

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday Afternoon, November 16, 1972

[The House met at 2:30 pm.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 214 The Anti-Organized Crime Act

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Anti-Organized Crime Act. Mr. Speaker, this bill, if passed, will give the Attorney General power and authority to deal with those companies, whether they be a sole proprietorship, or a partnership under The Partnership Act, or a corporation incorporated under The Companies Act of Alberta, where "any director or officer of a corporation incorporated under The Companies Act, with the knowledge of the president and a majority of the board of directors or under circumstances in which the president and a majority of the board of directors ought to have had knowledge, is engaged in organized crime or is connected directly or indirectly with an organization or a criminal society engaged in organized crime."

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of brevity, I will not recite the entire bill, but I think I should mention that this bill also covers activities of employees, agents, stockholders, and companies registered under The Partnership Act, as well as sole proprietorship. Organized crime in this bill means any combination of conspiracy to engage in an offence under sections of the Canadian Criminal Code dealing with such things as bookmaking, counterfeiting, prostitution, blackmailing, extortion, and narcotics.

Mr. Speaker, under this bill the power and authority is given to the Attorney General to institute, before the Supreme Court, proceedings to cancel the registration of a corporation, to cancel the registration of an extra-provincial corporation registered under part 8 of The Companies Act, or to enjoin the operations of any sole proprietorship, or any partnership registered under The Partnership Act as the case may be.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 214 was introduced and read a first time.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. DOAN:

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure at this time to introduce to you and through you to the hon. members of this assembly, 150 beautiful ladies who are seated in both galleries today. These ladies are mostly wives of councillors throughout the rural part of all of Alberta. I commend them for taking time off from an interesting convention in the Macdonald Hotel to sit in and listen to our legislature this afternoon. I would like the ladies to now stand and be recognized by this legislature.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. MINIELY:

I'd like to table the answer to an earlier question on a previous day's Order Paper, Question No. 230.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Opposition House Leader, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight.

76-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

Uninsured Vehicles

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I address a question to the hon. Minister of Highways? How many uninsured vehicles, that is without P.L. and P.D., does the minister estimate are operating on the highways and streets of Alberta?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer that question to the hon. Attorney General.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I suggest the hon. member put that question on the Order Paper, although I may say to him that I had one report a month or so ago from the Lethbridge area, and my memory is that out of something like 1,100 vehicles checked, something less than one per cent were uninsured.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the government satisfied with the present method of checking insurance on vehicles, or are changes being looked into?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, as long as there remains one car in the province uninsured, then we aren't satisfied with the method of checking. We are exploring ways and means of ensuring that all of the vehicles on Alberta highways are insured.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, followed by the hon. Member for Wainright.

Calgary Police Commission

MR. LEE:

I have a question for the Attorney General, also. Have you received any correspondence from the City of Calgary regarding a recent motion by Calgary City Council requesting that you replace two of the three provincial appointments to the Calgary Police Commission, and if so, is it your intention to make these appointments, as per the motion?

MR. LEITCH:

A letter came in the mail yesterday from the city clerk for the City of Calgary, requesting the appointment of Mr. Prothro, the existing chairman, and Mr. Shannon and Mr. Davis as the two additional appointments, all three of those persons being appointments by the Attorney General, under The Police Act, to the Calgary Police Commission. I have had no other communication from anyone representing the city or, in particular, the mayor. The Police Act does require that prior to making appointments to the commission the Attorney General consult with the mayor. That has not yet been done, although I have expressed great satisfaction in the council's recommendation that these three persons be on the commission, because I think they are people of outstanding ability and would bring a great deal to the commission.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, what will the Attorney General do when he hears from the mayor regarding his own selection, which has been indicated in the papers, as noted by the hon. member opposite?

MR. SPEAKER:

A hypothetical question. The Attorney General has not heard from the mayor yet, and we don't know if he will. The hon. Member for Wainright, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-3

Suspended Drivers Lists

MR. RUSTE:

I have a question for the Minister of Highways. Who has access to the suspended drivers list that is published from time to time?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, the only people that have access, or should have access, to the suspended list are police officers and issuers of our licences.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary to the minister. Is the minister aware of the fact that the news release indicates that one of the car rental agencies has three editions of the suspended drivers list and the news item further states that the radio station was able to get hold of this? Is he aware of this?

MR. SPEAKER:

With great respect, the hon. member is in effect asking the minister if he reads the paper. If there is any information which the hon. member would like to have, perhaps he might re-phrase his question.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. What security is taken to ensure that private individuals or companies do not get hold of the suspended drivers list?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, in this regard, I have not seen the news article that the hon. member is referring to, but I have heard about the program that was referred to this morning. As nearly as I can ascertain, the list that he was referring to is at least two-and-a-half years of age and at this time we have not considered this area as an area that should be explored, but we will certainly do that to be sure that an act of confidentiality is adhered to.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary. What steps of security is the minister proposing to ensure that this list cannot possibly get into the hands of individuals or corporations?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, at this time we have several ideas that we think might work, and we will refine them further and put them into force.

MR. LUDWIG:

Would the hon. minister name one or two of the several ideas that he has? Because I doubt seriously if he ever has had any.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister will not name them at this time.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Because he hasn't got any!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Rundle Lodge, Calgary

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. the Provincial Treasurer, but I wonder if I could just clear a point with the Minister of Culture, Youth and

76-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

Recreation. I was wondering if the minister is in a position today to announce when he will have the report on the future of the Rundle Lodge in Calgary?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, the report came in to my office yesterday; I have not had time to look at it but I will do so today after the House finishes and will table it tomorrow.

Native Counselling Services

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. the Provincial Treasurer is regarding a news release that went over the government wires yesterday that the government was going to give a grant of almost \$80,000 to the Native Counselling Services of Alberta. I was wondering, were these grants given on the recommendation of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, although that grant is paid out of the treasury appropriation, it is upon the recommendation of the minister who is responsible for native affairs and I will refer it to Mr. Adair.

MR. ADAIR:

...that it was in consultation with the Alcohol and Drug Abuse people and a number of other authorities that it was passed.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I think it is a job of the opposition to find out where the tax payers' money is being spent. Wouldn't this constitute an overlapping of services for people working in that field? Are we going to go beyond what the commission is doing?

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, we have looked into that and we are aware of the possible overlap, but at this point they have proven to us that is not the case. They work together and we have initiated plans where the two will go into the area together to resolve some of those problems they are facing. Of course, the majority of the funds are used in the native court-worker area, but we have expanded into that other area of drug abuse as well. We are working toward resolving the position where they will work together very, very closely and not overlap.

Legal Aid

MR. DIXON:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does legal aid not extend to our native people? That's another overlap that I was concerned about. I wonder if the hon. minister could enlarge on why this is necessary when we have legal aid set up as such?

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, that is a legal area, I would refer that part to the Attorney General. But the area of court worker's service is one in which they do follow-up service as well with the person after he has been to the courts, and also working with the other people. In relation to the legal aid, I would like to refer that to the Attorney General.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, legal aid is available, and the services that are covered in the grant that has been under discussion are, in a sense, non-legal services -- counselling, advice and things of that nature, which arise as a result of these people becoming involved with the law, but are not necessarily so closely associated with the law that they require legal advice.

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-5

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury followed by the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen.

Worth Report

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the Minister of Advanced Education and ask him why is it that the reaction of the University of Alberta to the Worth Report or The Commission on Educational Planning, is such that the reaction is held in confidence and students, the academic staff, and the public are not permitted to be present when this discussion is taking place.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member opposite could identify who is putting forward this reaction. Are you talking about the board's submission, the faculty's submission, the student's submission, or whose?

MR. CLARK:

The Board of Governors at the University of Alberta.

MR. FOSTER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Board of Governors or any other organization within any institution, is perfectly at liberty to make a presentation to the Cabinet Committee on Education on their views as far as their reaction to the Worth Commission Report is concerned. Whether or not they are prepared to provide copies of their reaction to other people, it seems to me, is up to them. I'm really not concerned one way or the other. If people want to know what other people have to say in these briefs, I would be very happy to provide them with that information through my office. Once I am satisfied it does not involve a breach of confidence or personal information, I can't see there would be a problem.

University of Alberta

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, what is confidential about the financial position of the University of Alberta, so that the Board of Governors hold their meeting in camera, so that students, the faculty, and the public at large, cannot be aware of the financial position of the university?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, that seems to be a second question. I was talking about their proposal or their reaction to the Commission on Educational Planning. I can't conceive of any information in the board's response to the Commission which would be of a personal or otherwise confidential nature, but there may be. I merely said that if that was the case, I would be careful not to get into it.

As far as the board's policy of conducting certain aspects of their meeting in private, that decision, for the moment, is with the board. I am not personally familiar with the subjects that were on the agenda of the board, as a result of which the board felt they should leave a portion of the meeting closed. I would be quite happy to discuss that with the board but that matter, as the hon. member well knows, is in the authority and jurisdiction of the board.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker to the minister. What is confidential about the University of Alberta's dealings on the British Commonwealth Games, that, once again, could not be discussed in public with the students, staff, and public present?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I suspect that the hon. member opposite is referring to press reports which referred to the subject the hon. member raises, and that was not part of the open meeting of the Board of Governors. I am not in a position to answer that question, Mr. Speaker. I have not discussed the information with

76-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

the board. If the hon. member is interested I am quite happy to talk with the board about it. I can do nothing but speculate on what there may be in there, but I am certainly in no position to comment on it.

MR. CLARK:

One last supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What percentage of the total budget of the University of Alberta is funded by the taxpayer's of the province?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Aw, come on.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Senior Citizens

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. In view of the fact that senior citizens in Alberta must apply for social assistance if they require more than the maximum federal benefits of \$150 per month in basic old age pension and guaranteed income supplement, is the government planning to follow the lead of British Columbia in providing a basic \$200 a month old age pension?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is -- not at the present time, but I do want to assure the House that we have done as much examination as is possible of the proposals placed before the British Columbia legislature. I would hope to get more information within the next few weeks. It is a subject that may very well come up at a conference of provincial Ministers of Welfare and Social Development which will be held in British Columbia. We will keep in touch with the situation. We have been estimating costs, and so on, of that type of program and we just don't have any final position on it at the present time.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has any representation been made to the federal government with respect to changes in the Canada Assistance Plan to ease the requirements for qualification under the guaranteed income supplement? This question is to yourself, Mr. Minister or to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on the particular area the question relates to, there have not been specific representations to the federal government.

MR. NOTLEY:

A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intention of the government to make representation on this issue, and also full federal cost-sharing of any additional pension over and above the \$150 per month pension and the basic old age pension and the Canada supplement?

MR. GETTY:

I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is directing the supplementary to myself, however, I would like to say that it is a matter that is being considered and when the government has made a decision it will advise the House and make the representations if it decides to do so.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-7

Premier's Office

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. the Premier. You will recall that a couple of days ago I led a question to the Premier concerning M.L.A.s working for the government to which I got a delayed-action reply. I would like to follow up now. Can the hon. Premier advise us whether any of the M.L.A.s on the government side are doing work for the government for which they receive per diem allowances, or expenses paid beyond that which is done by the political task force committees?

MR. LOUGHEED:

The answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Private Cemeteries

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, my question will be directed to the hon. Attorney General and he may want to refer to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. It's regarding The Cemeteries Act, and more specifically the Archmount Memorial Gardens in Lethbridge. As the members will recall last spring, I brought to the attention of the House the problems that are arising over the Archmount Memorial Gardens in Lethbridge, and consequently public hearings were held and report given by Judge Turcotte who chaired that public hearing.

My question is -- does the Attorney General anticipate bringing in any legislation, or amendments to legislation, that would either repeal the act, amend the act, or tighten regulations which would give the public more protection as far as private cemeteries and their operations in the Province of Alberta are concerned?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, we have no such plans at the moment and I should advise the House that the cemetery to which the hon. member refers came into existence and got into financial difficulties prior to some regulatory legislation being passed. My memory is that the legislation now provides that only religious bodies -- and there are various religious bodies -- or municipalities can carry out the kind of operation that was carried out in that case. Because of that restriction, Mr. Speaker, at the present moment I don't have any information that would indicate there needs to be a change in the rules, because there has been a restriction on who can do it. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development would like to add to that.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I heard most of the question, in particular the last part, that the hon. member directed in the first instance to the Attorney General. I don't think there is anything I can add to it.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In Judge Turcotte's report there were a couple of recommendations he thought were important to make secure and give satisfaction to the present contract holders. Number one, the trust account which, I think, the minimum amount is supposed to be \$75,000; it would appear this is inadequate to guarantee perpetual care for even the present contract holders, and there was a recommendation that this be increased to possibly \$125,000 or \$130,000. Would you think of any amendment along those lines to protect existing contract holders?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is now dealing with at least a different question from the one I thought I was answering. I thought his original question related to new businesses of this type starting out and being non-regulated, and his last question makes it clear that he is referring to this particular case. The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is that the matters raised in

76-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

that report do give us cause for concern. We are considering them, I do not have anything positive that I can say to the hon. member today.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. My point is not to take to task the present owner or embarrass anyone, but I would like some assurance for those contract holders, because there are about two thousand people in southern Alberta who are gravely concerned as to the ultimate outcome and preservation of Archmount Memorial Gardens.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Traffic Offences

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Attorney General. Would you advise why boys and girls between 16 and 18 years of age are treated differently in relation to traffic offences?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is referring to the fact that boys, 16 and over, appear in regular court on traffic offences, and girls, between 16 and 18, appear in juvenile court. The answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, lies in a federal O.C., that is an order of the federal cabinet, which defines 'juvenile' in Alberta as a boy under the actual or apparent age of 16, and defines 'juvenile' as a girl under the actual or apparent age of 18. So that once they have been defined as juveniles, they have to be treated differently. There has been legislation introduced in the federal House, called the Young Offenders Act as I recall, which would make the age uniform throughout Canada. There was some discussion about that bill, and my memory is that they held it and it may be that it will be re-introduced.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What is a boy then called between the ages of 16 and 18, if he's not --

MR. LEITCH:

It depends who's calling him, I guess.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, Would the Attorney General make representations to the federal government to regularize the treatment of boys and girls between the ages of 16 and 18?

MR. LEITCH:

Well, Mr. Speaker, as long as there is a possibility -- and as far as I know there still is -- of the Young Offenders legislation passing, there would be no need for those representations, because, as I say, that legislation does make it uniform.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Camrose followed by the hon. Member for Stony Plain.

Feeder Associations - Loans

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. How long is the waiting period that Feeder Associations in Alberta now have to wait for treasury to approve their loans?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it depends on a number of factors. One is whether or not they have had loans before, or whether they are a new association. It depends on the amount of the loan, it depends on the kind of experience that

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-9

they have had. We have been trying to move them through the channels as quickly as possible, having regard to the increased type of supervision that this government is giving to those loans because we've increased the amount of loans to Feeder Associations throughout Alberta by something in the neighborhood of \$15 million. We've also increased the individual amount each member of a feeder association can borrow, and because of this we feel it's imperative, along with the other loan programs, that we have adequate supervision to protect the interests of the people of Alberta.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Question, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister tell us, has there been quite an increase in feeder associations, or new feeder associations?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, a substantial increase, not only in the number of feeder associations, but the number of members in the feeder associations. We, as a government, feel that this is a good balance to the feed-lot operators in the province and gives us a really sound livestock economy.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Stony Plain followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

Suspended Licence Lists (Cont.)

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Highways, and it is a further supplementary to what was brought up earlier in the House today. What do other provinces do in regard to suspended driver's license lists?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I understand that in Ontario, every week the names of the suspended licence holders or former licence holders are advertised in the newspaper.

Human Resources Development Authority

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Mr. Minister what is the present status of the staff of the Human Resource Development Authority? In particular, the ones I was interested in were the Human Resources Community Development officers.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, we have not been talking in the House a great deal about the Human Resources Development Authority because it has been under study by the government as to its operations and how they might be improved. It has been a matter of some concern to me that the people working in the authority, hear from the authority as to the decisions the government makes. We have been able to talk to most of them, Mr. Speaker, but not all of them. I would hesitate, without checking first that every individual has been told by the government, to get into a partial description just out of concern for those people's feelings.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the hon. minister. Are there any persons in the staff establishment who will lose their positions, or will any of the positions be deleted?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, nobody working in the authority will lose a job with the government. It may be that positions will become redundant, but individuals as such will not be placed out of work.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Taber-Warner followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

76-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

Acupuncture

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. The subject of acupuncture has been widely discussed lately across Canada by both the public and medical circles. Has the hon. minister been considering any research into this sort of treatment or science?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is certainly a very penetrating question! I do want to echo, as the hon. member has, the keen interest that there is in the subject on the part of the medical profession in Canada. During the visit of the Chinese delegation here earlier this month, there were continuous references to the subject. I know that the Dean of Medicine and the principal members of the Alberta Medical Association, who were in touch with the Chinese delegation throughout the course of their visit to Edmonton, viewed a film and were able to question the Chinese delegation on it. My understanding is that the medical association certainly does intend to follow-up and get more information on it. They feel, I believe, that it will be a little while before they have sufficient understanding of it to look forward to that type of practice.

MR. D. MILLER:

One supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the low cost of this service in comparison to present medical costs, I take it that the hon. minister will be looking with interest to include this in our Medicare.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly sympathize with the idea that any cost effective procedure should be utilized. The question of Medicare, of course, is the responsibility of the hon. minister, Miss Hunley.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking with a supplementary, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. You stated that when you get a better understanding of it you might react. The Chinese have been practising this for 5,000 years or more and we still haven't got an understanding of it, but we know it works.

Secondary Highways

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Highways. Mr. Minister, what formula is used by your department to determine the priority of black-topping secondary or district highways?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, there are several ways in determining priority; one is by traffic counts, and one is by the determination of the local authorities, such as the municipal council, and one is the expected need of the road in the area in regard to industry or tourism or what may come into the area that would bring an unexpected amount of traffic.

MR. COOPER:

A supplementary, Mr. Minister. Has the department a five-year plan for hard-topping district highways?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. We have a projection of a five-year program for developing roads, but this will change from time to time as the situation develops in different municipalities, in different areas and different towns in regard to the needs in that area and the availability of the monies for the job.

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-11

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

1975 Winter Games

MR. GRUENWALD:

My question, Mr. Speaker, would be to the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth, and Recreation. Yesterday, November 15th, being the deadline, I understand, to receive submissions or applications for the 1975 Winter Games, could you tell the House what cities made submissions or applications for these games?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, with pleasure I will announce the cities who have asked to be included in the bid which will be sent by my department to Ottawa for their decision, in fact, for the decision of the hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare. They are Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Calgary, Red Deer, Hinton, and Grande Prairie; six altogether.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliffe.

Grains Group Study

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. At the spring sitting of this assembly during questioning, the hon. minister indicated that the study by Otto Lang and the Grains group on transportation was released to certain individuals and government bodies, but not to the public. My question is, has this study been released now to the public, and if so, would he make it available to members of this assembly?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that it has been made public now. I'll contact the hon. Mr. Lang for the hon. member and see if he can give me a copy for him.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary to that. I'm just wondering if it wouldn't be in the interest, especially of many of the rural members in this assembly, to warrant getting copies for them.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliffe, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill.

Water Management

MR. WYSE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Has the government decided to impose a moratorium on all proposed projects involving a diversion of water on rivers flowing across the Alberta-Saskatchewan border?

MR. YURKO:

No, Mr. Speaker, that is not correct.

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker, has the government then developed a priority list on water management proposals submitted to the government?

76-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, we have attempted to put together a five-year plan of projects, but this is a very tentative thing and hasn't been rated according to priorities. Mostly it's a list of projects within Alberta where there is some recognition that they have to be done. If they were all done, in fact, we would be looking at expenditures in the order of \$20 million a year for the next five years.

MR. WYSE:

Will this ever be made public?

MR. YURKO:

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the list right now is a very preliminary list. If the government decides to put out the list at some point, it certainly will. The present list is quite preliminary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Auto Insurance Premiums

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General. Have you any knowledge of any automobile insurance premiums having been reduced as a result of the new review procedures? I'm thinking particularly of the astronomically high rates for young drivers.

MR. LEITCH:

I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member means by the new review procedures.

MR. FARRAN:

I had understood that there was an Automobile Insurance Review Board that was to handle complaints of excessively high insurance premiums.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I'd have to check that and provide the hon. member with an answer later on.

PEP

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Were the areas that you referred to in your November 7th Ministerial Announcement on the Priority Employment Program, geographic or demographic, or both?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, that's a very good question. It's a combination of both. Certainly the characteristics of the candidates for employment are important -- age, sex, prior employment, period of unemployment preceeding application for employment -- all of these demographic kinds of data are considered. Then the areas in Alberta which are geographic and either chronic, or because of seasonal fluctuation -- because a large industry may not be working, for example, construction, in the area at that time -- a combination of these two. But the over-riding thing is that the person is unemployed for an appreciable period of time.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do you have statistics showing the percentage of unemployed under 25 years of age?

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-13

DR. HOHOL:

We have some, Mr. Speaker, that are beginning to develop as a support kind of information bank on which to make some judgments and decisions with respect to allocation of resources for unemployment, but it's not that sophisticated yet. But it's going to be, down the road. We're beginning to develop all kinds of data for Alberta and for regions of Alberta, both geographic, economic, and demographic.

MR. WILSON:

One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do your training programs make allowances for students who have been out of school for less than one year?

DR. HOHOL:

The retraining programs? Yes, Mr. Speaker, they do.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Calgary Millican followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Gas Exports

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question today to the hon. the Premier. The other day, in the question period, I asked him regarding the policy that has been debated outside the House that the Alberta Government is going to look with disfavour on any export of gas outside the province until producers in Alberta get a higher price. I wondered, owing to the fact there is so much publicity outside the legislature, if the Premier has given any indication to Trans-Canada Pipelines or some other transmission company that this was going to be the policy of the government? I understand, of course, the Premier claims he is going to announce the policy in about two weeks, but I wondered if he had given an indication to the companies that this was going to happen?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, it's a very timely question. I do have that policy statement to present to the House today on Orders of the Day. Perhaps after the hon. member has considered it overnight he may have a follow-up question that would fit within the ambit of that point.

Feed Lot Conditions

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment. Has your department carried out any studies on feed lot pollution this past summer? I believe you indicated at the spring session that this would be done.

MR. YURKO:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we used a number of summer students to conduct a pretty comprehensive study of feed lots this summer.

MR. SORENSON:

Supplementary. Could you tell us a little more about the results of this study?

MR. YURKO:

Just as a general statement. I might suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we found the conditions of feed lots pretty favourable. I think the report indicates that the people looking after feed lots have, to a large degree, handled themselves in a fairly good manner from an environmental standpoint. There are several that are creating some difficulties. We will review the report and perhaps table it next spring sometime.

76-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Have any feed lots been closed or been asked to close because of the study?

MR. YURKO:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

Social Assistance

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development and ask him if a survey was done by a private consulting firm on the government's position paper on social assistance?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is a matter which is in process at the present time. The background paper on public assistance was distributed through the department in August and our timetable calls for us to have the conclusions of the analysts who are working on that, and also doing a survey in conjunction with it, by about the end of the year.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary to the minister. Is it the government's intention to table in the legislature the results of that survey for the benefit of the public expenditure of funds?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, the public gets a great deal of benefit out of the manner in which public funds are being expended at the present time, compared with the historical situation, perhaps, Mr. Speaker. The answer is that the conclusions of the consultants will be submitted, first, after coming to my office, to the Task Force on Needs, Opportunities and Responsibilities of the Individual. I can't say whether or not the precise findings, as they are submitted, will ever be filed in the legislature but I certainly would be willing to give that every consideration.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

New Natural Gas Policies

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I have a very long and involved statement by the Alberta Government on natural gas policies. I felt that because of its nature and its importance that it would be desirable to present it while the legislature was in session. I realize that this is Thursday, but my schedule is taking me to Southern Alberta tomorrow and I hope, therefore, that I would have the leave of the House to make this presentation today because of its significance.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LOUGHEED:

The purpose of the statement -- and incidentally, Mr. Speaker, we will be having the statement distributed to the hon. members during the course of my remarks, so they can follow what I am about to say.

The purpose of this statement is to respond to the Energy Resources Conservation Board of Alberta "Report on Field Pricing of Gas in Alberta" which was released in late August, 1972, and also, to outline new Alberta natural gas policies.

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-15

At this time, however, it would be appropriate to briefly review important steps which have been taken by the new administration during the past year, and future plans concerning Alberta's natural resources.

With regard to Phase 1 of our administration, of course a new natural resource revenue plan for crude oil involving a five year period only, and some \$70 million, together with an exploratory drawing incentive system has already been launched.

In addition to that, we have commenced a review of existing policies regarding the export of natural gas from the province, and as a preliminary step the government requested the Alberta board to conduct a special hearing on the whole matter of field pricing, particularly from the point of view of the Alberta public interest.

During the period since assumption of office, the Alberta cabinet has held in abeyance approval of permits for increased removal of natural gas from the province, pending review of existing policies in light of current and anticipated conditions.

We have amended The Mines and Minerals Act to accelerate the turnover of petroleum and natural gas rights, to assist in stimulating exploration activity in the province. And the approval of the Syncrude application by cabinet, as mentioned in my earlier remarks, contained a number of important conditions.

Now in addition to all of this, there are a number of steps to be taken in the future, and it should be clear that the new administration in Alberta is in the process of conducting a complete review, and a substantial revision of natural resource policies for this energy-endowed province to establish new directions for the balance of the 1970's.

The government is developing a new natural resource revenue and royalty plan for natural gas; a new oil sands development policy; and new policy directions for coal, forest products and other natural resources.

Because these various policies are in the development stage it is premature to comment further on them at this time. There will naturally be consultation with industry on these matters prior to implementation.

In regard to the new natural resource revenue and royalty plan for natural gas, its timing of implementation and its content will be significantly influenced by the manner in which industry reacts to the Energy Resources Conservation Board recommendations on field pricing of gas in Alberta and to the positions of the Alberta Government as set forth in this statement.

With regard to the report of the board on natural gas, it was requested last January, and was the first such review ever undertaken in the province. The written submissions and evidence were presented to the hearings and the overall findings and recommendations were reflected in the board report. The government's initial view was that the report would clearly be in the Alberta public interest as would be the hearing, and we are very satisfied on that advise us on specific matters, and in particular that

"the Alberta Government has a responsibility to determine whether Alberta is receiving maximum benefit from the marketing of its natural gas outside the province, and has decided that the matter requires detailed review."

We therefore asked the board to look at four specific areas:

- (a) factors which influence field prices for natural gas and their suitability in the Alberta public interest;
- (b) the pricing provisions of present contracts for the purchase of natural gas for marketing outside the province and their suitability in the Alberta public interest;
- (c) present and anticipated field prices of natural gas in Alberta and their suitability in the Alberta public interest; and
- (d) possible modifications or alternatives to current practice affecting field price would enhance the benefit to all residents of the province.

The government is now in a position today to make a policy response to this report, a copy of which report I understand has been distributed to each member of the Legislative Assembly.

76-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

Mr. Speaker, this policy response today has important implications for the livelihood and for the quality of life of every Albertan. The report is of great significance to the citizens of Alberta for a number of reasons:

1. Natural gas is a depleting, a non-recurring natural resource; and about 80 per cent of the Alberta reserves are owned by the citizens of Alberta through their provincial government;
2. In 1971 Alberta provided 81 per cent of Canada's natural gas supply;
3. Alberta is currently permitting the removal of about 84 per cent of its annual natural gas production from the province. (In other words, for every cubic foot consumed in Alberta, five cubic feet are being exported from the province.)
4. The value of natural gas removed from Alberta in 1971, the previous year, was in the order of \$220 million at an average field price of 16 cents per Mcf. At a price of 31 cents per Mcf the value would be increased by \$206 million in that year.
5. The growth rate for removal from the province over the last period of 1968 to 1971 has averaged the very important and very significant growth figure of 16.3 per cent in each year. The production in 1972 (that's the total gas production in Alberta) would be more than double the production in 1967, in a period of five years.
6. In the administration of The Gas Resources Preservation Act, the board ensures that there are supplies of gas adequate to meet Alberta's growing requirements for a 30-year period before authorizing removal of gas from the province. In making that calculation, the board has regard both for established reserves of gas and the near-term trend in their growth in its appraisal of these supplies.
7. In 1971 we permitted the removal of about 3 per cent of that surplus reserve. The cash flow, of course, goes to both the Alberta government, in the form of royalties and also to producers, in terms of further exploration. In 1971 royalties from gas and gas products amounted together to a figure of \$36 million.
8. Out of a total labour force in Alberta of 696,000 people, over one-third are directly or indirectly employed by this industry.
9. Here is an important point -- there is no prorating of natural gas in Alberta, so production for removal from the province is dependent upon Cabinet approval of permits for export, and you are dealing with supply contracts usually negotiated for a long-term periods of between 20 to 25 years.
10. There has been no Alberta Government control over the price of gas sold for removal from the province, although the Alberta Public Utilities Board has the power to control the price at the wellhead of natural gas produced for consumption within the province.
11. The price at which Alberta gas is ultimately distributed to the consumer in Eastern Canada or to the United States is rigidly controlled by various other government regulatory authorities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, and members of the Legislative Assembly, the statement has attached to it Appendix (b) but I am sure that hon. members have all had reference to the board's important findings and recommendations, and I want to give the government's response to that.

With regard to factors which influence field prices and their suitability in the Alberta public interest -- the government fully concurs with all the findings and all the recommendations as set forth in the report. However, the government is of the view that in addition to increased competition in the buying of Alberta natural gas, a strong position by the Alberta Government in support of higher prices for natural gas leaving the province will have a significant impact. It should be noted that the government has shifted its emphasis, since November, 1971, from merely supporting increased export markets, to an emphasis on the pricing aspects of gas being removed from the province.

The government is also watching with interest the recent action by Pan-Alberta Gas Ltd., which has been sponsored by the Alberta Gas Trunk Line Co. Ltd., for the purchase and resale of excess natural gas in Alberta over a five-year period.

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-17

Now secondly with regard to the report, and regarding the pricing provisions of present contracts for the purchase of natural gas for marketing outside the province and their suitability in the Alberta public interest; the government fully concurs with all the findings of the board and in particular with item (d), that the inclusion of price redetermination provisions in gas purchase contracts are essential to the public interest. The government fully concurs with and endorses all the board's recommendations in this part, including, in particular, that

immediate price redetermination if action by the Canadian government or the exporter results in an increased export price for the gas from Canada.

And here is something very important -- the government, although concurring with the board's recommendations regarding frequency of price redetermination is of the view that the price should be renegotiated every second year.

The board has suggested that, if the government concurs in their recommendations, "producers and buyers would pattern future negotiations and contract provisions accordingly. And in this regard, the government is prepared to provide producers and buyers in Alberta an opportunity to review, re-open, and amend those subsisting contracts which do not contain satisfactory price redetermination provisions. The government urges producers and buyers to accelerate negotiation of price redetermination on all subsisting contracts.

The government has decided on a new policy to involve the board in matters of pricing and hereby requests the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board to require purchasers of gas for extra-provincial markets to file with the board particulars of the pricing provisions relating to all new contracts and all amendments or redetermination made to subsisting contracts for the purchase of gas in Alberta. This information will remain confidential to the board and to representatives of the government.

There is one case where the government does not concur with the board's findings and recommendations. That has to do with a suggestion regarding timing and we have requested the board by April of 1973, and annually thereafter, to provide the government with progress reports as to the extent to which new contracts and amendments to existing contracts reflect the pricing provisions herewith endorsed by the government.

In the third area, regarding present and anticipated field prices of natural gas in Alberta and their suitability in the Alberta public interest, the government fully concurs with the findings of the board in all respects, and in two very important particulars:

The current average field price for gas in Alberta is some 16 cents per Mcf, or less than the field value by at least [and I underline the words 'at least'] 10 cents per Mcf, and thus the current field price is not in the Alberta public interest (paragraph 11.41,a).

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the current field price is less than 60 per cent of the current field value.

For gas under contract without provision for early price redetermination, the future price will not be adequate, and not be in the Alberta public interest unless these contracts are suitably amended.

Although not specifically reviewed in the board's report, the board's practice of ensuring 30 years' protection for Alberta's own domestic gas requirements before authorizing removal of gas from the province is also confirmed and endorsed by the government today.

Mr. Speaker, the next major part of this report, after dealing with its significance, and dealing with our direct response to the Energy Resources Conservation Board's findings and recommendations, is that in Chapter 10 they raise the question of possible modifications or alternatives to current practice affecting field price which would benefit the citizens of the province. As part of this discussion the board outlines the advantages and also the disadvantages of a two-price system for natural gas, alternatively the advantages and disadvantages of a subsidy to selected industries. The board did not pass judgment on either a two-price system or industry subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, a two-price system for gas is a system where the ultimate cost for Alberta gas, delivered to Alberta consumers, would be maintained at a lower level than prices for Alberta gas exported from the province.

76-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

There are three really basic alternative courses of action available to Alberta regarding the issue of the export of gas from the province.

First we could continue with the past policy of a completely "hands-off" position in any involvement in price and allow larger and larger volumes of this depleting asset to be removed below its fair value -- and hence, in our view, fail in the government's responsibility to the people to properly administer their resources.

Or secondly, we could cut back on the amount of gas allowed for export from the province significantly, and accept the probability of substantially increased unemployment in the province as well as greatly reduced revenues to the government in order to provide needed services to the people.

Or thirdly, we could exercise pressure on the price of natural gas so that the people, through their provincial government would receive a fair and reasonable share and at the same time, as the return to the petroleum industry within the province improves, create conditions which would, in our view, expand job opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, obviously the government's feeling is that the last course of action is the only logical alternative for Alberta. It raises, however, the critical question of whether or not, in addition, the government should institute some form of two-price policy for gas so that Albertans who own the gas have the extra benefit of lower than average cost for this desirable fuel.

Mr. Speaker, we're not going to study it anymore. We're not going to delay in any sense, because today, on November 16th, 1972, the government has concluded as a policy decision that Albertans should forthwith have a two-price system for natural gas.

Mr. Speaker, this decision is taken with the full knowledge of its ramifications and its consequences. Therefore, in addition to striving for a fair price for the sale of the natural gas it essentially owns, the Alberta Government will design a plan to offset most of the impact of increased prices for this energy source upon Alberta consumers. We believe that the mandate we received from the people of Alberta was a mandate to make major changes in policy and direction which would benefit the people of Alberta. We intend to make such changes, and this is one of those changes!

Mr. Speaker, even at this short brief time as a result of the steps we initiated last January -- only a few months ago -- new contracts for gas supply being offered in Alberta today are for prices significantly higher than those contained in the former contracts -- although still far below fair value. We intend to continue this effort until we are satisfied that the gas owned by the people, removed forever from this province, is paid for at a price which is fair to the citizens of this province.

Mr. Speaker, the government has reached this decision in part as a result of the board's cost-benefit analysis that by 1975 some \$200 million per year would be the improvement to the people of Alberta, and also the board's finding that the Alberta public interest would certainly be benefitted if field prices for natural gas be increased to the field value.

The board has concluded that the current average field price for gas in Alberta is substantially less than the field value and that such a situation is not in the Alberta public interest. This finding illustrates the magnitude of the sales of our depleting and our non-renewable assets which are leaving the province, and have been leaving the province over the last few years, at less than its fair value. The effect of this abnormally low price for the sale of Alberta gas up to this date has, in our view, had an adverse effect on the extent to which new gas reserves have been discovered in this province in order to replace the depletion of the gas going out in ever larger quantities.

The government notes that, unlike gasoline refined from Alberta crude oil -- where apparent competition exists under the free enterprise system -- Alberta consumers of natural gas are denied any choice of a purchase outlet, and Alberta natural gas distributors are supplying natural gas at prices regulated by the Alberta Public Utilities Board.

The government has, therefore, concluded it will take such action as is necessary to assure that Alberta consumers of Alberta natural gas will not be significantly burdened by the consequences of higher prices, even though Alberta citizens will benefit many times over if the higher prices occur.

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-19

Mr. Speaker, the government also notes the suggestion of the City of Edmonton for a residential gas rebate, presumably comparable to the existing homeowner tax rebate plan for property taxes, and is giving further consideration to this suggestion.

The government is also aware, Mr. Speaker, that there are some 15 per cent of Alberta households still not enjoying the benefits of natural gas and has already announced its intention of embarking upon an extensive five-year program of reducing the number of Alberta households not having the benefit of this clean fuel. These new policies announced today will significantly improve the prospects of economical fuel costs for rural Albertans. Indeed, without such policies the whole question of substantially expanding the provision of natural gas in the rural areas -- particularly in areas of low density population -- would not be feasible. With this announcement, plans can now proceed on a logical and orderly basis to expand natural gas service to many more rural Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, it is our view that past policies in natural gas have tended to thwart the growth of job opportunities in this province by failing, as a province, to take advantage of the benefits of this particular fuel, both in itself and as a feedstock in such a way as to create a competitive advantage for Alberta industry to compete with industries in Central Canada already enjoying the unfair advantage of inequitable transportation rates. Mr. Speaker, this administration is determined to work to overcome this unsatisfactory situation.

I would like to point out to the hon. members that our assessment and the board's study is that the rapid increase in volumes to Eastern Canada has been primarily for industrial and commercial, rather than residential users. The government concludes that past policies have permitted eastern industrial plants to be subsidized by cheap Alberta gas and hence hold back industrial development in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, the government is presently designing the details of a proposed rebate system for Alberta natural gas consumers. The objectives of the system would be to shelter residents, commercial establishments and industries from the effects of significant gas price increases caused by the increasing value of Alberta gas in markets outside of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, such a system would be designed to protect Alberta consumers from the effect of gas price increases beyond those which would normally be expected due to rising costs and inflation.

Our follow-up as a government to this statement today would be the following:

- (a) to complete the design of the details of the proposed two-price rebate system for gas.
- (b) to assess the adequacy of the response to these new policies by the purchasers removing natural gas from Alberta.
- (c) to assess pending and future permits for export of gas from the province in light of this policy statement.
- (d) to proceed with the design of expanded rural natural gas systems.
- (e) to finalize a new natural gas revenue and royalty plan for the province, and
- (f) To proceed with establishing other new energy policies, including an oil sands development policy.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, what does it all mean to Albertans, to our citizens, and to our families? It means Albertans' fuel costs will be the lowest in Canada. It means Albertans, through their government, will start to receive a fair price for their natural gas taken out of the province. It means that Alberta's economy will become more competitive with the rest of North America and this should improve job opportunities for our citizens. It means Albertans improving the prospects of finding the yet undiscovered new gas reserves in this province as an asset for our people.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the Government of Alberta believes that this policy statement today is not only in the best interests of Albertans, but benefits all Canadians, as it is an appropriate forward step in developing a new national industrial strategy based upon growth.

76-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of our leader who is speaking at the municipal convention, may I have your permission to make one or two remarks?

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it that the hon. Opposition House Leader has the consent of the House?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, hon. members of the House. I'm very happy to make one or two comments on the very important statement made by the Premier of the province. I'd like to deal with it from one or two angles, first of all in regard to the benefits that will accrue to the people of Alberta from an asset which belongs to the people of Alberta -- at least 80 per cent of it belongs to the people of Alberta.

The people of Alberta for some time have had reason to worry and be concerned about the price of natural gas outside of the boundaries of the Province of Alberta. This has been very evident when natural gas has been exported to other parts of Canada and other parts of other countries, and used for industrial purposes which not only worked against the export of another fuel that we have, namely coal, but also was a little unfair to the industries in Alberta that decided to use coal instead of natural gas. When we have a fuel like natural gas that is depletable and non-recurring, I think that it is very important that its uses be planned very carefully by the governments who have some control over it. I, for one, for a long time have felt that natural gas should not be used in many industrial plants in this province, but when it is being used for similar purposes outside the province, it left little argument to proceed with.

Now I think in the light of what the hon. Premier has said today that the price of natural gas, if raised to a better level, will not only give Alberta people a better price, but will also be a factor in making industrial use of natural gas in other parts of Canada and the United States a questionable item as compared to the use of coal. This could very well lead not only to a revitalization of the coal industry for industrial purposes in this province, but could perhaps achieve one of the long-term objectives of the coal industry and the people of Alberta generally, in trying to export our coal to other parts of Canada particularly, and as well to parts of the United States.

The methods of controlling the price is something that we will have to review from time to time as they are announced, but I think we can say that the policy of having someone else control the price within the boundaries of Alberta was unsound and is unsound. When the National Energy Board, a few years ago, wanted to have something to say about the wellhead price of gas within Alberta, the then administration fought this vehemently and I think successfully; for that authority should only rest with the government of the Province of Alberta. The action being taken to get higher prices outside Alberta, I think is a very excellent one indeed.

I can see why there may be some worry created in eastern provinces and in the United States, but on the other hand, we have had a worry in this province for many years as to why we haven't been getting manufacturing and industry here. One reason has been the favourable freight rates in Eastern Canada and the very unfavourable freight rates for people in this part of the world. And now I think it will make it abundantly clear to the Canadian government and to the governments of other provinces that Alberta is sincere in wanting industrialization in this province and that we, as Canadians, are not content to have our industries located largely in Eastern Canada.

In connection with the two price system, I would like to say that I have been a believer in this for many years and I commend the government on taking the action. I think there is every reason for the people of Alberta to expect to get the best possible price from their own product. I would urge the government to make sure that perhaps we not only hold the prices at what they are today, if at all possible, but even give the people a better price if that is feasible and possible too. I think this is important; this is something belonging to the people of Alberta, and I can see no reason why the people of Alberta cannot establish a price within this province for a product that is

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-21

going to be used by the people of the province, and at the same time establish a price for those outside of the province who want to buy our product. Surely if there is any reason in free enterprise and public business today at all, that point will be recognized that those who own the item that is to be sold should certainly have some say in regard to what that price will be.

I am very glad to see the adoption of a two-price system for natural gas. I hope that this, as the details are unfolded, will give our people a very, very excellent price and, as the hon. the Premier said, 'the lowest price in Canada.' It should be the lowest price in Canada and the people have every reason to expect it to be the lowest price in Canada.

I was also very happy with the statement that there would also be the 30-year protection for Alberta consumers, and I don't think it would be out of the way to commend a former Albertan and a very able man, a man who made a great contribution in this province in the person of the former Minister of Mines and Minerals, Nathan Tanner, when he recommended to the legislature the 30-year protection period. I am glad to see that this is being followed through. I think when people are making an investment to use natural gas, they have to have some assurance that natural gas will be available for a good number of years to come, and 30 years is certainly not too long.

But in addition to that protection, the suggestion that more and more people are going to be given the opportunity to hook on to natural gas and make use of natural gas, I think is a very excellent program. There are many, many people in this province today who want natural gas and who would like to have natural gas and there appears to have been some resistance on the part of some of the companies in making this available for reasons of their own. I certainly can say, without any hesitation, that our leader and the hon. members on this side of the House, will support every possible program that will give the people of Alberta an opportunity to use this excellent fuel to the greatest possible degree, and I would hope that that 85 per cent who apparently are using it today, based on the Premier's statement, will increase to at least 95 and 97 per cent within a very short time. I think it is feasible, if we set out our minds to do that, to give the people that benefit.

There is one other point I would like to mention and this is a sore point too with many Albertans. When they travel in their automobiles and trucks to British Columbia and Saskatchewan, they are able to buy retail gas from the tanks at a lower price per gallon than they pay in the Province of Alberta. I think they have every reason to be frustrated and angry and concerned. I can see no reason for this. I can see every reason for the price going up in other places where they are importing our natural gas, but I can't see any reason why the people of Alberta should be stuck with a higher price for gasoline from the pumps than those who are importing our gas, and perhaps processing it within their own province.

I would like to see the government take a very firm stand in connection with establishing and maintaining the lowest price per gallon of gasoline also, because now, when there are so many factors coming into the use of automobiles, reducing every year the number of miles per gallon secured from each gallon of gasoline, I think it is most important we hold that price down to the very lowest possible figure.

The points raised by the hon. Premier in connection with discovery, I think are important. I think it is important to encourage more discovery of natural gas until we are satisfied that we have discovered every bit available in the Province of Alberta, and then of course, make sure too, that we make proper use of that natural gas and not simply flare it up in order to make greater profits today, because that certainly would be unfair to future generations.

Generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the statement by the hon. the Premier, I think, will bring delight to hundreds of Albertans. We will watch with interest the unfolding of the programs that will put these things into effect, and the effects I think every Albertan can expect to secure are, number one, greater industrialization, more secondary industry, the lowest price for natural gas, the expansion of natural gas to be used by many, many other farmers and people who do not now have the advantage and, of course, the lowest possible price for retailed gasoline as well.

MR. DIXON:

Could I ask the hon. the Premier a question for clarification? There was just one subject you didn't touch on -- the effect of major gas coming from the Northwest Territories and as far away as the Arctic Islands in Alaska, as it comes through Alberta. This would have a bearing on the 30 year rolling supply

76-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

for our own people as well as the price differential. I wondered if the government had given any consideration to the future effects of that system because it will be a decision as to whether gas will be exported earlier from Alberta, even at the higher price.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately that is a very complicated subject and I would like perhaps to give some thought to it, and to a place where I could more appropriately respond to the hon. member's question. I do believe it does need some response. Perhaps as we conclude the fall session with regard to Motion No. 1, I could come back to it. It is not something I would like to deal with in a very brief way, Mr. Speaker -- in answer to a question -- because I think it does have ramifications.

I would like to just say this: I don't think it affects this policy. It certainly makes it important that this policy be implemented now. It affects the timing of the policy. In other words, if this policy had been announced, say, 4 or 5 years from now, I think its impact and its effect would be much less. But I think the fact that it is put forward to the people of Alberta in 1972, that we are looking, at the very best, for the gas pipeline to be in operation in 1978 -- and there are many who question whether or not that will happen -- quite clearly the time for the Province of Alberta to establish its position on the policy is as quickly as possible, and in 1972. I know that doesn't fully answer the question raised by the hon. member, and I would like to take it as notice and find a way to respond to him in further detail.

MR. SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER:

May I just revert for a moment to the discussion we had in the House yesterday concerning the admissibility or propriety of referring in debate to the report of the committee which studied communal property. I think perhaps there was some misunderstanding about that. Although the report has not been received and concurred in, it certainly has been tabled, and I think, perhaps, we might have been misapplying Beauchesne to some extent. Citation 326, which says that a report is considered final only when adopted refers to the report of a Standing Committee. On reflection it must necessarily be so, because the Standing Committee continues to exist. The Special Committee, however, appears to be, as the lawyers say, 'functus' once it has given its report as requested by the House. In other words, the House asks the committee to make a report, and when the committee has made that report the committee has no further function. It would have to be revived by the House in order to have any further function in regard to that report. In this connection I would respectfully refer hon. members to Citation 286 on page 236 of Beauchesne.

I would, therefore, rule that in the debate on the bill there should be no hesitation to refer to the report -- it has been tabled in the House -- to comment on its contents, and to use its information in any proper way in the course of the debate.

QUESTIONS

Wetaskiwin AGT Staff

233. Mr. Henderson asked the government the following question, which was answered as indicated:

Will the minister explain, in the light of the government's stated policy of decentralization of public services, the centralization of A.G.T. services which has or will result in reduction of A.G.T. staff in the City of Wetaskiwin.

Answer:

It is the government of Alberta's stated policy to decentralize public services where it is technically and economically practical.

A certain amount of judicious centralization, however, through the effective utilization of new technology, has enabled Alberta Government Telephones to keep its rates down to the point where it has required only one general rate increase in over 40 years.

A number of years ago, Alberta Government Telephones began replacing the old manually operated local switchboards with automatic equipment connected to the larger centres. If this had not been done, it is estimated that every woman

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-23

in the province between the ages of 18 and 65 would now have to be employed as a switchboard operator, and that the cost of even a local telephone call might, in many cases, be prohibitive.

Direct distance dialing and the recentering of toll offices to the larger cities have similarly been making possible the handling of rapidly increasing numbers of long distance calls in a manner that is technically and economically practical. Direct distance dialing provides customers with the convenience of direct dialing, and it maintains a high degree of accuracy in the routing, timing, and billing of calls. Customers, by dialing their own calls, realize substantial reductions in long distance rates.

The efficiencies and economies realized through direct distance dialing, moreover, make possible the introduction of other sought-after services such as extended area service. Extended area service, in turn, still further reduces the justification for toll centres in the smaller cities by reducing the number of operator-handled calls.

The viability of the toll centres is ultimately determined by their size, their volume of traffic, and their traffic patterns. Operating costs for the small toll centres are much higher than those for the larger centres, as the size of the centres goes down, their efficiency goes down also.

The introduction of direct distance dialing, the recentering of toll offices to the larger cities, and changing trends in calling patterns all tend to reduce the number of calls requiring operator assistance. As this process continues, the consolidation of toll centres becomes increasingly imperative, both from a technical and an economic point of view.

The efficiencies and economies realized through direct distance dialing and centralization keeps the basic rates down, provides efficient service, and, in many ways, assist the residents of rural Alberta to achieve a quality of life that they could not otherwise afford. Also, the reasonable rates and efficient service assist in the decentralization of public services in rural Alberta.

Alberta Transportation Needs Study

240. Mr. Wilson asked the government the following question:

What 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, arising out of O.C. 2125/71?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Clarence Copithorne, that question no. 240 be made a Motion for a Return.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. minister wish to suggest that the question become a Motion for a Return or an Order for a Return?

MR. PEACOCK:

A Motion for a Return, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

In that event all that is required under our rule is the hon. minister's consent to the question.

Registered Retirement Savings Plans

241. Mr. Wilson asked the government the following question, which was answered as indicated:

1. Has any application been made since September 10, 1972, by the provincial government, to have Provincial Treasury Branch Term Saving Certificates accepted as investments under Registered Retirement Savings Plans?

Answer:

No.

76-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

2. Do any Alberta Government Investment vehicles qualify as Registered Retirement Savings Plans? If so, what are they?

Answer:

No

Government Vehicle Insurance

243. Mr. Notley asked the government the following question, which was answered as indicated:

1. What criteria did the government use in the selection of the five companies called together to obtain insurance on the government vehicle fleet?
2. When the government decided to select five experienced firms to assess the government's insurance needs, why was Farrell Agencies not asked to take part?

Answer: (1 & 2)

When the Provincial Treasurer enquired regarding past practice in renewing the automobile fleet and learned that:

(a) Tendering had not proven satisfactory in the past nor did sufficient time exist to tender by the expiry date of the policy,

(b) O.C. 1699 in 1962 had specifically rejected the low tender and appointed Farrell Agencies, the only firm which had placed the insurance for 22 years,

(c) The entire area of government insurance had been poorly handled, was fragmented and the automobile fleet had not been properly rated for several years,

it was obvious that a new approach to insurance was required. Therefore, the five firms, who all were known to be experienced and competent and provided a good cross section of large and small firms in industry, were asked to act as advisors on government insurance. The immediate and pressing matter, due to rapid expiry of the policy, was the automobile fleet. They were to act in the following manner on the renewal of the automobile fleet:

- (a) Determine the most suitable and economical insurance coverage on the province's automobile fleet, including in the future the possibility of self-insuring the fleet.
- (b) Renew the insurance for the immediate period, since time did not allow for alternative courses of action in the shorter term.

The advisory committee, due to the time factor, renewed the insurance contract with Guardian Insurance Co. for the 1971-72 period.

The advisory committee was not to be paid for its services, but rather could in its discretion determine each firm's share of any commission which Guardian Insurance Co. might pay. In the insurance industry, a commission must be paid by the insurer, which runs from 10% to 15%. In the case of the automobile fleet, the commission must be paid by the insurer, Guardian Insurance Co.

3. What criteria were used by the government in selecting Reed Shaw Osler Ltd., as supervising broker?

Answer

- (a) After several months operation of the advisory committee, it became obvious to the government and to the advisory committee that the only firm which had the staff capacity and placement ability to examine all areas of government insurance along with the Treasury Department was Reed Shaw Osler Ltd., the largest Alberta and Canadian insurance broker.
- (b) The wisdom of this choice was proven when upon renewal of the automobile fleet for the 1972-73 contract period the total cost to the Province was reduced from \$189,562 to \$162,000, even though 1,111 more units were insured. The cost per unit therefore decreased from \$52.82 to \$34.46 per unit.

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-25

- (c) Finally, while it was desirable to have achieved these savings in 1971-72, time was of the essence. The Provincial Treasurer was concerned that the policy would expire and the Province be left unprotected on the automobiles.
4. What is the estimated cost of Reed Shaw Osler Ltd., services for the duration of its first annual term of appointment?

Answer

Reed Shaw Osler are not to receive remuneration for their services. As "Agents of Record" on the automobile fleet, they will receive commissions from Guardian Insurance Co., which must be paid.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

Therapeutic Abortions

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

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:

Part 3 of the question refers to dates, and if we can change them by one month, from October 1, 1971, to September 30, 1972, because the reporting in this work is done on a quarterly basis, then I would be in a position to accept the motion and to file the answer to the amended motion forthwith.

MR. SPEAKER:

To save formality, with the consent of the mover and the seconder and the unanimous consent of the House, the motion may be amended in that manner.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

76-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

ARR-CNR Agreement

242. Mr. Strom proposed the following motion to the assembly, seconded by Mr. Anderson.

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

- (1) Copies of agreement between the Board of Directors of the Alberta Resources Railway Corporation and representatives of the Canadian National Railway, dated October 1st, 1965, and subsequent agreements, dated January 25th, 1967, and June 9th, 1967.
- (2) Copies of Addenda 3, 4, and 5, attached to the letter of the Alberta Provincial Treasurer to the chairman and president of Canadian National Railways, dated February 22nd, 1971.
- (3) Minutes of meetings of the Alberta Resources Railway Board for the period of January to September 1971 inclusive, including letter mentioned therein from Mr. Manning and a script of a tape-recorded interview with Mr. Roger Graham.

MR. STROM:

I move Motion 242 standing in my name on the Order Paper.

[The motion was carried]

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the information for Motion for Return No. 242.

AGT Contracts

245. Mr. Ludwig proposed the following motion to the assembly, seconded by Mr. Dixon.

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

- (1) Is the tender system of awarding contracts used by Alberta Government Telephones?
- (2) Who is responsible to the Minister of Telephones and Utilities for the awarding of contracts by A.G.T.?
- (3) Has the minister given instructions for the awarding of contracts on a cost plus basis?
- (4) Who determines when an A.G.T. contract is tendered and when it is offered on a cost plus basis?
- (5) Please give the amounts of contracts, dates, and names of contractors to whom cost plus contracts have been awarded since September 10th, 1971.
- (6) Please table all correspondence received by the government and replies to said correspondence dealing with A.G.T. contracts since September 10th, 1971.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move Motion 245 standing in my name on the Order Paper, seconded by the hon. member, Mr. Dixon. And I would like to make a few remarks concerning the motion.

I believe that, as Minister of Public Works in the former government, one of the most sacred things in the matter of awarding contracts is the public tender system, which has been developed to a state of certain perfection that resulted in other provinces and other areas asking us for the manner in which tendering is conducted by us. It was a system that is certainly supported by all those in government. Very few people have seen fit to criticize it; it was by-and-large fool-proof. Tenders were opened in public, and the construction industry knew that even though some may not have liked it, it was a fair system. And that is the attitude I have towards the awarding of contracts in all government departments. There should be very few exceptions. I will admit that there have been cases where a cost-plus contract has been awarded for very special reasons, but that should be the exception rather than the rule. I'm not suggesting any type of impropriety in the Alberta Government Telephones, but my

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-27

concern sprang from the fact that the hon. minister stated that he does not sign contracts. In my opinion, I am not concerned what the previous government did; I'm concerned with what I want to see happen now.

I'm of the opinion that the ultimate responsibility in spending government funds rests with the minister, otherwise we'll have the run-around as to the fact that someone else did it and perhaps the minister can be absolved of anything that may not be in the public interest. As I've stated, I'm not making any allegations of impropriety. I believe as a member of the opposition that it is our responsibility and our duty to see that these things are brought to the attention of the House and of the public, and that we should have an on-going vigilance as to how these things are handled.

I believe, in putting this question before the House, and that is exactly what I'm doing, as I consider it a bounden responsibility to do this -- and I will continue to do this in other areas as circumstances may warrant.

I'm asking for all the correspondence received by the government and replies to said correspondence dealing with all Alberta Government Telephones contracts since September 10, 1971, for two reasons. One is to see what has, in fact, transpired, whether there has been a change in policy, whether cost-plus contracts have been awarded. And I have a strong aversion to any cost-plus contract being awarded unless it happens to be based on solid reasons which the government can answer to immediately, and not have to launch an inquiry as to whether someone in the Department of Telephones has perhaps awarded a cost-plus contract.

So for these reasons I'm casting absolutely no reflection on the minister or the department. I believe that this information is in the public interest and should be provided as fully as the hon. minister is able so that we know exactly what is going on in the Department of Telephones. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment to the motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are copies of this amendment available for the Chair and for the two House Leaders?

MR. FARRAN:

I've got three. Will one do? It's only amending a date -- from 1971 to 1969 -- it doesn't take long to copy it.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, may I make a suggestion that that is an entirely new question. The hon. member can put a question on the Order Paper for that information. If he wishes to, if he is not stopped, he may put all the questions he likes.

DR. HORNER:

There's nothing wrong with the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is some question regarding the propriety of the amendment. If the hon. members would refer to citation 171 of Beauchesne, in one of the sub-headings there is a stricture against raising matters of past history for the sake of argument.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. That citation surely doesn't apply to motions requesting documents or reports, and I'm sure that it doesn't. The amendment is a simple one to expand the motion. If the amendment was one to restrict the hon. member's motion -- but here we're attempting to get all the information -- and to do that, my hon. friend from Calgary North Hill is expanding the motion to include additional information, so the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View can do the job he set out for himself.

76-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the point of order. You could see the folly in following the advice of the hon. Deputy Premier. As I stated, you could have all kinds of questions -- he could go all the way to 1935 on this if he wishes. It's his government. I'm concerned about the area in which my responsibility rests, and if somebody else wants to get on the wave length, let him do his own homework and place his own questions.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the point of order and the amendment. It seemed to me the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View made the point that he wanted to determine whether there had been a change in policy. Well surely you don't see a change in policy by starting where a new administration takes over; you see a change in policy obviously when you flow across the change of administration. It strikes me then that the hon. member has come up with an excellent idea so that all people can see -- is there a change in policy? He may have had some idea of what the old policy was; Mr. Speaker, but I even doubt that. It seems, though, to me, that this obviously gives us the chance to assess the very thing that he made a speech to the House requesting.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, apparently everybody is informed on this issue on the other side except the hon. minister responsible. Perhaps he should say this and he can elaborate when he gives the answer or debates this motion. Everybody is an expert on telephones except the minister who should speak on this. But, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection, if the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill wishes to go all the way back to the beginning it is no concern of mine.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You're out of order, Albert!

MR. SPEAKER:

The observations of the hon. Deputy Premier, in the opinion of the Chair, are well founded, in that citation 171 does not apply to Motions for a Return. And I know of no other prohibition in the rules or in Beauchesne which would indicate the amendment to be improper, and I must, therefore, rule that it is in order.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I should commend the hon. Deputy Premier. This is the first time he's been right since I've known him.

MR. COOKSON:

One up on him!

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment, I would like to make a sub-amendment to the amendment, if it is going --

MR. SPEAKER:

I think perhaps we should see whether the mover and seconder of the amendment wish to enter the debate. Under our rules the seconder may not speak unless he speaks immediately after the mover.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, we just have one observation. Presumably digging out all this sort of information is a costly business, answering all these --[Interjections] Now just a minute. While they're at it, they might as well do an exhaustive job. I mean, if it is going to cost some \$4,000 or \$5,000 to find the information that the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View wants, then it should be done in a way where it can make sense and see if there have been any drastic changes in AGT policy. So we feel that we could probably get better value for the money spent if we did broaden this motion to this degree.

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-29

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill might answer the question of the hon. Opposition House Leader as to the date which he wishes to insert at the end of Motion No. 245.

MR. FARRAN:

Wherever the figures '1971' appear, we amend the motion to read '1969'.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed!

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any further debate on the amendment?

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I frankly can't see anything wrong with the amendment. If cost-plus contracts were let by the previous administration without sound reason, it wouldn't be any better than if cost-plus contracts were let by the present administration. Cost-plus contracts have always been viewed rather seriously as far as I'm concerned. While the former Minister of Telephones is no longer in the House, I can't see anything wrong with us finding out whether AGT has been in the practice of letting cost-plus contracts with or without the knowledge of the minister, before and now. So I really think that the amendment is a good one.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to close the debate on the amendment. May I? Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill expressed some concern about costs. That is why if they want to go into the background of everything, they are entitled to do that. I don't object to it. In fact, I would favour it. But they must then not turn around and say that the motion I placed is costing the government \$5,000 or \$6,000. I am interested in that part for which I am responsible as an opposition member. The hon. members in the opposition had ample time to review public accounts and to review everything. I believe we should go further a few years back because I don't believe they did their job as well as they alleged they did. So perhaps we could help them out in that regard, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The amendment was carried.]

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any further discussion on the motion as amended?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few comments before this motion is passed. The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View suggested in his brief statements that there was no impropriety here. I would just question if he wanted the podium and had to stand up and speak to 75 members, then certainly he was questioning impropriety. I would like to acquaint him with a few facts of life regarding Alberta Government Telephones. AGT has over \$200 million worth of purchases a year, and if he suggests for one moment that --

76-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order. If the hon. member is stating that I allege impropriety, then he is entirely out of order --

AN HON. MEMBER:

What's your point of order?

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. minister please resume his seat while the hon. member states his point of order?

MR. LUDWIG:

I made it quite clear that I am not at all alleging any impropriety on the part of this department, and if I created that impression I did not want to. I made it clear that I was not. I really don't understand what you're so sensitive about. He's creating the impression himself now that I did, but I deny it. I went out of my way to emphasize the fact that I'm not, but I'm entitled to this information and I will get it.

MR. WERRY:

I accept his apology, Mr. Speaker. But the mere fact that he did have to stand up on his band box and make a few remarks, I suggest raises a reasonable doubt as to the propriety of the purchasing department and also the minister responsible for Alberta Government Telephones. Therefore, I would like to make a few remarks, if he doesn't mind.

In the normal course of operations of Alberta Government Telephones over a year, in one year's operations there are over \$200 million worth of purchases made both for capital and operating expenditures. If he for one minute thinks that I have nothing else to do but sign purchase orders, it would take me nothing but 24 hours a day, seven days a week, in order to sign those same purchase orders. I would like to assure him that there is adequate security for the purchasing department that is responsible to the AGT Commission.

The security, Mr. Speaker, is the following: the purchasing department's methods and procedures are first of all audited by auditors of the Alberta Government Telephones.

Secondly, Alberta Government Telephones operations are subject to audit by the Provincial Treasurer, or you could say the provincial auditor, so that not only is the purchasing department responsible to itself, but it has two additional checks placed on that department, and I think the member should be aware of some of the things that are there for protection to ensure that the low bidder does, in fact, get the bids in almost every case.

Now I have reason to believe that he is on a bit of a witch hunt with regard to the two sub-contracts that were let in the Calgary area for underground buried cable programs that took place late in September. With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would be only too glad to provide the hon. member the information he has requested.

MR. LUDWIG:

My I close the debate on the motion, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks made by the hon. minister, and I believe that he is defending a system that was pretty well worked out. I am not concerned about that portion of the contract letting that doesn't deal with purchase orders or small matters -- I know there are thousands of them. I'm concerned about the contracts for works projects primarily, and anything else that is of a major nature.

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-31

I'm well aware of the strict control of spending by government in all departments. I would make no allegations at all as to impropriety, and I hope that if I was misunderstood, I certainly did not wish to be so. I'm concerned about the bigger contracts. I'm concerned to see whether the cost-plus contracts -- if they are awarded -- are fairly awarded. I would appreciate it if the minister wished to elaborate in his answer. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[The motion as amended was carried.]

Government Advertising

246. Mr. Ludwig proposed the following motion, seconded by Mr. Wilson:

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

(1) How much money has been spent on government advertising since September 10th, 1971. Please itemize all advertising expenditures by the Government of Alberta, naming all individuals and agencies to which funds have been paid.

(2) Who is responsible for awarding of government advertising contracts in the Publicity Bureau?

(3) How much has been paid to Art Smith of Calgary, Alberta, or to any association or firm with which he is associated, for advertising since September 10th, 1971?

(4) Please table all correspondence dealing with government advertising and advertising by any government agencies, since September 10th, 1971.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I move Motion No. 246 standing in my name on the Order Paper, seconded by Mr. Wilson.

I wish to also make a few remarks about this motion, Mr. Speaker. I'm a little puzzled about the fact that when I gave a straightforward question to the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs I was immediately told to put it on the Order Paper. I somehow resisted that idea, but the majority and your ruling, Mr. Speaker, prevailed.

My surprise was that he was apparently bursting with enthusiasm to give an answer and then he came up and read an answer, purportedly to my question, but it wasn't too relevant because the information was on too narrow a field, and it was too restricted. So he, in fact, took the time of the House and I don't really know why. When I wanted an answer he said, "No, put it on the Order Paper." When he insisted, I said, "Let's have the whole load at once. Let's not fritter this thing away."

I'm not suspicious of anything in this department too much except the tight-lipped attitude of the hon. minister when I asked the question. That is the kind of thing that prompts me to open the thing up and say, "Let's have the goods." He came up and he dropped only part of the load. I did suggest to him that we are going to want much more. We may as well let them know that this kind of an issue, bearing in mind that the government has become obsessed or prepossessed with its own publicity and image, the opposition has to watch and watch carefully. When I mentioned Art Smith, it was not to cast any reflection on him but this has been a subject matter of discussion in public. And furthermore, I understand now that he has given a list of a lot of corporations that have advertising and I will be, perhaps, pursuing that a bit further.

I am concerned about these things, to see, if Alberta agencies are getting their share of business. And not going beyond the border, not merely to look for a witch hunt, as someone suggested, I don't believe that there was the slightest suspicion of impropriety -- but the opposition has reason to be alert on matters of this nature where the Publicity Bureau seems to be top heavy with people who I had found at one time politicking against me.

Now one can hardly be more straightforward than that; once that happens we don't want to end up in a situation where the government takes care of their own.

We want to guarantee to the people that every dollar is public funds -- whether it's the publicity Bureau or not -- is spent correctly and that is the ministers' responsibility.

76-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

I have added a bit to what I have on the Order Paper and so, Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the kind of information that the government should provide; it's in the public interest. I would like to recommend one brief amendment, because the minister wants everything to be entirely accurate although I think he gets the message as to what I want in this answer. In Motion 246 (3) one word: "How much has been paid to Art Smith of Calgary, Alberta, or to any association or firm with which he is associated, for government advertising since September 10th, 1971?" I believe it could be presumed that I meant government advertising, but I think in order to make it clear it would request that that one word be inserted, if the House would allow me to do so. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

With the agreement of the seconder and the consent of the House, no doubt the hon. member can make that addition. Does the House agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I was happy to provide this information and one particular comment I was going to make until hearing the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View who started off by saying that he had placed a straightforward question once and didn't get any answer and therefore would make it absolutely clear. Well, I refer any members of the House to this Motion for a Return; if they have ever seen anything that isn't straightforward and isn't clear, it practically takes five or six readings just to figure out what he's asking for. I would suggest, if he is going to straighten out a little bit of it with adding a word, why doesn't he take the thing back and do it decently rather than this sloppy Return that he has put forward?

MR. LUDWIG:

May I close the debate, Mr. Speaker?

MR. GETTY:

For one thing, Mr. Speaker, there isn't a publicity bureau, and if he is asking who is responsible for it he may be living in the past. But if he would get up-to-date, Mr. Speaker, he would know there isn't such a thing.

I'm happy, Mr. Speaker, to try and work through whatever this means. If you look at No. 4, "Please table all correspondence dealing with government advertising and advertising by any government agencies, since September 10th, 1971", Mr. Speaker, if the members who have been in the House before recall the number of departments and agencies and boards who have files; who have received letters and correspondence of all kinds that might refer to government advertising -- they can even be responding to an ad -- it's going to be a fantastic job to go through all of these to try and isolate those that dealt with government advertising. If he wanted to speak about the Bureau of Public Affairs he might isolate it to a certain extent, but the House should stand warned about what the hon. member has done in an evidently offhand manner. It's going to cause a great deal of work.

MR. SPEAKER:

It's not clear whether the hon. minister wishes it on a point of order or not, but I think perhaps the House should be aware that if this Motion is passed it becomes an Order to the government and the terms of it will be binding.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, there has been no motion. The minister talks about being accurate and specific, and he is vague and uncertain on many of the things he said. I doubt whether anyone in this House hasn't got the intelligence to know what is meant by the publicity bureau, and if the minister is in doubt he could ask --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. May the hon. member close the debate?

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-33

MR. LUDWIG:

Whatever it is, the hon. minister knew exactly what I am talking about. If you don't understand it I will draw pictures because the minister has showed trouble in the past and he does show now that he has real trouble comprehending, which is not a reflection on anybody else but the hon. minister.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If the hon. member is not going to debate his motion then I don't think that he should be allowed to stray. He has to be relevant to the motion that he has put. In view of the fact that my hon. colleague has pointed out to him that it is a sloppily done motion, a motion that was conceived without very much thought, a motion that was conceived mostly in an attempt by the hon. member for Calgary Mountain View to gain some publicity, whether it is in order or not, a motion that is completely emphatic --

MR. LUDWIG:

On a point of order.

DR. HORNER:

I am speaking on the point of order, Mr. Speaker. The point of order that I am making is, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest you and your officers should have a much greater responsibility in perusing some of the Motions for Return that are placed on the Order Paper because it is pretty obvious that my hon. friend for Calgary Mountain View hasn't got very much knowledge as to the form and nature of both questions and Motions for Return. He requires the assistance of your office and your officials so that he can do it properly.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, may I close the debate?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Aw, sit down.

MR. FARRAN:

On the point of order. We were, in this corner of the House, intending to move an amendment but we agree that this is so sloppily worded that we would have some difficulty. But the member from Calgary Mountain View did say earlier on a former motion, that he preferred to cover a whole range of years and not just isolate 1971. We had been thinking of putting in 1969 again and including Land for Living and various arrangements for travel magazines and that sort of thing, but if it is going to be reworded we will wait until it comes back in a proper form.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I will now close the debate unless someone else wishes to speak. I will read the motion to see where -- just an allegation by the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs or the hon. Deputy Premier --

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order --

MR. LUDWIG:

I haven't said anything yet.

DR. HORNER:

His motion is out of order because it is improperly written and improperly put together.

76-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, because there is one bureau mentioned that is no longer in existence doesn't put the Return out of order. The hon. minister can simply answer that way, and this is common in the House of Commons and elsewhere. That doesn't put it out of order.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, it doesn't, does it?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Were you in the House of Commons?

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, if I could speak just very briefly. I think our concern with respect to point 4, for example, is whether or not that would include all correspondence which the government has received in response to ads dealing with tenders for public buildings or for highways. Does it include correspondence which the government receives in response to ads from the Personnel Administration Office? Does it include correspondence which the Premier's office receives respecting complaints about advertising by The Alberta Liquor Control Board, or by anyone under The Alberta Liquor Control Board? I think that we are just concerned that it is a little bit ambiguous.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair has some responsibility for the types of questions and motions which appear on the Order Paper. Without wishing to get into the debate or defend the position of the Chair, I think some hon. members will acknowledge that on a number of occasions the Chair has pointed out that the text of this kind of motion must be simple, straightforward, lucid, and compelling, and if it is not compelling, then presumably if the motion is passed, the government will not be compelled to comply except within the strict sense of the motion. If we don't have that understanding we have chaos in this regard. So, I must leave it to the House whether the motion is going to be adopted, or amended, or otherwise disposed of.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I now beg leave to close the debate on the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I will read what I have requested here.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Aw, sit down.

MR. LUDWIG:

It says: that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

(1) How much money has been spent on government advertising since September 10, 1971. Please itemize all advertising expenditures by the Government of Alberta, naming all individuals and agencies to which funds have been paid.

Now I admit that this covers a wide field and I don't want part of the truth, I want the whole truth and I am entitled to get it; the people should know. [Interjections.] I know that the government members are now showing that they are sensitive to this idea and that's all the more reason why I intend to pursue it further. They are super-sensitive about it. There is nothing ambiguous, there is nothing unclear about that one; it's straight forward and it's in good english. The hon. minister's lack of comprehension is a reflection on him and nobody else in this one particular section. Now I will read the other one --

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-35

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member wish to conclude, or does he wish to adjourn the debate? We are now five minutes past the allotted time. I have been aware of it but because of the point of order I didn't draw it to the attention of the House.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate on this motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member leave to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

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

Bill No. 204, The Billiard Rooms Amendment Act, 1972

Debate Adjourned by Mr. Henderson.

[In the absence of Mr. Henderson, this bill was not proceeded with.]

Bill No. 211: An Act Respecting Remembrance and Dedication to Peace

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill second reading of Bill No. 211.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to this bill we seek to recapture the real meaning of Armistice Day. On this day we remember the dedication of those who laid down their lives to preserve our freedom and that great struggle for peace.

Our younger generation cannot relate as we do to the great wars. But they are, as we are, and as those veterans were, very concerned with efforts to preserve peace.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to this bill we must do more than just have a day -- so faintly preserved now -- for remembrance. Real effort must be made to dedicate ourselves to peace; and so, we capture the original feeling which brought about Armistice Day.

Mr. Speaker, the intent of this bill is not a statutory holiday. It does not prohibit any business man from remaining open, but it does set forth terms whereby any person that is required to work on Rededication Day, except a person engaged in essential service industries especially exempt from this act by order of the Board of Industrial Relations of Alberta, his employer shall pay that person double the normal rate of pay for such work on that day. In laymen's language this bill, once and for all, will take the gain out of business that now profit from that day of remembrance.

Mr. Speaker, last week I walked down Jasper Avenue observing which stores were displaying tributes to Remembrance Day and which stores displayed signs of profit (open on November 11th) a mockery to the incredible loss and suffering and sacrifice of over 40 million dead in World War II alone, a mockery to the countless examples of courage, heroism, which the war had produced, and in particular the devotion and determination of all those who had taken part -- at home and abroad -- in securing that final peace.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that in Holland, especially in the schools in Holland, services are held every year to honour and remember the sacrifices of those who partook in their liberation, in particular they pay tribute to the Canadians who played a major part in their liberation. Children, organized by their teachers, visit each Canadian grave, place flowers and hold services in the large Canadian cemeteries in Holland. Where there are no adjacent cemeteries, services are conducted in the schools. The message of remembrance gained in this manner will remain with all of them all of their lives and Remembrance Day will never disappear.

76-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

What is needed, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, is a change in emphasis. Remember our past, but look ahead to our future. Peace is a wider issue of ourselves which appeals to all persons regardless of nationality, race, creed. What is needed, Mr. Speaker, is to set aside one day in the year where all peoples and all nations re-dedicate themselves anew to principles surely we all can subscribe to: Namely, the brotherhood of man, the common striving to build a better life for all, to conquer hatred and prejudice.

In many respects we come close to this at Christmas time. But there are deficits. Christmas is not observed throughout the world, but all people want peace. Surely, Mr. Speaker, out of 365 days in the year, and the many national holidays observed in Canada and in other countries, we can find one day where all nations observe one common world holiday, in the name of peace, love and brotherhood honouring those who have made the supreme sacrifice on all sides, rededicating ourselves anew to the ideals of peace. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in seconding this motion of the hon. Member for Camrose. I don't see how anybody can argue that Remembrance Day is not a more important anniversary than Labour Day, Farmer's Day, Dominion Day, or any of those other days which seem to have a higher standing in the list of days which are observed in a public fashion. On Remembrance Day we remember the thousands who died between 1914 and 1918 in such places as Vimy Ridge, those who died at places like Dieppe in the Second World War, and those who died more recently in places like Kapyong in Korea in the Korean War. Those people -- so far as I see it and thousands of other Canadians see it -- gave their lives for a land fit for heroes to live in. This has not yet been achieved, but certainly they didn't give their lives for a land where chasing the almighty buck took precedence over honouring their fellow comrades who died. I think we have to remember -- as the Good Book says -- we don't live by bread alone, and if there was ever a day of the spirit, it's Remembrance Day.

I'm certainly disappointed, like many other Albertans, at the attitude of our department stores, some of them with an ancient history, that have now started to open on Remembrance Day, changing their former habit. I'm also disappointed at the attitude of the discount stores, the supermarkets, and the newspapers who aid and abet them editorially because they realize that this opening on a holiday leads to advertising revenue for them.

On last Saturday I was honoured by being the guest speaker in the Remembrance Day services in the Jubilee Auditorium in Calgary. There were more than three thousand people there. The place was packed, they were standing in the aisles. Then I marched with the 'old sweats' down to the cenotaph, in the cold -- so cold that the band found it hard to blow their trumpets. I just wondered why there had been such a huge turnout for Remembrance Day. I think the huge turnout is to some degree a reaction against the attitude of the big department stores; they went there just to show that they didn't agree in the almighty buck philosophy.

The Bill of Rights is the sort of thing these fellows died for, these Canadian soldiers, airmen, sailors, and let us not forget the women who flew the ferry planes across the Atlantic and fired the anti-aircraft guns, as the hon. Member for Athabaska reminded us the other day. It's The Bill of Rights that's the sort of thing they fought for, and The Bill of Rights would not have been possible in the totalitarian tyrannies they defeated.

There wouldn't have been any tolerance, any freedoms. In fact, there would have been persecution of races and creeds if those horrible regimes had triumphed over the rest of the world. We all know the long record of genocide, of seizure of property, and all the evil things they were doing. So if there is ever a day that should be commemorated, it is Remembrance Day. So I would like to congratulate the hon. Member for Camrose for having the guts, foresight, and sympathy with so many thousands of his fellow Canadians in bringing this act forward.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in support of this bill. I think in Canada particularly, war is a long way away. We don't really see the horrors of war. If we were to go to Europe or to the British Isles to see the huge cemeteries, as mentioned in Flanders Field, the crosses row on row, we would perhaps come to realize just how many people really died. When we think -- I believe it was two years ago over in India, a huge tidal wave came in and destroyed some 30,000 people. What a catastrophe, what a loss. But what was lost during the last two world wars was the cream of our manhood and the cream

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-37

of our womanhood. Wars are not the same today as they were, say, in the first world war, where, if you could say such a thing, they were a fair war where one soldier fought against his counterpart in the other army. Today war is, how much can the civilian population stand before one side or the other gives in?

Armistice Day is a special day for those who were veterans, and particularly those families who lost a member of their immediate family in the first or second world war. The hon. Member for Camrose mentioned Holland. I have a brother buried in Holland; he is not in the large cemetery, he and four others from a crashed airplane were buried in a little civilian cemetery. And when they came to gather all the bodies, the remains, and put them in a large cemetery, evidently they thought they were peaceful enough there and they left them. There has been a Dutch family, two maiden sisters from that family, from that day -- from the day they were buried there, to the present time -- who have tended that grave without any recompense whatsoever. My mother visited this gravesite of my brother. But these people have tended those graves since 1943 -- put flowers on them, sent pictures -- why? Because they remembered that these four boys died, among others, for their freedom.

I think one of the problems in Canada today is, we have large veterans' hospitals, most of us never go near them, or the sights that we have seen of mutilated veterans; they are probably kept out of sight because we just don't want to face what happened. In Canada and the United States -- we just don't want to remember any more, because we are so far away from the war. It didn't happen on our own shores; we didn't see our cities mutilated, or the civilian population, or our families, or everything we owned go up in smoke and flames.

I would like to commend the mover of this motion because war is still with us. We still look at the horrors of Viet Nam; we still see what can happen in a semi-civilized country such as Ireland; what happens today when people's passions and their pride gets out of hand. We could see the same thing happen here if our citizens don't respect The Communal Property Act. These are things that make war, and these are the things I think the hon. member wants us to remember, that the difference between love and hate is only a hair's breadth away. So I would commend him.

I don't think this is a time maybe to go over the past wars and what they have meant to us, but it is a time, as he has mentioned, not only for remembrance, but it is a time for rededication. Each year the Armistice parades get a little smaller in the smaller areas. For the older veterans, it is too much for them to walk in the parade. The younger ones are glad it is over. So you end up with mothers and widows and children; this, I think, is good, particularly for the children. I think they'll attend any parade. But to have them there to remember that these things have happened. As the hon. member who made the motion mentioned, millions and millions of people have died so that you and I could stand in this assembly and ask for a day.

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill I believe is quite correct. What is Farmer's Day to a farmer? He spends that day working while his counterparts come out from the city to see what goes on on Farmer's Day. I'm not detracting from Farmer's Day as such, but we have days of holidays on which we all have a good time. It is a time of joyful anticipation. The 24th of May weekend is another one that we can shift around to suit ourselves. But I still think that a day in a year, like the hon. member mentioned, a day we set aside for no commercial purposes other than the essential services, to remember and rededicate ourselves to what we espoused yesterday, The Bill of Rights, and for peace, is a day well spent in our lives.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, in joining in this debate, I would like to comment on a different area of concern. Although the bill is commendable, there are matters of respect and feeling you can put across to our fellow citizens, but can you legislate the observance of this respect? Who are we legislating for, for ourselves? For those who were here before us, or for those who are to come? I think it is important that we place emphasis on those who are yet to come. How do our young people understand or view our Remembrance Day? What interpretation do they have? What message is being given to them in their education and their learning processes? I think this is where we need to direct a great deal more attention.

I think that surveys have been taken in recent years, in the last year, as to the understanding that our young students have of Remembrance Day. And they really don't have a proper understanding, or very few of them do. They feel that this is something in the past, and that we shouldn't live in the past but in the future. But I think that we need to point out the relationship of the

76-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

past in this particular aspect, that it has with our future. I think that we need to convey in our schools how their conduct today is enjoyed by them because of the conduct of those who were here before us and gave their lives.

Inasmuch as I support this bill, I would like to draw direct attention to our Department of Education, to our teachers in the schools, to really take a good hard look at what understanding our young people have. We may recognize the respect and importance that should be given only for a short time -- for the time that we are here -- but unless we get these thoughts across to the schools, that respect and that remembrance will be very short lived. Thank you.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question, if I may, to the hon. Minister of Labour. In The Interpretation Act, Remembrance Day is listed as a holiday. Is there any particular reason that it is not being observed today in the province?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with the question to make sure the information is to the references that have been made, and proper ones, but as the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood points out, some of these things you just don't legislate. Maybe I shouldn't put it quite that way. One could, but if you have to legislate a human, merely a humane consideration, Mr. Speaker, I think you are on fairly sandy kinds of foundations in Alberta and in Canada.

Representations have been made to the Department of Labour and to this government, and I'm sure, to the prior one. We have considered it, within the department and beyond, and we feel, as the Member for Calgary put it, that this is really disappointing. I share that attitude, and I share that view, but having been, as so many on the floor of this House have been, one of the people who have had the experience of being in the armed services in the last war, I would take the careful view that if the situation itself, through education, through basic and common attitudes might be at a high level with respect to the effort and this meaning for Canada, not just then, but forever -- if that kind of attitude is lost, if it was there, sometimes it is observed because that was the apparently proper thing to do at that time. And the closer the time is, Mr. Speaker, to the time of such unfortunate events as world wars, the more is accorded to those who didn't come back, and in some respects, I suppose, to those of us who did. Then, as the time increases in length from the happening, other things begin to substitute. At the same time, I do not wish to generalize, and I know that many who turn out for commemorations of the war dead, and some of the living, do so from a deep and human concern and a respect that passes both understanding and the capacity to express it, as was the case here this afternoon by the mover of the resolution and the seconder, and all those who followed.

So I simply have to say that as a person myself, quite apart from government, my belief is that this is something that comes from other places than legislation. Legislation has been proposed to us, even to the point of pressure, because so many people properly feel so strongly about this, Mr. Speaker, that I accept these pressures as being very valid, very human and very proper. But it is the position of this department and this government at the present time, and it will likely continue to be this way, that we will not legislate in this area. We leave this to the corporate citizenship and to the interpretation of businesses each in their own way.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit that in The Interpretation Act, it definitely states that Dominion Day, Labour Day, Remembrance Day and Christmas Day shall all be called holidays and my question is; why does it not come under the present definition of a holiday?

DR. HOHOL:

The way I read that is about the way you do, because it says, as they shall be called holidays, they are called holidays. But there isn't a consequential kind of legislation or regulation to say that they shall be a holiday with certain kinds of meanings like commercial places being closed, the schools closed, other things being closed, if the day happens to be on a regular week day. There isn't that kind of legislation and that is the legislation I was talking about. The Interpretation Act says that this shall be called a holiday, but it doesn't say that it shall be a holiday, meaning that the commercial places of business shall be closed.

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-39

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of Bill 211. I too, for the past few years, have been deeply concerned by the tendency of some of our large city firms in this city and other cities of Canada to disregard suitable observance of Remembrance Day. They do not observe Remembrance Day by remaining open. This is all the more surprising, Mr. Speaker, when at least one of these firms has been an integral part of this country from the very early days of its settlement and development.

I am very much afraid that the example of large city firms who downrate observance of Remembrance Day by remaining open -- this is always accompanied by considerable radio and newspaper advertising -- I'm afraid this could spread into rural towns where, I must say, Remembrance Day to date has always been very suitably observed.

Remembrance Day could be called the most important day in the history of Canada, for Canada and for its allies. In our rural towns all business places close on Remembrance Day; its done without question, whether the 11th falls on a Saturday or any other day of the week. No public proclamation is needed or announcement is required. All businesses simply close in order that every person has the opportunity and the time to think of the reason for Remembrance Day and to attend the impressive and thought provoking services of laying of wreaths and Remembrance Day services.

I stated that November 11th was the most important day in the history of Canada. To enlarge on that, in two World Wars it must be recognized that Canada was fighting for her very existence as a free nation. I often wonder, Mr. Speaker, just what would have become of Canada had we lost those wars. The Second World War, of course, is vivid in most of our memories. Can you envisage the future of Canada under the iron heel of Nazi militarism? That would be a very bleak outlook indeed. In my opinion, we would be in an even more subservient position than those of the countries behind the Iron Curtain today. So it is only fitting that we should devote one day to remembrance of our men and women who prevented this from happening, who made sure that we Canadians would be masters of our own destiny and would continue to live a full, free and good life. That war should never happen again if it is in our power to prevent it. And so serves as a dedication to peace, the two thoughts, remembrance and rededication day, augment one another.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy with this act, and appreciate the fact that the date, November 11th, has been stated in the bill. No other date will do, such as has happened on some of our other public holidays. I am pleased to support this motion by the hon. Member for Camrose.

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, I too wish to make a few comments on Bill No. 211. I do want to commend the mover and the seconder because of the fact that they have indicated that this act now may be cited as The Rededication Day Act. The title to it is very appropriate in our present time, and it still links with November 11th, which will always be remembered for so many years as Armistice Day.

In the participation last Saturday at the Cenotaph that I had the pleasure to attend, I noticed, as the hon. Member for Calgary mentioned, to my pleasure, a larger number of lay people present. It maybe the large silent majority turning out appreciating the fact that November 11th is a day that shall never be forgotten and shouldn't be. Also, there were many people, quite obvious and quite recognized, from other ethnic backgrounds. And of particular attention, I noticed, was the large contingent of veterans from the Polish Army who paraded and took the salute at the reviewing stand.

Canada as it is today is a Canada of people from many nations, yet all of them I think will appreciate the fact that The Rededication Day Act may be more meaningful for them whether they come from Europe, Asia, Africa, or South America, to Canada. I do hope that this bill will bring about more appreciation, as some of the hon. members have mentioned, and some of our commercial outlets will refrain from carrying out business, because as the hon. minister stated, we can legislate all we want, but with this type of approach, with this type of debate, they may be more aware that there are legislators concerned with what is taking place in our commercial world. Thank you very much.

76-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

MR. WILSON:

In supporting the principle of Bill No. 211, an act respecting Remembrance Day and dedication to peace, I think that I might be able to shed or throw a little different light on it because I was one that was too young to participate in the Second World War. I can assure you, sir that over the years it has been difficult to understand at times what would motivate 100,000 and more Canadians to give their lives, plus many more who were wounded and are still crippled, plus many more who suffered in prisoner-of-war camps and things of this nature. It is difficult for one who did not participate to fully understand it, and it seems to me that we could do well in this day and age to make a concerted effort to educate and get the youth of upcoming generations involved in Remembrance Day services.

I think that we must make a conscientious effort to teach the value and worth of the freedom that we enjoy today, particularly in Canada. In Remembrance Day services we could take some leads from one small community that I know of that gives an opportunity for the Scouts and Guides and Brownies and Cubs and youth bands and various youth organizations to participate in those ceremonies. When the youth see how proudly the veterans wear their colours and medals and ask questions and have an opportunity to learn what they stand for, they will become interested, and they will have a better understanding of what it is all about. I think that, coupled with the education to alert the children and the growth of up-coming generations, -- there are still those in the country who would do away with our democracy and replace it with a dictatorship or even worse. But if we can involve the youth continuously so that they have a better opportunity to understand, I feel that a clearer understanding of Remembrance Day will surely strengthen our democracy.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to express my appreciation for this bill, but I would like to take a little different tack, and not necessarily repeat the good things with which I agree, but just to make mention of one or two things that might be considered criticisms, although I do not offer them as criticisms, but something to think about.

Every month of the year seems to have its holiday and November, if it did not have the 11th of November, would probably be left without a holiday. I think this day should be observed as a holiday. However people decide that holidays should be observed is a matter for personal consideration. It comes originally from Holy Day and some people choose to observe most holidays as such. I think that is generally the spirit and the intent of the bill, that some spirit of dedication and concern be observed. Many people would criticize the commercialization of Christmas and Easter and that apparently is the tone that is coming through today, there is some distress at the idea of commercializing this holiday, which was originally called Armistice Day and later called Remembrance Day, and now it is suggested that it should be Rededication Day.

During World War II those who were active during those days at home will recall, we had Rededication Days, not on November 11th, but quite often in September in the latter part of World War II. These were days when people were called to give time to prayer and rededication of their life to the responsibility of attempting to keep our country free and backing up our soldiers. I believe that Rededication Day is better than either Armistice or Remembrance, because there is really no Armistice or cessation of hostilities; it has continued indefinitely through the years. As far as remembrance is concerned, as has been pointed out several times today already, there are many who cannot remember World War I, and some who are not able to remember World War II. So, as a result, we need to give consideration to this kind of thing.

If they are going to have a holiday in November they should have put it on November 28th when my birthday was because that was after World War I and it would be a good thing to remember something that was peaceful. I like to believe that I might have ushered in a day of peace, but it just wasn't so. It was quite evident a very short time after World War I that the enemy was not really conquered, but only temporarily subdued.

As far as the stores opening on the 11 of November, or Rededication Day, whatever it might be, I don't think that there can be a stop put to it, unless there is very stiff legislation. But there isn't a holiday in existence today when stores do not open, including Sunday since some stores are open seven days a week now, and as well as over any kind of a holiday. I personally would not be as critical as some are about the stores being open in order to make a buck, because there are many people today who almost demand the services that are

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-41

rendered by some stores on holidays. People have become accustomed, even in Canada and certainly to a very great extent in the United States, to having services offered to them seven days a week, so that service stations and stores and all of that kind of thing are required on holidays as well on other normally considered work days. So for that reason, it might be pretty difficult to make -- outside of the educational process that has been suggested -- stores close on holidays, however much emphasis we might want to place on the holidays.

There is one point that I wanted to suggest, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this bill, and I think it needs to be considered, and that is the fact that it will tend again, as this type of legislation can, to interfere with our rights which are enshrined in The Bill of Rights. Now I don't know whether that is the reason why the beginning of the third point begins by saying, "notwithstanding any other act or any agreement or instrument prescribing terms and conditions of employment". Here is a notwithstanding clause which has come into this bill which we talked about in The Bill of Rights and this is something that I would like the mover's opinion on when he closes the debate. I think it also tends to work a hardship on employers when it is mandatory that holiday pay be given to anyone who is employed. There are many people employed now on Sundays and other holidays who do not have to be provided with holiday pay, and I'm thinking in terms of confectionaries and stores, and things of that nature. And so I think that some good hard thinking needs to go into this if it is to be enacted. I'm not prepared to make any changes in the bill at this time or even suggest them, I'm only suggesting at this point of second reading that some thought be provided before we go into it clause by clause, if indeed we reach that stage. In the United States their gross national product is somewhat higher than that of Canada on a per capita basis, and it has been suggested that part of the reason is because they have fewer national holidays in the United States, and every holiday cuts down the gross national product and service. And so this needs to be given some consideration when we add holidays, although I do not consider this as an additional holiday, but only an urging to possibly rename the holiday that already exists.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I might suggest that in this day of increasing leisure time, while every holiday may tend to have an effect on the gross national product when we're thinking in terms of three and four-day work weeks and adjusting of hours, it could be nicely arranged that the same amount of work was done on the week when there were holidays. If we wanted to increase the number of hours in the days that we worked in that particular week, so that we could get the same amount of hours of service from the people. So these are things that can be answered.

Now only those thoughts with my final concluding comment is that I favour the idea of doing everything we can to get people's thoughts in the right direction, and certainly better than just remembering those who gave their lives in the supreme sacrifice, and those who have suffered for many years since, whose lives were not taken. Better than just remembering them is to rededicate our own selves to the task that they left for us to finish when they passed on. Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a word or two. Some people have said that they do not agree with Armistice Day because it glorifies war. I would like to suggest that no one abhors war more than those who have gone through a war. No one else knows as well the terrors and agonies that result from war, and the lifelong afflictions that result. And I would suggest that Armistice Day is one of the surest ways to remind people of those horrors of war, when we remember that thousands did not return.

When we think of Armistice Day and Remembrance Day, I would like to suggest that there are those who remember war every day. There are those who left part of their bodies on the battlefields or in the air or in the sea, who have never been able to live a completely normal life because they were so anxious to preserve freedom for us. There are those who remember every day that their loved ones didn't return, and I had this brought home to me very realistically when I went to visit the grave of a fellow navigator, a young man by the name of Liston Anderson, who was well known in hockey circles in Alberta, whose plane was riddled with bullets over France and finally crashed in South Wales. I went to visit his grave in order to bring back a picture to his brother -- and father and mother. When I got there, I found the grave beautifully covered with fresh flowers. I thought I should put some flowers on anyway and went to a home nearby, and the lady said, "Well, whose grave do you want to buy the flowers for?" And I said, "Liston Anderson; he was a schoolmate of mine and a fellow navigator." She said, "Oh, we put flowers there this morning." And I said, "I wondered who had done it; are you related?" She said, "Oh no, but I have a son

76-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 16th 1972

who was serving in the RAF in India, and he was killed." She said, "I just hope every day that somebody will remember to put a flower on Henry's grave." And I brought that message back to the mother and father, who have now passed on. It was like a flood of freshness that came to them; as Mrs. Anderson said to me, "I remember every day, and now I remember in a little happier way when I know that somebody is thoughtful enough to put flowers on Liston's grave."

Well, some people will remember every day. Surely it is not too much to ask the commercial corporations of this province to remember, one day a year.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, in closing debate --

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe it is the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest wishes to take part in the debate.

MR. DRAIN:

I wanted to speak, and I will be brief, Mr. Speaker, because certainly this I regard as a very important bill and one that I would like to see voted on before the time moves around to 5:30 and this is rapidly approaching.

I do not think it was the intent of the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, when he mentioned Dominion Day, to belittle this particular day, because to me, as a Canadian, I think this is a very important day. When you think of Dominion Day, you also think of the past and magnificent history of Canada. You think of the Regiment Carignan-Salieres, you think of the heroes of the Nile who served from Canada, you think of the Canadians who went with the Canadian Mounted Rifles to the South African war, the Canadians who served in the Imperial army in the siege of Peking, and also those who fought for democracy in the Spanish war, some of them from the Crowsnest Pass.

I am very proud to concur with this bill, Mr. Speaker, and as I said as time moves on, and I'm sure the hon. Member for Camrose will be very eager to see this go to a vote. Thank you.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my seconder, and for the very moving remarks from the hon. Member for Macleod; to the the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood; the hon. Member for Vermilion; to our hon. Deputy Speaker who spoke on what, I imagine, quite a few of us took part in last Saturday; the hon. Member for Calgary Bow, he speaks as I do; I did not take part either, but I have a concern; and to the hon. Member for Highwood and his concern for a statutory holiday. I would like to point out that this bill was drafted eight months ago and went to the printers eight months ago, but I think a simple amendment in third reading would certainly clear that up.

In my remarks to the hon. Member for Highwood, that the hon. Member for Drumheller very well expressed the feelings of a tremendous number of people in Alberta when it comes to a statutory holiday for some little merchant in a little store. May I suggest to you that you try telling that to somebody in one of our hospitals who has been there for 30 years, or the mother who has lost a son or two. My thanks also to the hon. Member for Pincher Creek.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go back eight months when my colleague, my legal advice, the hon. Member for Sherwood Park, and I went down to the library to find out what was in those books in regard to statutes. We found that in 1919 an act was passed by the federal House of Commons naming Remembrance Day a statutory holiday throughout Canada. It is observed today as a federal statutory holiday. What has happened is that, the province at that time ducked the issue and left it up to local bylaws to the towns, villages, and cities. I suggest that the province is still ducking the issue.

I think, Mr. Speaker, there are a tremendous number of Canadians who are very concerned that this day be kept as Remembrance Day. Thank you.

[The motion was carried, and Bill No. 211 was read a second time.]

November 16, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

76-43

MR. SPEAKER:

With regard to Bill No. 204, the Chair must admit to some lack of alacrity. The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc not having been present to continue the debate, it was of course open to any member of the House to continue the debate. That bill should not have lost its place on the Order Paper. Unless there is serious objection, it would be the direction of the Chair that that bill retain its place on the Order Paper.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

If any hon. members would like to check the references in this regard, I think our new rule 13(6) is applicable, as well as Beauchesne Citation 122, inasmuch as this was a bill which was, in fact, proceeded with and is now required to be proceeded with further.

If the House will agree to call at 5:30, the House stands adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

[The House rose at 5:30 o'clock.]

