hon. the Premier. With the recent change of agents handling the government vehicle insurance contract, did the actual insurer or carrier of the insurance change at the same time?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the question is on the Order Paper and there will be an answer to this.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I know there is one on the Order Paper, but it doesn't cover this subject, and the hon. the Premier more or less indicated the other day he was going to make an announcement on this subject, because it is of vital interest to the people of Alberta.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I did not suggest that I would be making an announcement. I said we would answer questions put on the Order Paper, and if the hon. member wants to put supplementary questions on the Order Paper, that is his privilege.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. the Premier. Mr. Premier, have you considered as an alternative to contracting out insurance on the government fleet to private companies, the approach taken by the former administration in B.C., which was where the government simply insured the fleet themselves through a government operation?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter which was specifically said to be put on the Order Paper. There is an answer to be given and I believe the answer deals specifically with the question raised by the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Rural Post Offices

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. My question is, is the hon. minister aware that there are many small village post offices being phased out, or their hours of operation are being curtailed. Is he aware of this, and if he is, what is he doing about it?

MR. BETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the various details. I would be happy, if the hon. member would provide me with the details, other than during the question period and I would be pleased to look into them.

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-9

DR. BUCK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I just would like to know what the hon. minister does in his department because there are --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. Member for Calgary Bow followed by the hon. Member for Smoky River.

Retirement Savings Plans

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Has the government made application to have the Provincial Treasury Branch term-saving certificates accepted as investments for registered retirement savings plans?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I get the whole intent of the question. We have made some representations to the federal government under federal income tax revision with respect to the treasury branches. This particular one, in order to answer correctly, I would have to find the details in answer, if you would put it on the question form.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do any government investment vehicles, provincial government that is, qualify for registered retirement savings plan investments?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is clearly asking a question on a point of law.

MR. WILSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe it is a point of law, because registered retirement savings plans are plans wherein the sponsor of the plan applies to the federal government to have them recognized, and I was asking whether any vehicles or not in Alberta, that are administered by the provincial government, qualify, or if any applications have been made to have these vehicles qualify?

MR. SPEAKER:

Under the circumstances, if the hon. minister chooses to answer, I would have to find the question to be in order.

MR. MINIELY:

The only way I can answer that, again, is that there are several investment packages that are offered by the treasury branches, and there are others, as you know, in certain agencies of government. I would prefer, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member put that particular question on the Order Paper and I would be happy to answer it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Smoky River followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Moose Hunting

MR. MOORE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests with regard to the closure of moose hunting in a certain zone M5-22 in the Peace River Country. Has the hon. minister received any complaints with regard to this action from the area involved, and is the hon. minister contemplating similar action in other areas?

72-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, in response to the representations from the people of the local area, and particularly their M.L.A., Marvin Moore, and also I might add, at the same time, in the Athabasca area by the hon. Member for Athabasca, Frank Appleby, there were two wildlife management units, namely 5-10 near Athabasca, and 5-22 between Valleyview and Grande Prairie -- running a considerable distance north and south -- that were closed to foreign hunting for moose. The reason for this had been that there was a considerable hunting pressure going into those areas which had not occurred before because of the differential price between big game zone one and those areas. This being the case, the local people would be deprived of the equal opportunity to hunt in those areas, particularly because they were busy harvesting at the time. So for those reasons, the 5-10 and 5-22 zones were closed to foreign hunters but those were the only areas.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

Snowmobile Regulations

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this question to my good friend, the hon. Minister of Highways. The question is this: in view of the fact that the House has been sitting for approximately three weeks now and the hon. minister announced that there is going to be a licensing fee for snow vehicles, and also that they must carry PL and PD, why did the hon. minister not inform the House before he made his announcement?

MR. SPEAKER:

The question is a very questionable question -- the hon. minister is entitled to answer that if he wishes to.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I heard many times from the people sitting over there when they were over here say, "Well this is the vehicle; why don't you let the legislature know about this instead of my phone ringing all night last night, wondering what is going on in this place."

MR. FARRAN:

--on a point of order. Is it proper for members to constantly debate with the Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

The reason I had made the comment on the question is that it tends to be argumentative. However, the hon. minister is prepared to answer.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Member for Clover Bar may or may not know, regulations have to be passed by Order in Council. That is why it was not brought to the attention of the House, because it was brought to the attention of the press first.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary. Does the hon. minister think it was at least discourteous to the hon. members of the House?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! The hon. Member for Clover Bar followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat. Sorry, the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-11

Cable Television

MR. WYSE:

Thank you. I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the government going to amend The Municipal Government Act, or at least clarify existing legislation, thus enabling Edmonton to purchase their own cable television system?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is probably aware from reading the newspaper, that matter has been under consideration. There is more than just the City of Edmonton involved in this. We expect to be able to bring a provincial-wide answer down soon.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary. Would that be in this session?

MR. RUSSELL:

I wouldn't think that would be announced during this session, Mr. Speaker, unless this session runs several months.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Little Bow followed by the hon. Member for Vegreville.

Building Code -- Disabled

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Public Works. Yesterday we met with the Action Group for the Disabled. Out of a number of issues there is one that I was interested in. I would like to ask the hon. minister: has the provincial government stressed to municipalities that they should adopt supplement number five to the National Building Code of Canada?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent question, and one that has been giving us a good deal of concern, not only from this point of view but from the point of view of the construction industry as well. For some time it has been the policy in all tendering by the government to include supplement No. 5 for the disabled in our tenders. As the questioner is no doubt aware, municipalities do draw up their own building codes, and at present we are in the process of trying to provide a standard building code which will include supplement No. 5 for the whole province, and will follow the lines of the national building code, including supplement No. 5.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Farm Truck Licences

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Highways. Are farm trucks now required to have an off-highway vehicle licence?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is asking a question dealing with what is contained in some regulations and the question is out of order.

Advertising Contracts

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question, I believe it should be to the hon. the Premier, who, in the Public Affairs Bureau, is responsible for awarding advertising contracts in this province?

72-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

MR. LOUGHEED:

The director, Mr. David Wood.

MR. LUDWIG:

Is it true, Mr. Premier, that the bulk of government advertising is handled through a Mr. Art Smith of Calgary, or some agencies with which he is connected?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is an excellent question, and I'd appreciate it if the hon. member wants the answer, to put it on the Order Paper and we will provide him with the data. I'm quite able to assure him, though, that there is no advertising that has been let to Dunskey Advertising of Montreal.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary following that remark. Can the hon. the Premier assure us that Art Smith did not get any advertising from this government since it came into office?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, one of the things I would draw to the hon. members' attention is that the hon. Mr. Ludwig was up in the House asking about government advertising just the other day -- it was Friday -- and was asked to put it on the Order Paper because it appeared that a fair number of people were interested in government advertising. I'm wondering why, now, he is again not following what you suggested that he do. You've said, Mr. Speaker, "The hon. member's questions are infinitely pointing to a matter which should be on the Order Paper." I suggest that he follow your suggestion.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's supplementary could very well be put on to the question which he has already been invited -- order please! -- to put on the Order Paper.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, might I make comment on this. I didn't believe the rules to --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LUDWIG:

May I rise on a point of order? I do not believe that the rules state that once you ask a question on a certain issue, you may never ask another one because you didn't put it on the Order Paper. If this is so, then you will have an Order Paper about 25 pages long, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The question period does not provide for debate between the Chair and a member on a point of order which has already been decided.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary --

MR. LUDWIG:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Deputy Premier just got through debating with you, and what is sauce for the goose is sauce --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! The hon. Opposition House Leader has a point of order.

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-13

MR. TAYLOR:

I have a supplementary that I don't think can go on the Order Paper. I wonder if the hon. Premier could tell us why they couldn't find a Conservative in Montreal?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that's a very good question, why we couldn't find a Conservative in Montreal. I do suggest to the hon. member that he do some assessment about the interesting firm of Dunsky Advertising.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary to add to that question on the Order Paper from the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. My understanding is that the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill may, if he wishes, place his question on the Order Paper. If the hon. member then finds that the information is not adequate, perhaps he might ask a question during the subsequent question period or in the first instance, place his question on the Order Paper also. Otherwise we may be dealing with this topic two or three times.

MR. FARRAN:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The question is impossible to answer, because Mr. Art Smith is not in advertising ...

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. the Premier, in light of his statement regarding Dunsky Advertising. When the beer ads appear in Alberta, does that mean the ads are going to be accepted if they are sponsored by Dunsky on behalf of Canadian breweries?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we might make an exception; that depends.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place.

Gull Lake Water Level

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, my question and a couple of supplementaries to follow, are to the Minister of the Environment. My first question is; what is the status of the studies which the Department of the Environment have been carrying out during the last year on the water level of Gull Lake?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, we have examined in some detail, land ownership around the lake. We have also examined in some detail the accruals of land which became exposed as the lake receded. We have also examined the legal aspects of ownership of the accruals as the lake, in fact, receded. We have to, of course, in contemplating any level stabilization program, determine what monetary involvement would be required by the provincial government in regard to land accruals. Basically this has been the extent of our examination during the last few months, however, the department has also conducted some studies in regard to the compatibilities of waters that might be used to stabilize Gull Lake.

72-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is; that was all done when the minister became minister. Did you meet with a group of cottage owners during this last summer from the Gull Lake area?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, just for the information of the hon. member, that was not done before this government took over, as a matter of fact. It certainly wasn't and it has taken a great deal of work in order to rationalize this particular area. Mr. Speaker, I have received correspondence from several organizations and individuals in this regard and I don't think I have received more prodding than I have from the hon. member who represents the area, in regard to doing something in this area. I have indicated on several occasions that the government is very actively looking at establishing a cost-sharing policy in the area of lake stabilization, and the policy would be, to a large degree, based on the shore line ownership whether or not it is public or private. This policy, I hope to announce before too many months, or too many weeks in the future. That was our first requirement, and secondly, of course, whether or not the lake is stabilized, and when it is stabilized, is entirely a budgetary matter in the case of establishing priorities within government in this particular area.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, if I might have the indulgence of the House, I have been asked two questions which I indicated --

MR. CLARK:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. minister didn't answer the question, whether or not he had met with the cottage owners from the area around Gull Lake this summer, and before he gets involved in another trip, let's have the answer to that one.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the cottage owners didn't request a meeting with me and as a result I don't believe I have met with them, but I can assure the hon. member that if the cottage owners request a meeting and come in and discuss the matter with me I would just be too happy to meet with them.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, my last supplementary question. As a result of the prodding from the Member for Lacombe has the --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member is definitely asking the question in a manner which leads to debate. If that happens, then there is no way in which the Chair can interfere with a debating answer.

Lacombe Chamber of Commerce

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, has the minister met with the delegation from the Lacombe Chamber of Commerce in the last two months?

MR. YURKO:

No, Mr. Speaker, I have not.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton --

MR. YURKO:

As I started, I was asked two questions on two different occasions and I have said that I would take the matter under advisement and report later to the House. I wonder if I might be able to answer those two questions at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-15

City Packers Ltd., Lethbridge

MR. YURKO:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The one question I was asked by the Member for Lethbridge East, Mr. Anderson, as to whether or not the department had investigated the matter of the City Packers Plant in Lethbridge. The Division of Pollution Control conducted investigations on September 20th, and again on October 31, 1972. I would like to suggest that the plant is very old. It will require considerable changes to meet our minimum standards. It is operating without any approvals from the department at this time. The primary concern appears to be over odours emanating from the plant. In a letter dated November 3, 1972, the firm was advised that they are required to obtain an approval from our Standards and Approval Division. This will mean that they will have to make improvements in their operation in order to comply with our standards.

Salt on City Roads

The hon. Member for Stony Plain some days ago requested the release of figures in regard to the amount of salt used in the City of Edmonton on roads. I would like to advise the House that sodium chloride or common salt is used, and that in 1970-71, 6,310 tons were used. In 1971-72, 6,178 tons were used. I would also like to advise the House that the cities that do deposit snow on the rivers are required to have approvals for doing this and in fact, the approvals are quite strict and demand that the quantity that is sprayed in the city roadways is released or given to the department, the silt analysis of the sand, the quality of the sand, and other chemical de-icers used. The whole lot of information has to be filed with the department before such material is used. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place, and that may conclude the question period.

Noise Pollution

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of the Environment. I am wondering if the minister can report progress on the study of noise pollution, particularly as it relates to traffic in the City of Edmonton? I believe that study was under way this summer.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, that is a pretty major study. It is intended to establish a base line of noise survey both in the City of Calgary and the City of Edmonton. It is being done both over the summer season as well as the winter season. It is continuing at this time, and I might say that we used our consultants to conduct a side study in regard to the noise levels associated with the operation of the CN system in the Calder area in the City of Edmonton.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, a brief supplemental question. Could the minister indicate when the study is anticipated to be completed?

MR. YURKO:

I don't have the exact dates that the study may be completed, but I would suggest that it will be completed in the next several months. I hope that we will be able to make a report on this matter to the House during the spring sitting.

72-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Driver's Licences

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to announce that some time coming April, we will have a photo-on-licence program. The intention of the program is to improve the quality and the appearance of the Alberta operator's licence and to provide a licensee with a better means of identifying himself. This is to be achieved by inserting a color photo of the licensee into the plastic licence which will then be completely and permanently sealed. The licence will be attractive in appearance, long-wearing, absolutely tamper-proof, and next to impossible to counterfeit. Photo-type licences have long been tested and approved by the R.C.M.P. crime laboratory. Established accuracy, controls and auditing procedures will be preserved through central licensing of licences on the government computer. The person applying for a licence will complete an application form, pay the required fee, and subsequently a computer print licence will be mailed to him. Upon receipt of this item he will proceed to the treasury branch office or other designated locations, where an instant photo will be taken, inserted into the licence which will then be sealed and handed to him. This operation will only take a few minutes. All equipment, licence blanks, and supplies will be provided by private industry under a five-year contract. The government's purchasing agency will be calling for tenders in the very near future.

Draft Hansard Error

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with three matters, two of which relate to House business and the first of which is a point of privilege. The point of privilege relates to a mistake in yesterday's Hansard which, if uncorrected, might lead to a series of somewhat bizarre results. The mistake results to the introduction of two bills yesterday afternoon. I don't have the Hansard itself because it wasn't printed. Members will recall firstly the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona introduced The Credit and Loans Agreement Amendment Act; then the hon. Member for Drumheller introduced The Act to Amend the Pharmaceutical Association Act; thirdly, the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour moved that the first bill, that is The Credit and Loans Agreement Amendment Act, be put on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders. The rough sheets of yesterday's Hansard state, in error, that the hon. Member, Dr. Hohl put the hon. Member for Drumheller's bill under Government Bills and Orders. I'm not sure which of the two gentlemen would be more upset, Mr. Speaker, but I wanted to make it clear that the motion made by Dr. Hohl related to Bill No. 126 on the Votes and Proceedings of November 7th, and placed The Credit and Loan Agreements Amendment Act, 1972 (No.2) under Government Bills and Orders on the Order Paper.

[This error was in fact detected by the editors, and is not in the printed version, a copy of which was not available to Mr. Hyndman at the time this statement was made.]

Remembrance Day Holiday

The second matter I would like to deal with, Mr. Speaker, relates to an announcement made to the House about a week ago regarding the fact that this assembly would not be sitting next Monday the 13th and there is Motion No. 2 on the Order Paper dealing with that. When that statement was made I said that this was a statutory holiday. I was wrong, it is not a statutory holiday and a number of parents and school boards have now been concerned because they were under the impression that my statement was made, as Minister of Education, that I was distributing largess across the province in the form of a school holiday. As members realize, the Minister of Education has no power to declare a school holiday; that is strictly a matter within the purview of the school boards. The fact that the House is not sitting this coming Monday is strictly a matter of House business. The civil service will not be working that day by reason of the collective bargaining agreements between itself and the government, and I wanted to make it clear to parents and school boards that it is strictly within their power to decide whether or not there is a school holiday.

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-17

House Business

Thirily, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View may be interested in tonight's business. If hon. members will turn to page 9 on their Order Paper, the tentative order of business for this evening would begin with second reading of Bill No. 116, The Alberta Hospitals Amendment Act, 1972 (No. 2); then proceeding to second reading of Bill No. 127, The Credit and Loans Agreement Amendment Act; then proceeding to third reading of Bill No. 77, The Legal Profession Amendment Act, 1972 (No. 2) and at that time the hon. Attorney General will propose a motion to move that bill back into Committee of the Whole for a small amendment which he recommends. We would then proceed to committee study of Bill No. 121, The Improvement Districts Amendment Act 1972; followed by committee study of Bill No. 123, The Alberta Lords Day Amendment Act; followed by Committee study of Bill No. 116, The Alberta Hospitals Amendment Act 1972 (No. 2) and Bill No. 127, The Credit and Loans Agreement Amendment Act. Then we would move to page 8, Government Motion No. 2, regarding the non-sitting of the House this coming Monday; then to Government Motion No. 4; then to Government Motion No. 5; and then on to Government Motion No. 3 which is the debate on the Commission of Educational Planning on which Mr. Benoit adjourned debate.

MR. LUDWIG:

Just for clarification, is it the government's intention to leave Bill No. 113 on second reading and not proceed with it?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, no decision has been made as to where that bill will proceed or its pace through the House, if at all.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, still on Orders of the Day, I would like to express my concern in regard to the announcement of a new policy by the hon. the Premier yesterday in the legislature, regarding the Workmen's Compensation policy. While this policy was still under review by the committee, I am confident that there are important reasons for this, but I feel that as a member of the committee an explanation should be made.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I thought I was clear yesterday -- I may have my notes here -- that the statements I was making with regard to the Workmen's Compensation Board were statements that were beyond the orbit and beyond the ambit of what I saw by way of the legislative committee -- I do have my notes here -- I thought I said I am aware that both Dr. Hohol and the members of the committee are in the process of evaluating some needed reforms in the workmen's compensation system in Alberta. And I would certainly hope that nothing that was said, in terms of my remarks, would in any way deter or inhibit members of the legislative committee. I would think that there is a considerable scope, without prejudging the committee's recommendations, because I have no idea about them, but there is considerable scope for reform and improvement and we will welcome those views.

72-13

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

Since the House will be dealing shortly with some questions on the Order Paper and some Motions for a Return, this might be an appropriate time for the Chair to deal with a point of order which was debated at some length in the House and Tuesday, and was referred to the Chair for a ruling. Since the Chair is not about to make a speech, the rule concerning reading does not apply. This is concerning Motion 222 on the Order Paper for Tuesday, November 7, 1972.

1. The Point of Order proposed to the Chair on Tuesday (the day before yesterday) is whether Motion 225 is in conformity to the rules of the House.
2. The Motion, moved by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow and seconded by the hon. Member for Bow Valley reads:- "That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing: What Policy changes have been implemented, as a result of the current transportation study, on the overall review of the transportation needs of the Province of Alberta?"
3. The Chair's attention has been drawn to the second paragraph of Beauchesne's Citation 209 (3) which contains the following:- "The general rule is that information to be obtained from or through any department constituted or regulated by statute, is obtained by means of an order ..."
4. However, the policy information requested in the Motion which we are now considering, does not exist in any department of government unless it happens to be in privileged or confidential documents. For that reason, the reference to Beauchesne does not solve the problem.
5. What I am about to say should not (for the time being) be taken as a precedent, because some hon. members may wish to express further views on the matter, either privately or on some future occasion in the House.
6. The paramount principle must always be, in matters of this kind, to avoid being merely technical and to ensure the practical and effective continuation of the work of the House and of each of its members.
7. The Oral Question Period is, as is well known, intended for short questions which are suitable for short answers on topics of some immediate concern. Their purpose is information and not argument.
8. If a question is arguable and if it is intended to be argued, then it must go onto the Order Paper as a Notice of a Motion for an Order for a Return.
9. However, questions of a general policy nature are not suitable, either for the Oral Question Period, or for Notices of Motions for Orders for Returns.
10. Instead, they should be asked as Written Questions by being placed on the Order Paper.
11. The appropriate minister then has several options:
 - 1) She or he may decline to make a policy statement or to reply to the question whatever it may be.
 - 2) He or she may answer the question. Then the answer must be given to the Clerk and be printed in the Votes and Proceedings. This is as provided in our Rule 35(2).
 - 3) Under our Rule 35(3) if the Speaker thinks that the question requires a lengthy reply, the Speaker must express that opinion to the House. The government may then, through the appropriate minister, request the Speaker to direct that the question stand as a Notice of Motion. This does not imply either acceptance or rejection of the question by the government or the minister. It simply means that when the Motion comes up the matter may be debated. Under our Rules it would have to be seconded.
 - 4) A further option of the minister under our Rule 35(4) is to say that he has no objection to tabling the required Return. By so stating the minister automatically converts the question into an Order for a Return.
12. If the questioner starts off with a Notice of Motion for a Return (and the Motion is carried), this will deprive the minister of his option or discretion to decline to answer the question, or to decline to make the requested policy statement on that particular topic at that particular time.

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-19

13. Our Rule 35 and Beauchesne both indicate this: it is for the government or the appropriate minister to decide whether a question will be answered or whether it will become a Notice of Motion for an Order for a Return, or, on the other hand, whether it is to become directly, without a Motion, an Order for a Return. This particularly deals with questions of policy.
14. I would therefore rule that the Motion is not in order. For the reason already mentioned, this is not intended for the time being, to be a precedent. I would respectfully suggest that the hon. Member for Calgary Bow might wish to deal with the matter by means of placing a Question on the Order Paper (notwithstanding that the appropriate minister might in his discretion convert it into a Motion for an Order for a Return) or convert it directly into an Order for a Return under our Rule 35(4).

QUESTIONS

227. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following questions, which were answered as indicated:

- (1) What is the total number of convictions for the illegal use of purple colored fuel in Alberta during the first 9 months of 1972?
- (2) How many of those convicted were:
- (a) farmers?
 - (b) truckers?
 - (c) company and business men?
 - (d) laborers?

Answer

Illegal Use of Purple Product
Period - January 1, 1972 to September 30, 1972

Total Number of Convictions 530

Consisting of:

(a) Farmers	152
(b) Truckers	49
(c) Labourers	51
(d) Housewives	12
(e) Contractors	15
(f) Welders	11
(g) Students	9
(h) Miscellaneous	37
(i) No Occupations Listed	194
	<u>530</u>

Trade Mission to Japan

220. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following question:

- (1) What are the names and positions of the persons who went to Japan with the Alberta delegation whose expenses were paid in whole or in part, by the provincial government?
- (2) How were the members of the group, whose expenses were paid in whole or in part, chosen?
- (3) What is the total cost to the Treasury of Alberta of the trip to Japan?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not ready with all the pertinent details and information regarding this question. I would ask for it to stand over for a day, or failing that, it might be made a Motion for a Return.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it the wish of the House that the matter stand over for a day?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

72-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

Select Committee on the Communal Use of Land

230. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following question:

With reference to the Select Committee investigating the communal use of land:

- (a) what is the total cost of same to the taxpayers of Alberta
- (b) what was the total cost of the trip to Montana?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I agree to that question. I would ask for a day or two in providing the answer.

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-21

Government Vehicles Insurance

232. Mr. Notley asked the government the following questions which were answered as indicated:

- (1) What tendering practices are followed in awarding insurance contracts on government vehicles?

Answer

(a) Shortly after assuming office in September 1971, the Government became aware that the insurance on Government vehicles was expiring and that the renewal of the insurance policy was imminent.

(b) In determining how the matter had been handled in the past and how it should be dealt with in the future, the Provincial Treasurer was advised by his Department that tendering for such insurance had not been successful in the past and since 1962 had not been tendered. While, as a matter of principle, this Government believes that tendering of all contracts provides the best measure of economy there are exceptions, of which general insurance is an example. This is a highly technical field with a very narrow breadth of market and calls for a professional level of knowledge which is maintained by relatively few organizations in the province. There had been a previous experience in the past of requesting tenders for such insurance as indicated by Order in Council 1699/62 on November 6, 1962, a copy of which is attached. This Order in Council indicates that the low tenderer for auto insurance be rejected and that a single firm be appointed as agent, being Farrell Agencies of Edmonton. From 1962 to August 1971 there is no record of any tendering, either by insurance companies or insurance agencies on the insurance fleet to the Government and one agency had handled the entire account exclusively during that period. It should be noted that insurance can not be placed directly with a company without paying standard agency commissions.

(c) The Government then decided that as an interim measure five experienced firms would be called together to act on a concerted basis with the insuring companies to obtain the best possible arrangements for insurance on the Government vehicle fleet. It was then concluded that the former insurance company - Guardian Insurance Company - was prepared to offer, for the next year, the most favourable contract. The following five firms were involved - Roy Henry Insurance Agency Ltd., Reed Shaw Osler Ltd., Stewart Campbell Insurance Ltd., Sewall-Huber Agencies Ltd., and Thibaudeau Agencies Ltd. Because it is necessary that an "agent of record" be named on the policy - Roy Henry Insurance Agency Ltd. was named agent of record.

(d) This current approach is the subject of review by a new insurance consultant - Mr. Don Morley - appointed in September 1972 by the Deputy Provincial Treasurer (see attached memorandum of October 27, 1972) to reassess the total insurance approach of the Government including the possibility of self-insuring the Government vehicle fleet. In addition, on October 27, 1972 the Deputy Provincial Treasurer appointed a supervising broker for the Government - Reed Shaw Osler Ltd. (see attached letter of October 27, 1972 and Order in Council 1709/72) to review the placing of all insurance aspects of the Government's operations.

- (2) How many provincial government vehicles are insured?

Answer

Between the 9th of November 1971 and the 9th of November 1972 - 3,589 units.

- (3) What is the total expenditure on insurance for government vehicles?

Answer

Between the 9th of November 1971 and the 9th of November 1972 - \$189,562.

- (4) Which firm or firms have government vehicle insurance contracts, and what is the value of each contract?

Answer

The Guardian Insurance Company - \$189,562, subject to additions and deletions to the contract during the course of the year.

72-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

[Attachments not copied]

Agt.Staff.--Wetaskiwin

233. Mr. Henderson asked the government the following question:

To the Minister of Telephones:

How does the minister justify centralization of A.G.T. services which has or will result in reduction of A.G.T. staff in the City of Wetaskiwin in light of the government's stated policy of decentralization of public services?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It would seem to me that this is an improper question and I would ask that your honour rule on the manner of the question, not the material in the question. In my view, to put a question such as this on the Order Paper in that manner is out of order.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The reason it is on the Order Paper in that manner is that I asked the question verbally and was instructed by the Chair to put it on the Order Paper. So I have just restated the question. If the hon. Deputy Premier doesn't care for it, well, I'll leave it to the discretion of the Chair whether it is appropriate or not.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should, with his experience in this House, appreciate that it isn't a question of providing the information. It is the manner in which the hon. member is writing the question. I sincerely suggest to him --

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order! I'm quite --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! May the hon. House Leader please finish speaking on the point of order.

DR. HORNER:

I would suggest to the hon. member, through you, Mr. Speaker, that he sit down and do a little bit of thinking about how questions should be put on the Order Paper in a written form.

MR. HENDERSON:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The last thing I really need is a lecture from the hon. Deputy Premier on how to ask a question. As I said, when I rose in the first place, the reason it is in that form is that I asked it as a verbal question; I was instructed by the Chair to put it on the Order Paper; I have written it out and I leave the matter to the discretion of the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair would respectfully suggest to the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc that the question might be rephrased since its opening phrases, as they now stand, are an open invitation to debate. A challenge to anyone to justify something must be the clearest possible invitation to a debate.

MR. HENDERSON:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. minister, if he chooses to answer it, can write it out in the form he wants. I can't follow the logic that it is open to debate. If it was an oral question, yes; but as a written question? Either it says something or it doesn't say anything. I don't know how that question of debate gets into it.

MR. KING:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-23

MR. SPEAKER:

If it is the same point of order, then. The Chair is unable to deal with that point of order further since it has been disposed of.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, I was rising, not on a point of order, but on a point of privilege. I will be frank. I am uncertain how to proceed, but I think that the privilege of the House and its members is being imposed upon by some hon. members who rise, claiming that they have a point of order, and proceed to speak, not on a point of order at all, but in order to encourage or enjoin debate. I would appreciate, Mr. Speaker, some direction from you in this regard. It seems to me that a number of hon. members have risen in this manner.

MR. SPEAKER:

The only way in which the Chair can deal with such situations is as and when they arise.

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what I am rising on. I'm rising on my two good feet, Mr. Speaker, just to show the hon. Member for Ladue that I will be able to provide him with the information Tuesday next.

Livestock Grazing Permits

234. Mr. Henderson asked the government the following question:

To the Minister of Lands and Forests:

1. How many livestock grazing permits have been issued during the period October 31, 1971 to October 31, 1972 in the general area bordered by the Panther River, the Red Deer River, and the National Park Boundary?

2. How many head of livestock are covered by the permits issued?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, in my usual non-contentious way, I would like non-contentiously to file a non-contentious answer to that non-contentious question.

Answer

1. Grazing permits are issued in this area for winter grazing of horses within the period November 1 to May 31.

Number of permits - November 31, 1971 to May 31, 1972 - 3.

2. 110 horses.

Loans for the Purchase of Land

235. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following questions:

With reference to the Agricultural Development Act,

(a) How many applications for loans for the purchase of land were received between April 1st and October 31st, 1972?

(b) How many of these were accepted and processed?

(c) What is the total amount of money involved in these applications?

DR. HORNER:

I accept the question, Mr. Speaker, but we will require an extra day to file a return.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

Therapeutic Abortions

231. Mr. Dixon proposed the following motion to this Assembly, seconded by Mr. Cooper.

72-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

1. The number of therapeutic abortions carried out in each Alberta hospital from September 1, 1971 to September 1, 1972.
2. The number of complaints the Minister or his department have received from Alberta hospital authorities and medical practitioners as outlined on the second page of The University of Alberta Hospital Report which outlines major problems that have arisen because of the large increase of therapeutic abortions in Alberta hospitals.
3. The amount of money paid out to Alberta medical practitioners by Alberta Health Care covering therapeutic abortions from September 1, 1971 to September 1, 1972.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to ask that this question stand until the next day that it would normally come up, next Tuesday, on the basis that although I believe now that parts one and three can be quite readily answered, it appears that number two may cause some difficulty and I may have to ask the hon. member to change it slightly. It is based on the way that subject matter of correspondence from the sources he asked about might be indexed. We may have all sorts of this type of correspondence from these sources, but no indication of whether it is related to the subject or not. Although we are willing to undertake very extensive examination of files in order to answer the hon. member's question, I just want to see the extent that is going to be before dealing with it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the House prepared to accede to the request of the hon. minister that this matter stand over until next Tuesday?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Advertising Expenses

236. Mr. Taylor proposed the following motion to the assembly, seconded by Mr. Dixon:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

1. What is the total cost of
 - (a) Advertisements under the caption: "Notice from the Legislative Assembly for Alberta Re:Crude Oil Revenue Return to the Province"; and
 - (b) Advertisements under the caption: "Notice from the Members of the Legislative Assembly Province of Alberta" re: crude oil revenue return to the province
 - (1) in the daily papers of the province?
 - (2) in the weekly papers of the province?
2. In how many of the dailies and weeklies were both of these advertisements, which essentially contain the same information, placed?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could rise here and request that you take this motion under consideration with a view to giving us a ruling. The concern I have here is not with getting the information, but concern with the question of principle. What I would like you to consider is the form of the notice of motion, inasmuch as what it requires is details of expenditures by a committee. It was a committee of the legislature on public affairs, agriculture, and education. That is a Committee of the Whole Legislature and not any information that would be in the purview of the government. The minister wouldn't be giving that information. That is a little different when you are asking for details of the expenditure by that committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the question would be quite proper to ask the minister the amount of money that was expended by that committee, but I think the details of that motion would probably be put to the chairman of that committee. That's what I'd like your ruling on.

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-25

In my cursory examinations of the rules at the present time, certainly a minister does answer questions in the area for which he is responsible. In this case wouldn't be responsible for the actions of a Committee of the Whole when they make a decision on the details of advertising. That's the ruling I request that you would give consideration to.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I think the point is well taken, and I could withdraw it now and put it on the Order Paper on two separate returns.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. Opposition House Leader the consent of the seconder to withdraw the motion?

MR. DIXON:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House concur with the withdrawal of the motion?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Grain Shipments

1. Moved by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Buckwell:

Be it resolved that, this assembly express grave concern over the possible loss of grain markets at the Port of Vancouver for a number of reasons including an insufficient number of box cars and locomotives, and urges the Alberta Government, in co-operation with the four western legislatures, the railways, the grain companies, Unifarm and other farmer organizations, to commence an immediate investigation designed to pin point the causes and effect results that will enable Canada to meet and expand its present overseas commitments.

Debate adjourned by hon. Dr. Horner.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, prior to our summer adjournment, there had been some discussion of this motion in relation to the situation as it stood then in the ports in western Canada. One of the benefits of a fall session may well be that the things that happened during the intervening period can have some direct result on the resolution that happens to be on the Order Paper. Certainly that is the case in relation to the situation with regard to grain and its marketing in western Canada.

I would like to run over, Mr. Speaker, the situation as we see it now, as it has been in the past, and where do we go in the future in relation to the entire matter of grain marketing and its impact on the province of Alberta?

And while we are going to be talking primarily about grain, grain of course or the equivalent of grain can be expressed in practically every endeavor in agriculture and so becomes the indicator, or the indices, with which we can judge whether or not certain policies are being effective, whether or not the policies are to the general good of the people of Alberta and to the province of Alberta. The whole question then of grain becomes very important. It probably should be broken down -- because of what happens to grain and because of those equivalents that I am talking about in agriculture -- into a couple of areas. Certainly I think it is in Canada long past the time to keep talking about a wheat economy; we should be talking about a grains economy of which a part of that is the wheat economy. The other part is the feed grains situation.

The present situation in regard to wheat generally in Western Canada is that we have made some major commitments and major sales, hopefully at increased prices. To give you some indication of what can happen in the intervening period of time since we last debated this resolution in regard to price, the hon. members may be interested to know that from the middle of August to the

72-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

middle of September the world export price of wheat rose by approximately 20 cents a bushel. This was a reflection, Mr. Speaker, of substantial sales made by the United States government to the U.S.S.R.

This also has had some effect on the resolution itself in relation to the situation at our ports, and in transportation, because the question of how many boxcars we have to carry our grain is sometimes dependent upon how many boxcars we can borrow from the American railways. What has happened at the moment is that because of the extensive sales that have been made in the United States to the U.S.S.R., the American railroads have called in a substantial number of the boxcars that were on loan or were in our systems and so, apparently, we have become short of boxcars again.

This is partially offset again by another development since we debated this resolution last, and that has to do with the federal minister in charge of the Wheat Board and the authorization to have constructed in Canada some 2,500 hopper cars. I understand that some of these cars have now come into service and we are hopeful that they all will come in. The present situation in the port of Vancouver is that, while we have 21 million bushels of storage space there, there are something like 6 million bushels only in storage and somewhat less than 6 million in transit to Vancouver.

We are again involved in the same kind of situation in which, because of our transportation policies and because of our marketing setup, we are going to be losing additional customers because of our failure to be able to deliver to those customers at the time they would like the grain.

This reflects, Mr. Speaker, on general policies that I believe have been in effect in Canada in the last few years; the restrictionist policies of the lift operation, the policies of the present government in Ottawa in not making major use of the government elevators in Alberta and in the rest of Western Canada.

This is, in my view, a serious shortcoming. The policy of the federal government and certain people within that government in the bureaucratic level to continue to talk about a carry-over of 700 million bushels as something abnormal or something that you don't want is just pure nonsense. We have to have, as a wholesaler of wheat and grains, a carry-over in this country of 700 million bushels a year, minimum. We don't have that now, Mr. Speaker. We are in the strange position, as a matter of fact, that if harvest conditions had been as bad as they looked they were going to be in September, we would have had to import feed grain into Alberta to keep our livestock industry going. I think that is a pretty serious situation.

I think we have to redirect our policies as a province and hope to have some effect on the federal policies in relation to the grain situation so that we can reach our objective of maximum production and maximum returns to our producers.

I hope that nobody will come along with another program of restriction, but rather that we will be starting to talk about not supply management, but market management, and the development of markets to meet the maximum production that we can achieve in Alberta and in western Canada. There are those, of course, in eastern Canada, and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture is one of them, that continue to espouse the supply management concept as sort of the panacea for everything in agriculture, including the grain situation. It just won't work, Mr. Speaker. We have been trying it for fifty years in Western Canada and it hasn't worked. We have been accused, I have been accused, by some of them in Eastern Canada, of inventing marketing out here. Not at all, Mr. Speaker, but I do think that the approach to marketing is the key to continuing an increased prosperity in agriculture in Canada. I don't particularly care which province you are talking about, they all have to be in that category.

We come back to the present situation in wheat. Alberta is fortunate. The estimates are that we will probably produce approximately 20 million bushels more this year than last. The sales prospects are good, the price has increased, and generally, if we can move that wheat, we can sell it. With the other producing countries around the world, Australia, Argentina, France, perhaps Russia on occasion, and of course, the United States, we have to be very concerned about our ability to service our customers, to get our product to the consumer. So, as the resolution states, we have to be concerned about the transportation system in all of its facets about the question -- and I want to come back to that a little later on -- of the Grains Group report on rationalization of elevators and rail lines and where they are in that situation.

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-27

We have to be concerned not only about the rail line rationalization but also the provision of more adequate box cars. These new hopper cars, as I understand it, are very easily loaded, very easily unloaded, and will carry about three times what the ordinary boxcar will carry, so they are going to be a real help to our grain moving ability. Surely, we have to have a look -- if we are going to use these kind of sophisticated box cars.

This has to be tied in with a program of the processing of our grain in Alberta. And I am not talking about cleaning, and having clean grade moved in these hopper cars to ships in Vancouver, the improvements in the ports that we require in the Vancouver area.

I would like to suggest as part of my recommendations, which I hope to summarize a little later, that one of the things we really have to be concerned about, is this whole question of what we do with our grain once we have grown it and want to market it.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I think we, as a government, have to continue to keep pressure on the federal government in relation to the National Harbours Board and their activities in the port of Vancouver, and also of course, their activities in other ports, more particularly Prince Rupert and Churchill. We depend upon these three ports particularly in Alberta (there is some that goes out through Thunder Bay), but primarily we are talking about the movement of our grain through Vancouver, Prince Rupert and Churchill. We have to have an upgrading of the port facilities in all three areas. The most pressing one, of course, is the port of Vancouver and its ability to handle railway traffic coming in to unload the number of bushels that are required to meet our commitments.

The second most pressing, and almost on an equal basis is the situation at Prince Rupert, the continual promises by the federal government that they are going to do something there, and the continual absence of any activity in fulfilling that promise, are some of things I am sure help to explain the kind of expression that western Canada gave the federal government on October 30th. We have, in this area and in western Canada, continued to get these kinds of promises with very, very little action in relation to fulfilling them and to making the whole agricultural industry more viable.

We intend as a government, as we already have, to continue to press the federal Department of Transport in relation to the port of Vancouver; in relation to the provision of bulk unloading facilities at Roberts Bank, and specifically to prod them, hopefully, into some action in developing the port of Prince Rupert so that we can have a substantial storage capacity in Prince Rupert, and substantial unloadability. Certainly when we are talking about our markets in the orient Prince Rupert is substantially closer, by a day's sail, than the port of Vancouver. We are vitally concerned with the situation in Prince Rupert.

Just briefly, we are concerned about the port of Churchill, we do believe that it does provide, particularly in northeastern Alberta, an additional outlet to sea that we don't have otherwise. We continue to be concerned about the activity in the port of Churchill as well.

Then I would like to come back, Mr. Speaker, and just review briefly the situation with regard to the general mechanism, the activities that the Grains Group has had underway for the last three or four years, its implications for Alberta and the recommendations that we would like to see happen in relation to that; and then, to talk for a moment of the activity of the Wheat Board -- whether or not it isn't time to suggest some changes in how they operate and in what they do.

As most hon. members are aware the Grains Group under the hon. Otto Lang has been studying the grain marketing transportation system in western Canada for the past three or four years. They have produced a number of reports, approximately two feet in height, in which they talk about various alternatives, various cost benefit analyses in relation to the movement of grain in Western Canada. They list therein the areas that they think might be eligible for rail line abandonment and elevator consolidation.

I can assure the House that we will not allow, as far as we can, any rail line abandonment until we have much more evidence that this kind of thing is really going to improve our marketing ability and our ability to move our product to market, than we have had placed before us before. I suggested before and I suggest again that if the federal government should act unilaterally and suggest that they are going to recommend rail line abandonments to some of the places that they talk about, the federal government then had better have on hand

72-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

pretty substantial sums of money available not only to Alberta but also to other western provinces to fill the void and the additional costs that will be put on the province if these rail lines are abandoned and elevator consolidation goes ahead.

In my view, the estimate of \$100 million that will be required in relation to highway construction alone is a very modest one and may not be enough to meet the construction costs that are involved. In addition to that, I think the federal government must be willing to put another \$100 million, at least, as a relocation fund so that people who might be affected in these communities can either be relocated, or otherwise compensated, for unilateral action by the federal government. Of course these people have no control over that.

The situation at the moment, Mr. Speaker, is that the Grains Group has now passed this kettle of fish on to another group called the Grains Council in Winnipeg under Dr. Dever and as sort of an implementing agency I suggested to Dr. Dever and his Grains Council that they look into the matter of how this might be implemented. I might say that we were pleased that Dr. Dever was very co-operative and came to see us about the situation and asked for our co-operation of our Grain Commission. Also, after discussions with him, he agreed to the appointment of a producer producer from Alberta to the Grains Council to have an input from the producer's point of view. Mr. Ken Appleby from Alliance, Alberta, has been appointed as the Alberta producer in relation to the studies that are going on under the Grains Council at this time. In addition to that the chairman of the Alberta Grain Commission has been active and his ex-officio member of the Grains Council study into how any implementation of this rationalization might take place.

At the same time I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government has already attempted to put up for sale the elevator which is known as National Harbour Board Elevator No. 2 in Vancouver port. We have asked him to delay the sale of this elevator and as a matter of fact, have asked him to sell it to the Province of Alberta for the nominal sum of \$1. If we were to acquire that elevator, it would be used as a strictly clean grain terminal and would alleviate any question of extensive pollution control equipment which was being asked for by the City of Vancouver. In addition to that, the federal government has also put up the government elevator in Lethbridge for sale. We've asked them to delay the sale of this elevator so that Alberta interests might give some consideration to its purchase as well.

I think it is a mistake on the part of the federal government to sell these inland terminals that they have, but rather that they should have a very close look at operating them in a much more efficient and useful manner than they ever have in the past. We are quite willing, as a province, to sit down with the federal government in regard to these inland terminals, and would be quite willing to discuss with them the question of leasing these elevators from them so that they could be used as additional storage for Alberta grain. We would also like to point out that the more processing of our grain that is done in Alberta, the more jobs are created in Alberta, and this is another objective of our government.

In that regard I would like to speak for a moment in relation to the question of the Canadian Wheat Board's activities, past and present, and where it should go in the future, because it has a very important connection with the entire ability of our people to market their grain, and it has a very important relationship as to how much our farmers receive in the end result from their production.

Everyone is aware, I am sure, that the Wheat Board was established after a rather off-again-on-again start in the early 30's and then more particularly again after the war, and then it gradually acquired an increasing amount of power to look after the export movement of grain. In 1946 the Alberta legislature passed The Alberta Coarse Grains Act which was the implementing legislation that allowed the Wheat Board to take over the jurisdiction of the inter-provincial movement of coarse grains. An additional legislative amendment earlier had given them that requirement for wheat. As the Board continued to operate, it became, as certain bureaucratic agencies sometimes do; they sometimes lose their objective they started out with, and end up somewhere else. The Canadian Wheat Board, I'd like to suggest, over the years, developed into more of a controlling operation than one that was really looking for markets and servicing the marketing areas of the world. That may not be quite a fair assessment in the past two or three years when they did change their policy and move into foreign markets in a pretty substantial way. However, it doesn't really alleviate the Wheat Board from the accusation that some of their restrictions have shipped jobs outside of Western Canada rather than try to keep them here in Western Canada and more particularly Alberta.

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-29

I want to talk first of all about the question as to what the Wheat Board's position should be in relation to feed grains. In my view, after looking at this for a year, I'm absolutely convinced that the sooner we knock down barriers within Canada for the movement of feed grain, the better off we'll be as a country, and the better off our farmers will be in both the production of grain and livestock in Alberta.

There is really no excuse, Mr. Speaker, in this day and age, for the bureaucratic maze that a Canadian has to go through to buy a bushel of feed grain from the Canadian Wheat Board. I really suggest very sincerely that I would hope the government in Ottawa of whatever stripe, will have a serious look at removing from the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board the question of feed grains within Canada. The Wheat Board then would remain as the sole marketing agency for export grain, and that is what its job should be. With the kind of competition we are getting from the United States, Argentine, Australia and from France, that is a pretty big job, and they should be using all of their resources to look after that export commitment that we require very much indeed.

But in regard to the question of feed grains, there have been a number of different proposals put forward in the last year in relation to how this should be handled. There have been proposals from Ontario and Quebec; there have been proposals called FAIR, which is the one put forward by the federation of Agriculture. In my view, adding additional proposals with additional regulations and additional red tape is not going to help unity in Canada. It is not going to help the feed grains industry, either on the livestock end or on the grain producing end. We simply say in Alberta that we can compete in a friendly and fair manner with any producer in Canada in relation to feed grains, and that our borders should be open in that regard. We do say as a province, that we have set up a Provincial Grain Commission to make sure there is a floor of some kind to prevent fire sales of feed grains.

And, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, the fire selling of feed grain was a thing that set off all of the activity of looking for an answer to the feed grain question in Canada because our compatriots in Quebec and Ontario heard about sales of barley in Western Canada at three bushels for \$1, and they immediately said, well, why can't we buy that -- why do we have to pay the Wheat Board \$1.5, when those farmers out there are able to feed their hogs barley at 3 bushels for \$1? Not very much of that happened. But we only had to have one case of it happen to get some publicity, and the farmers in Quebec and Ontario and the Maritimes were pretty uptight and felt they were being discriminated against. Fortunately that situation has disappeared now, and the Manitoba Grains Commission is taking a different approach than we are in Alberta, in that they are legislating a compulsory price for grain to feed lots, which I don't agree with, but it is one way of maintaining a base price.

We have, in Alberta, set up a feed grains exchange which has worked well. For a nominal investment by the province, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that for the first time in a number of years, the price for feed grains is within a matter of two or three cents among the various locations in Alberta. Our feed grain exchange is working well, and I think that we have given them the commitment that if there was additional required to maintain those prices at a fair price to the grain producer, we would take the necessary steps to do that.

So I think that the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta can maintain, look after, and regulate the feed grain situation within their province, and we in Alberta would like to see those boundaries removed so that we could have a return to real unity as a country, and we're not afraid to be able to produce and compete in any way with either the livestock end of the business or the feed grains end of the business.

That means then, Mr. Speaker, that the Wheat Board should get out of the feed grain situation within Canada and allow an open market with a floor price to producers. Immediately we would save the producers of livestock and meats a substantial amount of money in relation to the production of food in Canada. While I don't subscribe that the recent increase in the price of food is related to what the farmer has received, it is related to the amount of intermediate steps that take place before that product becomes food and before it is set on the table. One of the increases is the government bureaucracy or costs which have been caused by the way the Canadian Wheat Board operates at this time.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is a pretty dramatic change from the present, but we in Western Canada, and the other provinces I'm sure, can do a job of regulating the feed grains industry within Canada. We can do a job in Alberta of making sure there will be a fairness of opportunity to deliver. We can accept the challenge in Alberta that all of our farmers will be treated on an equal basis without any problem whatsoever.

72-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

We move from that, Mr. Speaker, because it leads me into the next particular problem which relates to the question of processing grain in plants within Alberta and the red tape, the bureaucracy, and the costs that are involved in the present regulations of the Canadian Wheat Board when they force our processors within Alberta into uneconomic situations, where they are not competitive with other countries in the world in processed grain products.

I want to remind you, first of all, that rapeseed is a grain, as defined in The Canada Grain Act. We are concerned in Alberta, where we have a major livestock secondary industry, that we have to import to Alberta soya bean meal from the United States as a protein meal where our rapeseed crushers are being interfered with by the Canadian Wheat Board on the grounds of equality of opportunity to deliver, which are not valid, on the grounds that they can designate any kind of structure in Alberta as an elevator and thus become, under The Canada Grain Act, the omnipotent god that can interfere in all cases.

In my view, unless we can change the attitude of the Canadian Wheat Board in relation to the processing industry within Alberta, we will continue to be, in Western Canada, nothing more than the producers of raw products; never being able to get into the secondary industry of processing those products because of restrictions we place on ourselves through the Canadian Wheat Board.

There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that there is a rapidly expanding market for raw and refined rapeseed oil throughout the world, that we can't get into and provide those jobs in rural Alberta because of restrictions by the Canadian Wheat Board and because of other factors that are related to freight rates, which I'll (if I have enough time) discuss in a moment.

That, in essence, is the situation in relation to rapeseed at the moment; that we have interfered with the legal questions in relation to the prosecutions that are going on in Southern Alberta on the grounds that we don't believe that this is under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board. We tried very hard to negotiate the dropping of those charges and to negotiate with the Province of Alberta through our Grain Commission an equitable settlement in relation to who should look after the deliveries of grain to processing plants within Alberta. This not only applies to rapeseed, but it applies to malt houses; it applies to rolled oats; it applies to puffed wheat, the processed product. At the present time, our malt house in Alberta has to pay to the Canadian Wheat Board \$1.54.5 cents for malting barley. Our producers get in the neighbourhood -- and my friend from Smoky River could probably give me an accurate figure -- but it is in the neighbourhood of 90 cents at the most through the elevator system with probably an additional five cent per bushel premium.

I think it's a fair question to ask, Mr. Speaker, what happens to the difference between the \$1.54 and 95 cents. About 30 cents of that is taken up by what the Wheat Board calls its ordinary handling charges. In effect, if you, as a producer, found yourself short of barley and went to an elevator and wanted to buy, you'd have to pay the initial price of barley plus about 30 cents that the Wheat Board charges for handling. In addition to that, our people running malt houses in Alberta have to pay a premium of 27 cents per bushel. That premium gets lost in the total pool, and isn't reflected and returned to the farmers who are willing to produce a quality product.

In relation to the question of malt, which is another one of those opportunities for us in rural Alberta -- if we can get rid of some of our own head yokes and restrictions that are placed upon us by things that happened in the past -- we have to have the ability to remove some of these if we are going to move forward in secondary industry.

I refer hon. members to the September issue of Playboy, not for the inserts or the pictures, but for an article in it in relation to the world consumption of beer and the production of beer throughout the world. It was an interesting article if you are interested as we are, and as I was, in the amount of barley that is used in the world to make beer, and the conversion of barley into malt, which means jobs, which means industry for rural Alberta. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the situation in Canada, most of the malt houses in Canada were built in the early 1900's and its only now that we hear of some expansion in the one in Calgary.

What's been happening around the world? In the last six years the world consumption for manufacture of beer has doubled. Every newly developing country in the world, almost before anything else, gets a national brewery established. What does this mean, and what are the opportunities for us in this area? I can assure hon. members that in Japan we visited the brewery and had numerous discussions with a number of the trading companies that were interested in the production of malt, and interested in a joint venture in Alberta in the

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-31

establishment of malt houses. As I've said, these are ideal industries for rural Alberta. They provide jobs, they provide a market for our grain that we know is going to be there.

I could go on at some length as to the connection between the idea of getting processing plants in our province and what that does to our ability to market. If you have a processing plant that is going to process our grain or any agricultural product into the end product, then we have some security of market that we never had before. In any case, there is an opportunity in the world to catch up. As a matter of fact, our exports of malt have gone up very, very slowly compared to this very rapid expansion in the brewing industry in the world. We find that when you visit a brewery in Japan, for instance, where they produce about 30 per cent of their malt from their own domestic barley, the balance of the 70 per cent Canada at the moment has got a meagre 10 per cent.

Again, among the reasons that we are having trouble competing in that market and in other markets around the world are these unnecessary blocks that are placed upon ourselves by ourselves through the mechanism of the Canadian Wheat Board. I think that these rightfully and constitutionally should be under the control of the province in relation to secondary industry and secondary manufacture within Canada. The same thing applies to the use of the soft wheats in the production of macaroni and the production of puffed wheat and a production of a variety of these products which we can produce and which we do produce in Alberta but to which we add these extra costs in processing them here in Alberta and this becomes a very important thing as far as we are concerned.

So basically, and just to recap quickly the recommendations by which I think the Canadian Wheat Board should operate in the future; it should be restricted to the export market. If the feed grain situation in Canada can be quickly and effectively resolved by removing the barriers at our provincial boundaries, that the provinces take over their rightful role of looking after the feed grain situation within their province, that they take over their rightful role of looking after the processing of the raw product within their province and that the Wheat Board be restricted to the export market in relation to wheat and other grains that are going out as grain. That should be their role and I want to suggest that it's a pretty major role.

Then, very briefly the other important thing that I wanted to touch on has to do with the question of freight rates, the question of the Crowsnest Pass rates.

There is increasing pressure from a variety of areas that we should give up some of the advantages that people say we have in relation to the Crow-rates in exchange for some other -- some other sort of thing that we are going to get on freight rates in regard to raw or refined rapeseed oil or meal etc. In my view this would be an entirely wrong position to take. The Crow-rates should remain. Interestingly enough, the Crowsnest Pass rates apply to malt as well as to puffed wheat, but don't apply to raw oil or rapeseed meal. If some of my legal friends could tell me what the difference is between one processed grain and another I would like to know, but it gets involved with a long period of numerous regulations and decisions and what not and needs some resolution.

One of the ways in which we might be able to resolve some of this question of getting better freight rates for our processed products is by better agreed charges with the railway. And one of the ways that we might be able to get those better agreed charges is by doing what has been done recently coming into Alberta from the Okanagan in which you have a truck train of apples coming in, I see no reason why we couldn't organize truck trains going the other way to the port of Vancouver in relation to a number of products. With the modern concepts in transportation that we have to use -- and I'm talking now in relation to the malt situation, if we are going to be competitive in that market we have to get the container shipments of malt. I think if we are going to be competitive in the highly competitive alfalfa industry, and the markets that are available for a quality product are substantial, again we have to get to the question of container shipments. I think that one of the ways in which we could rapidly get the railways to look at a better rate structure for Alberta in some of these products is to, if necessary, subsidize a truck train carrying these products to the ports on the West Coast. I think we are going to have to take that kind of strong action if we really believe in doing something about the freight rates in western Canada.

My colleague, the Minister of Industry and Commerce has done a great amount of work; more work than has ever been done by a provincial government in the province of Alberta in the past years in relation to this whole freight rate question, and I am sure that when he gets an opportunity to place before the House his views in this regard that you will agree with me that we are fortunate

72-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

indeed in having a man of his background in that particular position where he can deal with some of these problems in transportation. I know that we in agriculture are happy that he has been able to do that job and to know that maybe in the future we can do something about this very vexing problem of freight rates to a land locked province like Alberta. And, of course, it is so important to us in agriculture because we are dependent upon those export markets.

I would just like to conclude Mr. Speaker, particular point as I see it is 4:30. That surely, and I would hope all of us, would consider the question of supply management, whether be in grain or livestock as supply management for the world; that we would forget about looking inward and thinking about how we can divide up our little pot, and that we would look more importantly around the world, be knowledgeable about what is happening to living conditions and living standards around the world, be knowledgeable about what that market demands, and instead of supply management for our own little backyard or our own country, we are really talking about global supply management, and we are talking also about market management. If we can do that and rationalize some of the problems that we have had in the past in relation to ports, railways, to a gathering system, then I think the outlook for agriculture in the future for Western Canada, and for Alberta in particular, has a great deal of life in it and I think there is going to be a real improvement in the income of our producers in Alberta. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I move we adjourn the debate.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

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

Bill No. 210: An Act to Amend The Election Act. (No. 21)

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the Bill No. 210, I would just like to point out that the main purpose of this bill is to revise the requirement that a woman's name be preceded by the prefix, Mrs., or Miss, in the list of electors, so as to allow for the use of the prefix, Ms.

Now, Mr. Speaker, present legislation requires enumerators to register married women with the prefix Mrs., and single women with the prefix, Miss. Women are not given the same rights of anonymity as are men in regard to their marital status. In this enlightened age of social change, it does not seem necessary to me, that women should have to suffer the indignity of being forcibly classified on voter's lists by their marital status.

This bill will bring recognition to women as individuals with personal qualities, and not by marital status. We pride ourselves on being a civilized people, but our cultural development has been painfully slow in many areas. The rights of women is one area where long-standing prejudices have been most evident. I feel that individual women must have the right and the opportunity to decide the manner in which they are to be addressed and registered. The passing of this bill will in no way deter or adversely affect the rights of women who chose to use the prefix, Mrs., or Miss. And it must be recognized that many women are currently using the Ms. prefix for social, business and informal communication. Ms. enjoys widespread use in many federal government publications even on federal government voter's lists. Three members of the British Columbia legislature choose to be addressed as Ms. Alberta Government Telephones recognizes the need for anonymity and even prefers to list women by initials without any prefix. Edmonton Telephones would list Ms. if requested to do so.

Federal Manpower Department says Ms. is okay in their books; the Alberta Teachers Association allow female employees to be addressed as Ms. The Canadian Union of Public Employees made Ms official in their dealings one year ago. There are many magazines and publications which use the prefix Ms. Yes, Ms. is definitely making its evolutionary way into modern day usage. Even, Mr. Speaker, the Social Credit Party and the Alberta Social Credit League allows application forms for membership to use the designation Ms.

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-33

Now there are some definite problems for women who have to use a standard prefix, Miss or Mrs., I understand that they encounter problems in registering into hotels. The first thing they are asked is; "Are you a Miss or a Mrs.?" That is really none of the clerk's business. Anything that we can do to bring the situation up to formal approval and formal usage of the term, I think, is for the good of women in Alberta and in Canada. Also when the voters' lists are posted all over the country designating 'Miss' I think that this contributes to crime and other activities some people may have in mind. I don't think that women should have to have their names advertised as 'Miss' all over the province on billboards and such.

In investigating this situation, Mr. Speaker, I wrote to assemblyman Ray Johnson in California. He was the one who first proposed it for legislation and he put me in touch with one Bonnie J. Jesse in California and she was the woman who started this idea for legislation in the United States. I had some very interesting correspondence back and forth with her. One of the things she points out is the implication that she must be sponsored by some man, either her husband or her father, in order to claim her right to vote is certainly not justifiable.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I have had some correspondence with the State of Hawaii and with other legislators around the country. I have considerable correspondence with Albertans which shows that there is tremendous reception for this idea. I like to think that it is pretty well seasoned over the summer months and so on. I have had various people write, and various newspaper articles have appeared on the topic and I don't think there is really any need for a great long harangue on my part for such an obviously well intended and good piece of legislation to give women the same rights as men in Alberta.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Member for Calgary Bow permit a question?

MR. WILSON:

Certainly.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, how do you pronounce the plural of Ms?

MR. WILSON:

Ms.

MR. FARRAN:

The same way, you don't distinguish?

AN HON. MEMBER:

You say it twice.

MISS HUNLEY:

I am not always in accord with the hon. Member for Calgary Bow, but this afternoon I happen to be in his ball park. In rising to speak in favour of this bill --

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Member for Calgary Bow is in the hon. Miss Hunley's ball park.

MISS HUNLEY:

I would like to indicate just one reservation that I have about presenting the bill, not about the principle, but about the timing. In view of the fact that we have a select committee reviewing The Elections Act, and the whole thing is now under review. But I don't think it's well just to put it aside, under these circumstances, because this happens to be a matter that is of quite a bit of importance to quite a few women. In fact to some women, it's quite a crucial matter. Not Mr. Speaker, that they wish to use the Ms. to deceive the unsuspecting male, but rather they only wish the same privilege in this regard that males have.

72-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

When a woman marries, she, by custom in this country, adopts her husband's surname, and changes from Miss to Mrs. -- like the hon. Member from Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, I consider that one of my more profound statements -- but this is not so in the case of men who marry; they do not, by their titles, indicate to all the world their marital status. In my opinion, the use of Ms., which I prefer to Miss, when everyone wishes to use it is a great convenience. Much of my correspondence comes in and the replies go out, using the letters Ms. as part of the address. This is done whenever the sender does not indicate whether she is Miss or Mrs. and always I use it whenever she indicates in her signature that she uses Ms. herself.

There's another angle to this and the hon. Member from Calgary Bow touched on it. Many women who live alone prefer to use their initials in the telephone directory, they also use them on their apartment mail boxes. It isn't necessarily the suggestion of the telephone companies, it's the desire of the women. I think perhaps the reason is quite obvious.

I also support the idea that if we must indicate on the enumerator's list, on the voters' list, I feel that Ms. would be a protection for some women, because it's quite often hopefully not so in Alberta but in larger cities, where the fact is indicated for all the world to see, by any individual who wishes to look at the voters' list, whether there is a Miss or Mrs. in the area. And occasionally this does lead to obscene phone calls and other types of interruption, confusion, and unpleasantness that perhaps could be avoided. And so I support the use of Ms. whenever anyone wishes to use it. I do not know whether legally we need to bother giving it any form of legality, I think that perhaps by custom it will become a habit and it will be used quite widely and will not create any sensations as it sometimes does now.

And in future, while I've endorsed this bill, in case anyone's wondering about how I prefer to be addressed on formal occasions, I'm quite happy to be called Miss. My correspondence usually comes in Miss, it's always signed going out using Miss, not that I have anything against using Ms., I'm just quite happy with Miss. In case anyone's wondering what my attitude will be, on formal occasions it suits me to be called Miss, Ms., or Miz, that really doesn't matter. The fact is I think this is important, it's timely, I think many women are anxious to have some acknowledgement that they do have some individuality, and I support the bill.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few comments in relation to this bill, in the support of it, and to bring into mind a few other points of view that need to be taken into account. Although the bill, primarily as introduced, drew attention to the indication of Miss or Mrs. on the voters' list, I think that it probably attempts to go farther, with the idea, particularly in the mind of the women, not only of Alberta, but across the country. I think that women have been striving to gain recognition of individuality, insofar as their qualifications are concerned, so there not be a reflection of recognition or the lack of recognition to some second party, such as their husbands. And I feel that these areas primarily deal with matters of business, or sometimes even in personal situations. I think women want to be given anonymity to their marital status the same as the men enjoy, and not to be classed in one area or another. Not that I think they want to hide whether they are married or not, but I think because of the attitude that exists generally in what we might call this 'male dominated world'. I have to agree that in some areas it is not male dominated, and I have to acknowledge that there are areas where it is the reverse.

HON. MEMBERS:

That's right.

MRS. CHICHAK:

But I think the same might be said for the reverse I know that women have been discriminated against in the areas of applications for loans, through lending institutions of one type or another. The merits of their ability to take on such a responsibility were not dealt with on the individual basis, but almost always on what the situation or the involvement or the income of the husband is. I think this is wrong because when we attempt to take out a loan, we do it on the recognition or on the basis that we know what responsibility we are entering into. And I think that probably this might assist in a change of general attitude in wider areas, although the abbreviation itself may not in its first appearance appear to have much importance for the breadth that it really has.

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-35

I think also that there is a subtle discrimination, and sometimes, not so subtle. When you have women in business or otherwise, in social functions or public functions, when they have reached an age over 30, and they are asked, are you Miss or Mrs? And if they happen to say Mrs., the subtleness of the action is either an expression, or sometimes an indirect question, why it is that you have missed walking down the aisle. Inasmuch as I have, and I have no regrets, there is also the choice of not wanting perhaps to go down the aisle, and not having to make explanations or give reasons for such a choice. I think this would suit many women.

I also think that a change of this nature would be in keeping with The Alberta Bill of Rights from the point of individuality. Quite often the indication of whether a woman is married when she applies for a job, simply by the indication that she is married, you must then reply on the form -- where is your husband employed? What is his income? And we find a very broad degree of differentiation in incomes, in job levels. And statistics bear this out that women who carry the same responsibility in many areas as men are not accorded the same income level, and quite often this is as a result of consideration being given to the fact that the husband has a substantial income, if such be the case. But there is this subtle discrimination. So I think that we should give this some consideration; we should show that we are prepared to open up our attitudes, if we are narrow on them, and to recognize individuality. Thank you.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, in rising this afternoon to take part in this debate, I have some hesitation, hesitation because I will be following where the hon. member opposite has led, and where the angels on this side have trod. Undoubtedly, I will not be able to match that performance. I would, however, like to state that I agree with most of the things that have been said this afternoon in terms of the respect for the right of anonymity of those of the female sex. I see no reason for the ladies to be forcibly classified in terms of the registration on the voters' list, and I might add that I see no reason for the males to be forcibly identified or classified either. As a matter of fact, I see no reason on the voters' list for any designation of that nature.

Mr. Speaker, in trying to make a few preparations for the comments this afternoon, I went to the trouble of trying to trace, very quickly, how it came about that we are using the form of address that, indeed, we are now using. Apart from finding that if one used the term 'Miss', 'Mrs.', 'Mr.', or 'Ms.' it really is an abbreviation for all sorts of things under each heading. I don't know whether I should just identify one definition out of 20 for the term 'Ms.', but one definition means square. There are some equally amusing definitions, I suppose, if one wanted to carry the discussion in that direction, for Mr. and for Mrs. etc. But really, and I think the significant point is that all of these are regarded as a conventional title of courtesy. So this raises the question of whether, in fact, on the voters' list we need to have a conventional title of courtesy, and whether, in fact, on the voters' list we need to have a conventional title of courtesy which, it appears, does remove the anonymity for certain people and perhaps in so doing, makes them subject to certain types of abuse. Therefore, I am in agreement with the motion.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to move an amendment. I'll state the amendment now, and I have copies of it available here, three in number, one for each House leader plus one for Your Honour. Mr. Speaker, my notion, seconded by Mr. Ashton, is to the effect that the original motion that Bill No. 210 be read a second time be amended by adding, 'not now' after the word 'be' and that after the word 'time' the following words be added: 'and that said bill be referred to the special committee of the legislature established to review The Election Act.'

Mr. Speaker, in making this motion, I have kept in mind the fact that this particular bill refers only to the removal of loss of anonymity in one particular area; in other words, it is a bill of very narrow application.

Secondly, it is a bill which is dealing in an area that this assembly has already established a committee to look into. We have, earlier in the year, established a committee, the Special Committee of the Legislature, to review The Election Act. We placed our confidence in that committee to review all aspects of The Election Act. Mr. Speaker, it is for that reason that I think the bill should be directed to that committee for review. It is a part of their responsibility and I would consider that since we have placed the confidence of the House in that committee with respect to the many amendments that are required in that act, this should be a part of their purview.

72-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

I would also hope that some members of the committee are in the House at this time, and that they will take into consideration a further suggestion I have, which I am not going to place in the amendment, but that suggestion is to the effect that all designation, Mr., Mrs., Miss, and Ms., whatever, be removed from the voters' list unless it is the expressed wish of the person to be so designated. I cannot find any reason for purposes of identification, for purposes of making sure that there is no confusion or attempts to vote twice or any other reason why this conventional title of courtesy should be used on the voters' list. I think it would simplify the voters' list and make the work of the people who draw up the voters' list easier and, in fact, respect anonymity and treat equally all men and all women who are entitled to vote.

MR. ASHTON:

In seconding the motion, Mr. Speaker, I would say that first of all, I am very favourably impressed with the bill --

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it the amendment the hon. member is seconding?

MR. ASHTON:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm very favourably impressed with the intent of the bill. If there were any doubts in my mind before, those doubts were completely removed by hearing the two hon. 'Ms's' who spoke earlier this afternoon. However, I do not feel that there is any need for unseemly haste in proceeding with this. I have reason to believe that the next provincial election won't be called until after the spring session. It is most appropriate that the select committee that has been designated by this House to consider the matter take it under advisement because there are alternatives, as the one described by the mover of the amending motion. These alternatives should be considered.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question of the previous speaker? I am really interested in this, and I think perhaps he could answer my question. It relates to the content of the bill. I know a number of married women in the city right now --

MR. CLARK:

Ah hah!

MR. GHITTER:

In a very impersonal way -- impersonal.

MR. KING:

Well, no, I don't know them as well as the hon. member opposite thinks that I do, but, on the other hand, I wouldn't say that it was as impersonal as my friend in front suggests. My question is this, I have been confused about what title to attach to married women who go by their maiden name. Are they Miss or Mrs.? My question really is, what legal effect does the use of these titles have, if any? Because if these married women going by their maiden name refer to themselves as Miss, could a single person refer to herself as Mrs.?

MR. SPEAKER:

Might I respectfully suggest that the hon. member consult his solicitor outside the Chamber?

MRS. CHICHAK:

Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, just on the amendment. I do want to inform the House I am quite happy to be called Mrs.

MR. WILSON:

Speaking to the amendment, I would just like to point out that the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place mentioned the narrow application of the original bill; that is part of the reason he suggested the amendment. I would like to point out that the narrow application of the bill was purposely chosen so that we could make a decision based on the principle of whether or not we

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-37

could give formal recognition to the term 'Ms.', which custom dictates requires formalization.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any further debate on the amendment?

MR. DIXON:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a suggestion regarding the amendment. I see no reason for the amendment because in the House earlier today the suggestion was brought up that we have a committee studying The Workmen's Compensation Act, and yet the government is making announcements and even making changes that have a greater ramification than even this amendment, and so, Mr. Speaker, I see no reason for not voting down the amendment and proceeding with the bill.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, on the amendment to the motion, surely the hon. member would realize that in the case of the Workmen's Compensation Board, it isn't within the practical limits of this government to wait until the next election may come. The bill we have under discussion, being referred to the select committee, will not make any difference until the time of the next election arises. When we have a select committee of the legislature appointed to study a certain thing, I would think that the legislature would be within its rights to refer any matter that isn't of an urgent nature to that committee. As I respectfully point out, the Workmen's Compensation Board situation is certainly entirely different from the referring of the bill before us to the Select Committee so I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should indeed vote for the amendment.

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the hon. Member for Calgary Bow would permit a question so I could better understand his opposition to the amendment?

MR. WILSON:

Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether or not, at the leadership convention of the Social Credit party, their ballot will have Mr. or Mrs. or Ms. on it?

MR. WILSON:

I'll tell him as soon as we find out who the candidates are.

MR. LUDWIG:

Speaking to the amendment, it is obvious that when you want to get something done in this House, keep it out of the hands of the Conservatives. It's really irrelevant. It's a good bill, the ladies supported it, nobody will object to it; so now we'll probably talk it out today and not vote on it. I would like to see this thing voted for, so let's get something done. Let all the non-experts over there keep off the thing. The ladies like it, we'll support it, let's get on with this debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest also that the amendment should be turned down. This government has demonstrated it has casual regard for legislative committees; the Compensation Board case is an excellent example. This is really basically a case, I think a demonstration, where the gentlemen opposite should either make up their minds that they favour the amendment or they don't. Let's not stall the thing off under the guise of referring it to legislative committee, when this government has its mind made up before the committee has even bothered reporting. The whole exercise of referring it to committee I find completely illogical and is nothing but a big stall.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, if it is the will of the House I would be happy to close the debate.

72-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

I regret that on an amendment the mover doesn't --. Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

The amendment moved by the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place, seconded by the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell is, that the motion on Bill 210 for second reading, be amended to read "that Bill 210 be not now read a second time and that the said bill be referred to the Special Committee of the Legislature established to review The Election Act".

[The Speaker declared the amendment carried; a number of members rose, calling for a recorded division. The division bell was rung.]

MR. LUDWIG:

I would like to rise on a point of order regarding this amendment by the hon. members. I wish to draw your attention to page 161 of Beauchesne. It says "When a question is under debate no motion is received unless to amend it; to postpone it to a day certain; for the previous question; for reading the Orders of the Day; for proceeding to another order; to adjourn the debate; or for the adjournment of the House". I am saying that when a question is under debate they could not adjourn it, they could not delay it by a negative motion to some uncertain kind of a disposition, and therefore, that amendment is out of order, Mr. Speaker. [Interjection] That is my submission, you can make yours.

MR. KING:

Speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think this is another case of a little bit of knowledge being a dangerous thing. On page 278 of Beauchesne, the reference is annotation no. 386, the exact amendment as made by the hon. Mr. Young is in the book.

MR. GHITTER:

Don't confuse them, David.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair also has noted the exact parallel in the wording between the amendment and the one that is approved by Beauchesne.

AN. HON. MEMBER:

Sorry, Albert.

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided as follows:

For the Amendment: Messrs.

Adair	Doan	Jamison	Purdy
Appleby	Dowling	King	Russell
Ashton	Farran	Koziak	Schmidt
Backus, Dr.	Fluker	Lee	Stromberg
Batiuk	Foster	Leitch	Popelnisky
Chambers	Getty	Lougheed	Frynchy
Cookson	Ghitter	McCrimmon, Dr.	Werry
Copithorne	Hansen	Miller, J.	Young
Crawford	Hohol, Dr.	Minieley	Yurko
Diachuk	Horner, Dr.	Moore	Zander
Dickie	Hyndman	Peacock	

Against the Amendment: Messrs.

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

For the Amendment - 43, Opposed - 26.]

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-39

MR. SPEAKER:

The amendment is carried.

AN. HON. MEMBER:

Albert hasn't got over it yet.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it the effect of the amendment is to refer the matter to the committee. If it is going to be referred, then unless someone is able to point to some authority to the contrary, the inclination of the Chair is that for the time being this disposes of the matter.

Bill No. 209: An Act to Amend the School Act

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to move second reading of Bill No. 209 in light of the hour, or the 15 minutes, I will make my remarks brief, Mr. Speaker. The amendment to The School Act is the exact amendment which was considered for The School Act before the House a number of years back. It deals with the question of making it possible for people of Indian ancestry in the province to have representation on school boards in this province. If it is the desire of the Indian people themselves, and if it is the desire of the school board in the jurisdiction which the children are attending, this arrangement cannot be finalized until the Minister of Education, after consultation with the Indian representatives and any board concerned, approves the agreement. And it would make it possible then for a representative of the Indian people to sit on the school board. The Minister, as I have indicated, has to approve the agreement, and outlined in this amendment to The School Act are the various provisions that should be and must be included in the agreement.

The only other comment that I would make Mr. Speaker, is this, that certainly the problems of jurisdiction, as far as people of Indian ancestry are concerned, is indeed serious. I think that all hon. members of the assembly are aware of some of the problems that there have been in the field of Indian education, in the very recent past, but on a longer term basis also. I feel that a move, such as is made possible by this amendment to The School Act, would make it possible for Indian representation on boards so that they would have a real input into what is going on in their particular school system. I do believe Mr. Speaker, that there are some Indian groups in the southern portion of the province who would be interested in taking this step if we move along with Bill 209.

In conclusion, let me say this, that when the idea included in Bill 209 was presented to the legislature some time back, when The School Act was being rewritten, there was not opposition from the Indian Association of the province at that time, on the basis of them being opposed to the amendment. The opposition or the request came from the Indian Association that there should be a period of time in which they could have consultation with the Indian people across the province. This is something like three years ago now, I believe, that all bands across the province have had an opportunity to respond to the suggestion made at that time, and I would urge members of the assembly, in rather quick fashion, to agree to second reading of Bill 209.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I think a few remarks are in order by me at this time. The government began moving on this matter some months ago, last spring, and, in fact, last February I was in conversation with Mr. Clarence McHugh Sr., the then President of the Indian Association of Alberta, with regard to a meeting to discuss this very matter and other matters regarding Indian education. He met with me on April 28 of this year and at that time indicated that he would like to be able to seek the unanimity of all the Indian bands in the province, and of the association, in agreeing to an amendment which I proposed very similar to the one in this bill. During the summer, as hon. members know, the presidency of the Indian Association of Alberta changed, and prior to that change I had not heard back from Mr. McHugh as to what the position of the Indians was. I indicated to Mr. McHugh that I felt it would be only proper that the Indians should set forth their viewpoint and agree to such an amendment being presented to the assembly before that step was taken. Then when Mr. Harold Cardinal took over as president of the association, I believe it was in August or September, I wrote to him on September 19 asking for his views and that of his association concerning changes such as this, and in particular asking for his views as to

72-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

the number of Indian representatives that a board might have, the powers that such Indian representatives might or should have, and the method of appointment of such representatives. I have not yet heard back from him and I would think, though, that if there is an obvious and substantial degree of unanimity regarding the manner in which Indians could receive representation on school boards outside the reserves, there would be a fair likelihood that legislation and amendments in the forthcoming spring would be brought forward to implement just that.

I think it is important that we proceed with this matter, certainly in a forward way, but with full consultation with the Indians, bearing in mind that of the some 9,500 registered Indians in Alberta, approximately two-thirds of those are now attending schools outside the reserves, and attending schools within provincial public or separate school jurisdictions.

Accordingly, our position is that we would like to, and are looking forward to receiving the Indians' views on these matters, and then, hopefully, move ahead in the spring with legislation to give Indians a greater representation and voice on school boards outside the federal reserves.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any further debate on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 209?

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to close the debate, I would just like to --

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CLARK:

Might I make four comments quite quickly? Firstly, in the points made by the hon. minister, I should remind him that this doesn't make it mandatory at all. It is strictly after consultation with the individual Indian reserves, and I just have to emphasize once again that this legislation would not make representation by Indian people on school boards mandatory at all.

Secondly, the hon. minister talked about the terms of office, how the representatives would be selected, and in the proposed amendment, Mr. Speaker, under (ii) and (iii), it says that those matters can be set out in the agreement which the minister approves. And so I see no reason why we couldn't move ahead on the matter at this particular time.

I appreciate that there is need for consultation with the Indian people of the province. I point out also that this has been going on for about three years on this particular matter, and all this amendment would do is make it possible for those reserves who wanted to, to have this kind of representation on school boards. I would urge the hon. members to support the amendment, and I think if we find ourselves in many more situations of the government asking us to slow down, like we had on the Ms. bill, and this one here, and wait for a while, we'll have to give serious consideration over here to the term 'Progressive Conservative', and change it to 'Procrastinating Conservative'.

AN GOVERNMENT MEMBER:

Tighten up that loop-hole!

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER:

You've got a leaky ship!

[The motion was carried, and Bill No. 209 was read a second time]

November 9, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

72-41

Bill No. 205, An Act to Amend the Social Development Act, 1972
[Debate adjourned by Mr. King]

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, as my hon. colleagues know, I had hoped to have considerably longer to speak this afternoon than this. I think that I will only just get into it. I want to begin by saying that for a number of years, and I suppose particularly during the time that I was in university, I was quite an avid supporter of a concept which is known as the guaranteed annual income. There are a number of different methods proposed for implementing this proposal. And in my younger days I had been a supporter of the particular program known as the 'Provision of Democrats'. As a matter of fact, I would have to say that it had very close resemblance to an economic theory which many years ago was discussed in this province and never implemented. The reason that I speak briefly about where I once was is that I am presently quite a way away from it. Since leaving university, particularly during the time I have been involved in politics in this city and in this province, out of the experiences I have had representing the constituency of Highlands, I have come to raise some very serious questions about the position that I once held. I would have to say that I believe, very strongly, in an idea which isn't fully defined in my own mind yet, of social responsibility; of the obligation, which I think is a fundamental human responsibility to contribute to the development of society. I would have to say, as well, that as the result of my participation in politics, the importance of this has increased in my own mind because the more I have been involved myself, the more I have seen the need to involve other people; the more I have seen the absolute urgency of organizing all of the talents and all of the resources of all of the people of the country and the province; the more I have seen the need for making absolutely clear to all of the citizens of the province, that we cannot do many of the things we want to do; we cannot achieve the goals we would like to achieve without the participation of everyone. Because everyone has a contribution that he can make.

I think that was really brought home to me, and I hope to a number of other hon. members, yesterday with startling clarity when we had lunch with the Action Group for the Disabled. I have met many individuals in my day, as have all the other hon. members of this assembly, who can give a reason for not being able to participate in the development of our society, they can't do it because they don't have a good enough education, or because they have responsibilities to their family, or because they have some physical disability, and for a number of other reasons. We all met people yesterday, some of whom were quadriplegics confined to wheelchairs and who, in addition to that, in some cases had only a grade school education; and who, in addition to that, in some cases had wives and families to support. They came to us having done quite a bit for themselves, and they came to us, not to ask so much that we should do things for them in order to relieve them of their responsibility, but rather to ask that we should make changes in the rules of the game that would allow them to contribute themselves and would allow them to participate. I think the greatest desire those people had yesterday was not to be given something for nothing, but to be given the opportunity to participate and to make a contribution.

When I consider the problems which are raised in this legislature, when I consider their magnitude and when I remember the people with whom I had lunch yesterday, I find it very hard to believe that there is any significant number of people in the province who can't make a contribution to our development. This is the real problem with which I have to wrestle, made all the more difficult for me because it removes me so far from where I was a few years ago.

Another concern that I have is about a situation in which the government provides the people who make no contribution more than it allows to people who work everyday for 40 hours a week, who are attempting to make a contribution; whether it is to private industry, government, or to non-profit organizations of one kind or another. I think it is ludicrous that this should be the case in view of what needs to be done. I think it's ludicrous that the elderly, many of whom have contributed all of their adult lives to the development of this province and to the development of the society we have today, are often getting less than people in good health, with good family circumstances, who don't believe that there is any need for them to contribute or who don't believe that there is anything of value that they have to contribute.

Mr. Speaker, I had a couple of other things that I really did want to say. Could I have leave to adjourn the debate?

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member leave to adjourn the debate?

72-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 9th 1972

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Just before we adjourn, I'd like to ask leave of the House to revert to Notices of Motion in order to give oral notice that tomorrow I will introduce a bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. Government House Leader have the leave he has requested?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I hereby give notice that tomorrow, Friday, I will beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Election Statutes Amendment Act, 1972. Perhaps I should say that this is simply a minor procedural act dealing with consequential amendments to five acts which refer specifically to, and will delimit legal status of the Clerk of the Executive Council as distinct from the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

[The House rose at 5:32 p.m.]