

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday, March 1, 1973

[The House met at 2:30 o'clock.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, for the third year in a row I am very pleased to introduce to you and through you to the hon. members, students from the Calgary Hebrew School in Calgary Glenmore. The hon. members will recall that last year when they arrived they brought with them a Calgary chinook. They are unable to do that this year because it wasn't necessary, but I understand that if we need one we just have to let them know the word. There are 39 students, Mr. Speaker, and they are accompanied by their principal, Mr. Sherman, their vice-principal, Mrs. Miller, and their teacher, Mrs. Melnyk. I ask them now to rise and be recognized.

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly some 22 political science students from Western Canada High School. This is a unique privilege for me because this is the first student group that I have had to introduce, albeit Western Canada High School exists in the constituency of Calgary Elbow. It is right on the edge of my constituency so I don't think the members will mind. These students are accompanied by their teachers, Rick and Vera Mokoski, and Doug Donald, and I would ask them to rise and please be recognized by the Assembly. They are in the public gallery.

MR. YOUNG:

It is my pleasure and privilege today to introduce the Grade 8 class from the Calvin Christian High School in my constituency. I would like to point out, for the information of the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that this particular school is supported on the following basis as far as parents are concerned: each student has a tuition fee of \$600, a minimum charge levied by the school for the first child in each family. When these students, who are in Grade 8, progress to senior high school, the tuition fee will advance by another \$150 per student. Mr. Speaker, that is a tremendous commitment on the part of the families and the students concerned, and I would ask these students to rise and be recognized. They are in the members gallery with a few of their parents.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table for the information of all members two reports required by statute, the reports of the Provincial Auditor. The first is the Municipal Loans Revolving Fund as of December 31, 1972, and the second is the Self-Liquidating Projects Act of December 31, 1972.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour of tabling today Sessional Papers Nos. 45, 46, and 47. Also required by statute is Sessional Paper No. 44, the Annual Report of The Alberta Opportunity Fund. The fund, however, only came into effect July 1, 1972, so there is no annual report for the last fiscal year.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table three reports required by the Legislature. They deal with regulations under various acts. The first act is The Gas Resources Prevention Act. The next act is The Alberta Gas Trunkline Company Act, and the third one is The Coal Mines Regulation Act.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table two reports required by legislation. The first one is The Annual Report of the Department of Municipal Affairs for 1972. This is their 60th annual report. Going with that are The Municipal Statistics for 1971.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation as required by statute.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table two reports that deal with the work in my department; first the Annual Report of the Consumer Affairs Branch, as of December 31, 1972, and second the report of the supervising of Consumer Credit, pursuant to The Credit and Loan Agreements Act.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table two orders issued on February 23, 1973, by the Alberta Automobile Insurance Board. One deals with minimum insurance for motorized snow vehicles, and the other deals with minimum insurance for motorcycles, motorscooters, minibikes, and other similar motor vehicles.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table some documents related to my department and required by statute.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Alberta Colleges Commission, 1971-72, and the Annual Report of the Governors of the University of Alberta, 1971-72.

MR. SPEAKER:

As required by the rules, I am tabling The Hansard Report for 1972. Copies will be going to all the members.

OPAL QUESTION PERIOD

Mental Health Advisory Council

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. I was wondering if the minister could advise as to whether his department has received the nominations from the various organizations for appointments to the Provincial Mental Health Advisory Council, as per Section 5 of The Mental Health Act? Related to that, could he give some indication as to when the Provincial Mental Health Advisory Council will be established?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I don't expect there will be any great delay in the appointment of the advisory council. As the hon. Leader of the Opposition would know, the act passed during the last session will soon be in force, and we will be ready very shortly with the appointments. Now, as to whether or not every association asked in regard to recommendations has replied yet, I do not know, but I would be pleased to find that out.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister advise as to whether or not he has made any requests that women be considered for appointment to this advisory board?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I can understand the hon. member's interest in asking a question like that in view of the compelling interest the subject always holds for all us men. But I haven't specifically asked any of the associations to do that. Certainly, along with other hon. members, we would hope that this is done, at least by some of them.

Mental Health Regulations

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health and Social Development. What is the present status of the regulations under the new Mental Health Act, and have those proposed regulations been made available to the various mental health groups across the province?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am not certain of the extent of consultation that has taken place with the various groups. It has been reported to me, though, that the regulations are in the final stages of preparation. I would be giving them my own attention, therefore, very shortly.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister check to see that the draft regulations have been sent to the Alberta Mental Health people for their views on the draft regulations and report back to the House, please?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to doing that. I might add that my feeling would be that that particular step has probably already been taken. I don't personally know that it's been taken, but I would certainly be glad to follow that up.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Cypress, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.
Mental Health Programs

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. I would like to know what efforts are being made by the Department of Health to provide local autonomy to the area of mental health programs, as no regional councils have yet been appointed.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, when we got to the point of developing the new mental health programs that were consequent upon the government's new initiatives in this area, we had to consider what the best vehicle would be in various parts of Alberta for bringing the services to the community.

Now, it was my view that even waiting for the passing of the new act, which we hope will bring with it a number of favourable developments over the short term of the next year or so -- even waiting for that time it seemed to us that we could use the existing machinery of the Department of Health and Social Development in a number of parts of Alberta to build upon. And by that I mean the guidance clinics. We were thinking of changing their personnel staffing pattern slightly in each area, adding some in areas where there had not been clinics before, and introducing the concept of the regional co-ordinator of services to work with the clinic, with other government services and with the private sector in each community.

So at the present time the answer to the hon. gentleman's question, Mr. Speaker, would relate to the circumstances I have just described, that in each community where a guidance clinic has existed or where one has been introduced as a result of increased staffing in this area by the department, the responsibility for local community autonomy and planning is really one which is bound to be related to the ability of the people in the community to co-operate with each other and to share a willingness to develop programs without duplication and overlap.

The direct given, both to the new regional co-ordinators in the areas where they have been appointed and to the staff of the guidance clinic, is to function as a community resource and not to relate to the fact that they are branches of the Department of Health and Social Development to such an extent as to appear to the community to be centralized in their function.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Does the appointment of five mental health co-ordinators responsible to the division of mental health in Edmonton represent a retreat from the election promise to establish regional division councils assuring community involvement and autonomy?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I missed one word - regional what councils?

MR. STROM:

Regional division councils.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Division? Mr. Speaker, certainly as far as retreating from election commitments are concerned, I hope all hon. members opposite would have recognized by now that the amount of commitment this government has already kept in such a very short period of time having the responsibility of government -- has been such that I hope and trust it overwhelmed the hon. gentlemen by now.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the area of concern is not entirely free from difficulty, but we are committed to, and have instructed our people to relate these services in the community to a community focus. We haven't had that long to achieve it yet but we believe that it's possible to do.

The hon. member's question, Mr. Speaker, relating to the reporting line from the regional co-ordinators to the director of mental health is not inconsistent with the effect that we want to achieve in the local communities. Some discussion was held that perhaps there would be a local agency the co-ordinators could report to. At the present time we have just begun this process and we want to try it with the present reporting system so that the trust that is available through the Division of Mental Health here can relate to what is happening in the community. We think it will work. If it doesn't, of course, we would have to look at the program again.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary? We have covered this topic at some length.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, this is the last supplementary question I have. I am wondering whether the hon. minister can tell us what consultation has taken place between the Canadian Mental Health Association of Alberta and other private agencies, with the Department of Health, in establishing regulations under The Mental Health Act?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I believe I dealt with that when I indicated to the hon. Leader of the Opposition in answer to another question, that the regulations are in the final stages of preparation. I believe the Canadian Mental Health Association in Alberta has, at least through one of their offices, had some consultation in regard to these regulations with my officials, but if that is not the case, I would expect that to be happening before they are finalized, and I did undertake to find that out.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, with a duplication would it not seem reasonable to conclude that another supplemental might be in order?

MR. SPEAKER:

We have a long list and I would like to suggest that if there are further questions on this topic, they might come at the end of the list or in the next question period.

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

New Dental Clinic in Calgary

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Is the minister aware that there is an urgent need for a dental clinic in the Bowness-Montgomery community of Calgary because at the present time, there are no private dentists to serve the 16,400 residents?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has just made a ministerial statement to the House.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I don't mind responding to the hon. member's questions. I am going to do so on the presumption that he and I read the Calgary press reports in the same way. I am waiting to hear from the group meeting in Calgary that gave rise to the report. I don't want to prejudice any fair consideration of what may be proposed by appearing to react to it based on what was reported in the newspapers.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister advise how he would like to handle urgent matters in the transitional period, until the government takes over such operations?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there is an obvious implication and assumption made by the hon. gentleman representing as he does, a private enterprise party, that we are about to socialize the dentist. That is not an understanding I have had up until the present time.

Emergency Health Care Services

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister advise how he would like municipalities to handle transitional health care situations that are of an urgent nature?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the public health services in municipalities, of course, relate to the health units, and in the major cities the local boards of health. We are indeed in the process, as a result of new fiscal policy, of beginning to work closely in health units and local boards of health in the discussions that relate to the degree of support the province is giving to those local bodies over the coming fiscal year. Now these discussions, of course, at this stage are not concluded, but I hope that they would, over the next year or so, lead to a greater degree of setting of minimum standards of care by common agreement between the province and various local units. I do think that is possible, and that is one of our objectives, and I believe it to be an objective of the local units also.

Now the hon. member's question relates to emergency types of things that come up, and I think the only way I can respond to that is that under the present arrangement, the best that we can look for is that the local units will, with the support the province gives them, equip themselves to the best of their ability with enough flexibility to respond to emergency situations.

Now, the degree of response possible in given areas of the province will vary because of the existing organizations. The way the health units have grown over the years there has been a very wide divergence in the quality of service

provided, depending on the area of the province that one is in. For at least the medium range of time from now, I would say that the ability of the local units to handle their situation will relate partly to the adequacy or inadequacy of the services that they have built up to the present time.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Assistance for Health Centre Clinics

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Health and Social Development. What communications have you received from a Calgary medical clinic seeking provincial assistance in the establishment of community health centre clinics?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I suppose I might respond to that by asking the hon. member a question: surely he is not referring to the East Palliser Surgical Suite?

MR. HO LEM:

I have information that there was such a letter sent to you. A supplementary question: are funds available for experimental medical clinics which wish to use para-professional staff, including social workers and so on, for projects?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. member -- and I don't have a supplementary -- really was very sincerely asked, because I knew that I was approached by the organization that I mentioned and no answer has been given directly to them. I have had both the written approach and a discussion with them. Because of that I treat it as being at the present time -- although indeed potentially a matter of public concern -- a matter which should be approached privately, and want to respond to it fully before going into the principles that are involved and might be implied, if that type of thing were used in Alberta.

MR. HO LEM:

Do I take it, sir, that you wouldn't care to reveal any further information until you had further consultation with the group?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I think the situation is, Mr. Speaker, that I have had some consultation. I feel ready to be able to give them a response in the near future, but in view of the circumstances, and looking upon this as a private rather than a public issue, I think I owe them a direct reply at the present time. After that it would be up to them, and to some extent up to hon. members, including myself, to pursue that type of concept here. But I don't want to give at this time what will be my response to them privately.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary --

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this point.

MR. HO LEM:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Are there any federal funds available for such projects?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I suppose I could refer that question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, but I won't do that. I'll just say this. To the extent of the knowledge that I gained from the three or four pages of information that I received on the Calgary projects, and the discussions I have

had, it did not appear to me that there would be any basis for raising the question of federal support. Now the federal people may have -- as they do have from time to time -- programs which they go into on an ad hoc basis for various reasons, whether they want a pilot project or whether they want a health-research type of approach worked out in some particular field. But, subject to things like that, there would be no established cost-sharing mechanism that I can think of that would relate to it.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Lethbridge Laundry

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, just by coincidence I happen to have a question for the Minister of Health and Social Development as well.

Did the Lethbridge Municipal Hospital Board give you or your department or the hospitals' commission an explanation for not accepting the lowest tender for the equipment for the new central laundry to be built in Lethbridge?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to mention that both of the hon. Members for Lethbridge had indicated to me their interest in this subject, and I have gathered some information in respect to the granting of a tender for laundry equipment at the Lethbridge Municipal Hospital.

The first thing that I want to say about it, Mr. Speaker, to be entirely clear, is that the prime responsibility for matters relating to the administration of any hospital in Alberta, which is a hospital operated by a local board is, of course, the responsibility of that board. The tender in this case was given by the board. The information that I have on it was a result of information available to the Alberta Hospital Services Commission.

I am informed that the hospital board did not accept the lowest of all of the tenders submitted in that case, but accepted the sole tender that precisely met the specifications. The tenders that were lower in some particulars in each case, failed to meet the specifications. So we have a situation where the only supplier to meet the specifications had its tender accepted.

Now there were some reasons that I might give that came to my attention; for example, the allegation that the equipment couldn't be easily or properly serviced in the community of Lethbridge if it was provided by that particular supplier. My information from the Alberta Hospital Services Commission is that this is not so, and that adequate servicing of it will be available.

The one other point that I might make was that the tender did have a specification that the ironer in the laundry, which is to be a regional laundry for a number of communities in southern Alberta, had to be oil heated, and that one or two of the other tenderers took exception to that as it was their desire to provide one that was operated by steam.

I am implying that ordinarily the specification as to oil heating would not have been there if it was not for the fact that the steam plant of the Lethbridge Hospital is not able to provide for that particular piece of equipment by steam power, in view of the other loads on their steam system.

So on that basis, the answer to the hon. member's question would be that what appears to be a full and adequate explanation of the circumstances has been given. And in keeping with the desire that all hon. members would have to minimize interference in decisions which are locally based and belong quite properly in the community and with the board, I have not myself pursued the matter further at the present time.

MR. GRUENWALD:

A supplementary -- I'm sorry, John -- I presume then that you are satisfied with the explanation that you received. But one further supplementary. Is the equipment that was accepted or agreed upon by the board approved for use in the Province of Alberta?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that question came up more recently than the first question raised with regard to this, and when I obtained the report that I did, that particular item wasn't covered.

I have had a chance today to check into it a bit more, and will have a final answer on that next week. But my understanding is that the equipment is said by the Hospital Services Commission to be approved for use in Alberta, and so the answer to your question would be yes. But since it was one that came up after the time of the report that I originally asked for, I have asked them to go into the matter again, and they are to be in a position to advise me on that by next week.

It would seem to be a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that it could be relatively easily established one way or another, so I have asked them to check it.

MR. ANDERSON:

With regard to the same, Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary. How many bids were received, and what was the difference in the price of the bids on these tenders?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the bids, of course, went to the Lethbridge Municipal Hospital Board, and I don't mind seeking that information from them if the hon. member would like.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. minister examined the specifications with a view to seeing if many types of equipment were automatically excluded?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, a short answer to that question is that I have not examined the specifications.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. HENDERSON:

While the hon. minister is examining the question of whether the specifications were really directed so that only one manufacturer could meet them, could he advise the House further as to whether the commission is going to pay the incremental cost incurred as a result of the acceptance of the higher tender? Or is the local authority going to pay for it?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the laundry in Lethbridge is to be a regional laundry. It is not solely the responsibility of the Lethbridge Board. Perhaps that is a matter between themselves and the Hospital Services Commission of arriving at their annual local budget. So I think it would be looked after in that way.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder since the subject is about a laundry, would you mind permitting a supplementary?

[Laughter]

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Minister, you did mention that since it is a regional laundry, the logic was that you would go to the oil-heated ironers instead of the steam-

heated ironers. I can't see what difference it should make -- whether it be a local laundry, or regional laundry, or whatever.

MR. CRAWFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member misunderstood what I said -- I don't know whether that is a failing on my part, or the hon. member's. But I will say that, in fact, the type of power used for the ironer does not relate to whether or not it was a regional laundry. It only related to the capabilities of the existing steam plant at the Lethbridge base.

Foster Care

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Little Bow, followed by the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development also. Has a uniform system been developed and carried out throughout the province for the purchase of goods and services by foster parents for foster children, that is divorced entirely from the appearance of the voucher system, as recommended by the foster care report known as the Judge Catonio Report?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, probably at some point in the near future I shall give the House a report on the government's reaction to the Catonio Report. When it was submitted last year -- and quite a lot of publicity was given to it and copies distributed in large numbers -- a number of recommendations were acknowledged to be of value. I would have to say to the hon. Member for Little Bow that in respect to that specific recommendation, I can't tell him right off whether or not that has been pursued. I think that it would not be in effect yet. It may well be one of those that some favourable response should be given to.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary on the report. Has the government increased the rate structure for payment to foster parents as recommended in the same report?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, no announcement has been made of any change in the rates yet. The matter is one I hope to deal with when the estimates of the department are up.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. --

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary about the report. Have requirements for foster home applicants been changed, as recommended in the report?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is at the present time a program under way, or about to get under way in the province, directed at interesting a wider range of prospective families in being foster parents. As to actually changing the qualifications in the ordinary sense, that has not been done. There are proposals, though, that relate to the using of foster parents in other areas that have not been gone into very far heretofore, such as in some of the areas of the mild or medium range of emotionally disturbed children. We are looking at the possibility of using foster parents more than institutional care in cases like that. It's a direction we are trying to move toward, to develop approaches to prospective foster parents that will lead to that, but not everything has yet been achieved in that respect.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this subject.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, in light of the title of the report -- the word "urgent" -- I was wondering what schedule the minister has established for making decisions on these some 19 recommendations?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, I indicated to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that I thought it probably was timely to give to the House, within a reasonable time, the government's real reaction to it. I don't doubt that the issues where the interest of the children, many of them disadvantaged, are involved are at all times urgent, and have indeed been urgent for years. We have now the advantages of a report which has been generally well received and within a short time I hope to have some good results from that report.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona.

Peace River Guidance Clinic

MR. BARTON:

Yes Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Is the guidance clinic in Peace River unoccupied?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I believe I heard the hon. member's last word as "unoccupied"?

MR. BARTON:

Unstaffed.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Unstaffed? Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona, followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

Alberta Tax Reduction Plan

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Will the amount of the rebate which a homeowner in Edmonton can expect to receive under the Alberta Tax Reduction Plan be affected by the new assessment which is presently being prepared by the City of Edmonton?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I realize there has been a great deal of concern about the publicity given to the recent new assessment undertaken by the City of Edmonton. I think, in capsule form, we could say that as a result of assessments going up on land, in many cases more people will be brought into the category of receiving the maximum benefit under the plan.

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will those pensioners who are receiving \$150 grant, that is those who are on supplementary assistance, will they be receiving any increase under the new arrangement for increased rebate to the homeowners?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is a year behind, because last year The Senior Citizens Shelter Assistance Act took care of property tax to the full allotment of the education foundation levy for people in that category.

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary. Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of this, but I am wondering whether these particular people will be receiving a cent more than they did under the previous program, notwithstanding your answer.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, they will still receive the full education foundation levy, whatever that happens to be.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's marvellous.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Speaker. Has the department come to any conclusion why a lot of the renters over the age of 65 have not applied for the renters' rebate?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if that's a correct assumption or not. The amounts of the votes that were included in the budget, of course, were based on an estimate of how many senior citizen renters we thought there were in the province. And as all hon. members can appreciate, that is an educated estimate in the best circumstances. Many of them, of course, are in senior citizens' lodges and therefore don't pay the tax so don't get the rebate. Surprisingly enough, the estimate for owners was over, and the estimate for renters was under, so perhaps more pioneer senior citizens are trying to hang onto their own homes that we had assumed.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The government did extend the time limit; just the other day was the deadline rather than the end of the year. Did quite an increase of applications come in during that extended period of time?

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes, I saw the figures a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, and it seems to me that a substantial number did come in. We tried to get out as much publicity as possible around the Christmas season, and I think the two month extension that the government proceeded with was of benefit to many senior citizens.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East, followed by the hon. Member for Highwood.

Hospital Nursing Aides

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question again to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Is there any current intention to discontinue the employment of nursing aides in Alberta hospitals?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, once again, the actual operation, of course, of practically all hospitals in the province, other than the provincial hospitals of which there are about five, is a responsibility of the local boards. But I have seen the reports in the press of late that give rise to a concern expressed by the nursing aides in regard to the possibilities of their future need in the system becoming less. I would point out that the article I know the hon. member refers to, gives the other side too, and points out that many people feel the concerns expressed by the nursing aides were not real and that there would be no decline in the need for their services over the coming years.

The opinion that I have come to, based on the inquiries that I have been able to make into situations where changing in staff patterns did affect the nursing aides in two hospitals, is that this will not be a general thing. There were specific reasons, I believe, in those cases, but the overall requirement of the hospital system in Alberta for nursing aides will continue at a high level.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Highwood, followed by the hon. Member for Bow Valley.

Adoption of Children

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to some other minister, but it would probably only be referred back to the Minister of Health and Social Development, so I will address it to him directly. It has to do with adoption. I was wondering if the minister could tell us if there are more applications for adoptions now than there are children to fill the applications in Alberta?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I should probably look at up-to-date statistics before answering the hon. member's question directly, but I can tell him my observation of statistics over the last year and a half have indicated that, on the whole, the situation described in the hon. member's question does exist in certain age groups -- that of very young children at the most adoptable age. This situation does exist. There are enough people wanting to adopt children so that the department has had to adopt a policy that does not encourage people -- for example those who can have children of their own or who may have one or two adopted children already -- to go any further in regard to adoption. In some of the older age classifications, the situation is generally shown to be that there are still children to adopt for parents who are willing to take the child on at a slightly older age.

MR. BENOIT:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In the light of that statement, why is it so difficult for people in Alberta to adopt children from other countries?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I think, Mr. Speaker there are a number of considerations that wouldn't relate entirely to the responsibilities of the Alberta government when it comes to involving citizens of other countries. I think that we have the necessary regard for the federal laws in respect to immigration, for example. Other than two or three things including that, and questions such as the health of individuals involved from certain parts of the world -- this is a real problem -- other than considerations like that, I myself don't see any reason why some adoption of children from other countries shouldn't be encouraged. I'm not aware that it is, in fact, not encouraged by our people. I think it's probably at the other government level that may exist, and it relates to the reason that I gave.

The only other comment I could make in regard to the provincial attitude would be that our situation is probably not that extreme yet. We were at a period, a few years ago, where there were more children to be adopted than could be adopted. That has changed and is still in the process of change. We have now shifted around to the position described in the hon. member's question, but it is not so extreme that there aren't any children to adopt in Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Bow Valley, followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

Nursing Aide Student Allowance

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question also to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development -- we've got great continuity here. My question is, are you going to re-instate the \$3 a day allowance that was available to nursing aide students entering the nursing schools, which was discontinued in April, 1972?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the \$3 a day allowance for students was discontinued. There is no proposal to change the present policy.

MR. MANDEVILLE:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What effect has it had on the applications coming in from students to enter the nursing aide schools as a result of the discontinuance of this allowance?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member is raising, of course, is the question of how far the government should go in subsidizing educational programs through departments other than the departments involved in education. It seems to me that --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The understanding of the Chair is that the hon. member was asking whether it had any effect on the program.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, I'm in the process of answering that.

I was going to suggest to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that the necessary level of financial support for most people who want to go into programs that advance their education in some way, is available to them through other government programs. Therefore, in my view, there would be no effect on the removal of the particular subsidy which used to exist. To my knowledge there is no shortage of people applying for training in this area.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

Hospital District Boundaries

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question, oddly enough, is also for the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. What purposes do the boundaries of municipal hospital districts serve now that the department is paying all hospital costs?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, they are of much less significance than they were before the fiscal decision, to which the hon. member refers, was announced by the government. However, there still would be some relevance. There may, for example, be requirements -- and these are things that have to be worked out in connection with finalizing the new fiscal program -- that relate to things like the landscaping and incidental improvements of that type. The municipal bodies involved in the district may still have to be responsible for them.

Our policy was announced in respect to operating costs and the removal of the right to requisition for operating costs. I agree with the hon. member that the boundaries are of much less significance once that step has been taken.

MR. COOPER:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the hitherto unattached area in dispute between the Vegreville and the Mandeville hospital districts been allocated to either district, and if so, to which district?

MR. CRAWFORD:

The answers to those two questions, Mr. Speaker, are no and neither.

MR. HENDERSON:

Supplemental, Mr. Speaker. I am looking forward to the recent demonstration of brevity by the minister on this question. With the move to disband the Wetaskiwin-Leduc Auxiliary Hospital District and set up two new districts, is it the intention of the department to include active auxiliary and nursing homes under one board, as per the legislative provision for compensate boards, or are you just going to have two new auxiliary districts? Smaller ones?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the interest of the hon. Leader of the Opposition in that particular subject in that particular area, has come to my attention in the past. My hope is -- and this would apply to anyone in the province -- where the desire of the people involved is to have the integrated or composite board, that is what would be done. It has not been a policy to impose that in any area.

MR. HENDERSON:

What is the course of action that will be pursued, Mr. Speaker, in this particular case? I am not suggesting that the hon. minister is going to propose this, I just wonder about the course of action he appears to be taking.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, if I am not mistaken, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is one of the interested citizens who has discussed the matter with the hospital commission.

MR. HENDERSON:

No, I haven't.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Have you not? My answer in any event, is that other interested bodies certainly have, and my hope would be that anywhere in Alberta people would tend to go in the direction of the composite or integrated type of board. But if when it is being finalized, they are not in favour of it, then it would not go ahead. In the particular case mentioned by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I do not believe it has been finalized.

MR. TAYLOR:

I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Is there some machinery whereby the minister and the commission can get the views of the people as well as the members on the board who often want to keep that position for ulterior purposes?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I surely disagree that the thing that motivates the public servants on those boards is an ulterior purpose in any sense. A great many people serve Alberta very effectively as members of local boards, be they large or small, and I think that, taken all together, they do a good job. We appreciate fully what they do. Their contribution is every bit as important as may be the contribution of hon. members who are also serving the public. I do just want to say that the question raised is interesting nevertheless. The normal response I have in regard to "who represents whom" is that people placed in those positions do in fact represent the community. However, that is not to say that some further sort of opinion sampling or something like that might not be helpful in some cases. I just would have to say that I don't really have a firm conclusion to offer on that subject.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, for clarification, by ulterior purpose I meant that they wanted to retain that particular job. They are certainly doing a good job. You answered the other part.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

132. Mr. R. Speaker proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. French:

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

(1) How many recipients of social allowance were domiciled in motels, or other like accommodation authorized by the Department of Health and Social Development in each city and town in Alberta as at December 31, 1972.

(2) How many recipients of social assistance were domiciled in motels, or other like accommodation, authorized by the Department of Health and Social Development in each city and town in Alberta as at December 31, 1972.

(3) How many recipients of social allowance and social assistance were domiciled in motels, or other like accommodation authorized by the Department of Health and Social Development in each city and town during the calendar year of 1972.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is accepted. I just wanted to take the opportunity of making a gratuitous statement to the hon. member, and say that no doubt, considering his experience, he will know some of the difficulties involved in answering, particularly part 3. But the government will certainly do its very best.

[The motion was carried.]

135. Mr. Dixon proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Ludwig:

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

(1) The amount in fees paid by Alberta Government Telephones to the City of Edmonton for origination and termination fees for long distance telephone calls, for the period January 1, 1972 to December 31, 1972.

(2) The rate per line that AGT pays to the City of Edmonton for use of lines for AGT offices in Edmonton.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, in moving Motion No. 135 on the Order Paper, I would only like to state that my purpose in getting this motion on the Order Paper is that I see a serious conflict is going to arise between AGT and Edmonton Telephones, so I appreciate that the government is going to make this material and information available.

[The motion was carried.]

145. Mr. Wilson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Clark.

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

Copies of all correspondence with and minutes of all meetings held between the Government of Alberta, its ministers, departments, or agencies and the City of Edmonton with regards to the establishing of a provincial park for the city.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, at the time of adjournment on this particular motion for a Return I was pointing out to the House that one of the reasons I want to see this information made available is the apparent reluctance of the Premier to discuss questions of local interest in the Legislature. We were attempting to ascertain, after a certain announcement was made in Calgary relative to a provincial park, whether an announcement was forthcoming in the near future relating to the city of Edmonton. I can only conclude thus far in the exchange, Mr. Speaker, that the government does not have any plans relative to the establishment of a provincial park in the vicinity of the city of Edmonton. I suppose another option would be that they have it under discussion, or they have already decided. Of course, if it's either the first choice or the second choice there is no reason why the information shouldn't be made available.

Proceeding on the assumption that they haven't done anything, notwithstanding the commitment to the City of Calgary, I think it is desirable to point out to the House one or two factors relating to the location of a park adjacent to the city of Edmonton. Certainly the suggestion that it should be located at St. Albert -- and I'm sure the Member for St. Albert is most enthusiastic about it -- wouldn't be in the best interest of people in the city of Edmonton.

I would like to bring to the attention of the government, the Minister of Environment, other ministers for parks, whoever they are, and the Premier -- if

somebody would pass the message on -- that there was a recommendation made relative to a water line from the North Saskatchewan River to stabilize the water level in the Cooking Lake-Miguelon chain. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this would be an excellent location for a provincial park in the vicinity of Edmonton. On the one hand, it is sufficiently far away so that it will not seriously influence the price of land adjacent to the city of Edmonton for real estate development purposes. We have a tremendous potential in that area.

I make these comments because I conclude that the government really has done nothing thus far on this subject, and a little bit of encouragement would probably be a good idea. The area in question has tremendous potential, as I say, Mr. Speaker. If anyone has read the history of the area, the history of Cooking Lake in particular, he would know that there were tremendous stands of timber there a hundred years ago. There are other reports on file in the department, recommendations made to the previous government with regard to the establishment of reserves in the area for ecological purposes. Logically these could be expanded for recreational purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is incumbent upon the government to make its intentions known -- whether they are, or whether they are not, proceeding with the development of a park in the vicinity of the city of Edmonton, which is comparable to the gift of the taxpayers of Alberta to the citizens of Calgary. One way of clearing the matter up would be to provide the information that has been asked for in this Return.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks concerning this motion. I believe it is essential that we receive that kind of information because, notwithstanding that the park will be in the vicinity of Edmonton or within the city limits of Edmonton, it still costs every other part of province. The MLAs have to decide whether the budget will be approved for this kind of proposal.

The MLAs from all constituencies should be interested in whether they are spending \$8 million or \$25 million on a park in Calgary. So should we all be concerned about whether the government will be spending more money than it ought to to provide a park for the people of Edmonton.

We have a government that is always talking about open government. Yet I have never seen until now, such a situation where it's harder to pry information loose from the government. They seem to want to be open, but they also want to keep a lid on everything. They say one thing and do another thing, and then they get up-tight if we question their credibility. The evidence is clear, they are an open government, but there is no information. They don't want to give you information; everything is confidential. They play every trick in the book to keep something confidential, and therefore the opposition has a responsibility to try to get this information, which is for the legitimate need of the MLAs, including the Edmonton MLAs.

I understand that the only person in this whole House who really knows where the park is going is the hon. Member for St. Albert, and I suppose I can't ask him a question. But if he does know, he knows a lot more than the Edmonton MLAs know, and it's about time they started finding out what is going on in the city, because if and when the next election comes around, and they are asked what they did, they will say, "We did what we were told to do."

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, in referring to Hansard of last Tuesday, I believe the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View has already spoken on this motion.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware, but I would like to tell the hon. member as I told the hon. member, Mr. Farran, it's not when you get up but when you wake up, that counts. I have finished my remarks, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Laughter]

DR. WARRACK:

I remember the hon. member's speech on Tuesday.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I wait for a ruling from you. I don't take their word to mean that I spoke.

MR. SPEAKER:

I regret the Chair has not the list here -- it should be here, I know -- of those who have spoken. I would assume that the hon. member would know whether he has spoken on the motion.

[Interjections]

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I have got advice from a reliable source. The hon. Leader of the Opposition says I have spoken, and I will sit down.

[Laughter]

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I haven't spoken on the motion, and if I had I would have remembered because it would have been of more import than the contribution from the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Mr. Speaker, these people aren't naive. They are not as wet behind the ears as they appear. They are quite well aware that negotiations regarding the assembly of land have to be kept confidential, in the public interest. I presume they graduated from elementary school, so they know that. When they assembled land in Mill Woods, when they assembled land for projects in conjunction with Calgary Power at Bighorn Dam, when the hon. Member for Drumheller was out buying rights-of-way for roads, it was all kept confidential until the deal was finalized. If it were not in those days, then they were guilty of gross mis-spending of public money.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I haven't spoken on this Return. I would like to make a few comments in connection with this matter. If this matter were to have been kept under grass, I wonder why the story which brought this out into the open and aroused everybody's interest appeared in The Edmonton Journal and was attributed to the hon. Member for St. Albert. If it is going to be kept under wraps, why not keep it under wraps? But if we start publicly advocating one site, then it is very unfair to the city of Edmonton or other areas where there may be a better site. I think the government and the City of Edmonton, have a responsibility to make an inventory of all possible sites, and surely, this has been done?

If we are establishing an urban park for all time, then let's not make a mistake. One of the best ways of not making a mistake is to get an inventory of all the possible sites, and then to weigh the merits of each particular one. I'm not going to recommend any particular site. I don't think I have the necessary information to recommend a site. There may be areas that I prefer to others, but I think that the City of Edmonton and the government has to go way beyond any one member's thinking, in connection with establishing an urban park. I see a little bit of difference in connection with the park that is going to be there for the enjoyment of the people of the area, including the city, and the people of the province, if they come here, to a site for building or a site for a highway.

As a matter of fact, I think now that the thing is out in the open and one site is being openly advocated, that the government has some responsibility to let the people know that it is checking all possible sites, and making an inventory of them, and that no decision has been made. If there has been a decision made without setting out an inventory of all possible sites, and weighing their merits, then I think the government is in a very bad position with regard to the expenditure of public money.

I think the city is also, because the city, I believe from a reply the other day is going to have to supply the land and the maintenance of the park once it is established. And consequently the citizens of the City of Edmonton should have some say in regard to this. The maintenance may be double on some sites to what it is on other sites. Some sites may have an ample supply of water now; some may not have any water at all; some that would have other benefits may have the potential of getting water. I think what we are saying

here is that we want to make sure that since public money, both city and provincial, is involved, every site is carefully examined and weighed on all of their merits and all of the costs involved, so that we can get the very best possible site at the lowest possible cost and the lowest maintenance cost throughout the years.

There is another factor, too, when an inventory like this is prepared. Now that one site has been made public, I would think there might be some merit in making all possible sites public. Not with the idea of increasing the cost, but with the idea of reducing the cost. If there were one site only, then certainly the costs might mushroom, but if there were four, five or six possible sites, then surely these would be weighed against each other, and it could well be that the competition there might save the government and the city considerable money, particularly if the merits of every one were very carefully analyzed. In that case the competition, which is the lifeblood of free enterprise, might very well have the effect of doing the reverse to that suggested by some members of making the costs rise. It could have the effect of reducing costs, through fair and open competition.

Those were the main points I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, but I did want to emphasize that the inventory of all possible sites is a requirement, I think, and something the people of Edmonton and the people of the province have some right to expect from the government.

[Mr. R. Speaker and Mr. Jamison rose simultaneously.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, in view of those two hon. members drawing back I'll stand up and I'll take the opportunity to debate this. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

I first want to say it is unfortunate that we have such a motion, and rather unfortunate that the opposition is truly ignoring certain facts. First of all they referred to the hon. Member for St. Albert as a citizen of Edmonton. I know the St. Albert people are very proud -- I believe they are citizens of St. Albert, and not Edmonton.

Secondly, we have discussed here, and we have referred to the hon. Mr. Jamison as a country cousin. The hon. Member for Highwood referred to country cousins and city cousins, and he's speaking about a park in a rural area. The Edmonton MLAs are sincerely speaking about the proposed study of a park in Edmonton. And just how anybody in the opposition would feel at this time, that --

MR. DIXON:

How about both?

MR. DIACHUK:

Possibly even both -- something for the country cousins and something for the city cousins. However, how anybody would feel that this would be an opportune time to get correspondence, minutes -- it's a wonder you haven't asked for Hansard of last year when I spoke on a provincial park for Edmonton. And I spoke again on Tuesday. You know I'm a little bit miffed you haven't asked for my reports --

AN HON. MEMBER:

Didn't know you made any.

MR. DIACHUK:

I have studied with the alderman representing the ward that I represent.

MR. HENDERSON:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The request for the Return is directed to the government, not the back benchers in the Conservative party.

MR. DIACHUK:

However, at the same time I say that the motion, Mr. Speaker, is quite incomplete. And if only on the point that you haven't asked for my information, I'm going to have to vote against the motion. Thank you very much.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to make a few remarks in regard to this motion. One of the things that concerns me very much is the cloak of secrecy over this whole thing, and one which the citizens of Edmonton are very concerned about -- not only many of the citizens, independent citizens, but the city council and the city people themselves, because they are not sure just what these plans are. As my colleague has said, we're not sure at this point whether there are no plans or whether the plans have been completed. It's all wrapped up and finished.

Well if that last alternative were true, that the plans are already completed, the decisions have been made. I can indicate to one of the hon. members on that side, the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, that if a certain location next to the university has been chosen he is in difficulty in the next election.

I would like to say that many of his constituents have been very concerned about this matter, and I think it would be only right and proper that he stand up and support it and say "I want all of the public information out so that the people in that area of the city know that the university site isn't the one that is going to be chosen." Because if it comes out later that it is and he hasn't stood up, I am certain that he will be back to being a private citizen after the next election.

So I think that number one the government has certainly a responsibility of presenting this information to the House and making it available to all the members; number two, that if the decision has been made and it is the university farm land, then the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs has a responsibility to announce that as quickly as possible, because his constituents tell me that he hasn't been around since the last election and they haven't had a chance to really respond on this particular matter.

[Interjections]

So, for his benefit and the government's benefit, I certainly urge the government to go along with this motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, may I close the debate?

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member close the debate?

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's proper to close the debate just yet. I think there is one comment that needs to be made with respect to the tremendous speech we have heard from the hon. Member for Little Bow. He was very concerned about whether the government is aware of the pulse of the citizens of Edmonton, and he feels that he has a much better grasp of the feelings of the citizens of Edmonton.

I will vote against this motion, Mr. Speaker, for the simple reason that we have had a demonstration within the last 20 months of just how far off he is from the pulse of the citizens of Edmonton, and I think that on that ground alone it bears being voted down.

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Speaker, may I close the debate by saying a few words?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MR. JAMISON:

I don't recognize any of them on the other side who are from the Edmonton area, so I feel the people from this side should do most of the talking. I am very pleased that the fumbling and bumbling of the --

MR. HENDERSON:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. member from Edmonton? The constituency of Wetaskiwin-Leduc is from the Edmonton area.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The name of the constituency of the hon. member is public knowledge and not the subject for a point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He's all mixed up.

MR. JAMISON:

As I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, the fumbling and bumbling of the former government in their estimates of the needs of a university brought up this question in the first place. I will make it very clear now by saying I will not support Motion No. 145.

The area which I referred to, and have referred to many times in this Legislature, first of all in my maiden speech last year and many times since, and in conversations with the Minister of Lands and Forests -- the area that I would like to see as a small provincial park is the land which is now presently in the Public Works Department, roughly 960 acres, the area of which has been broadcast around quite a bit. A survey was done on it. I think something like 67 engineering studies have been undertaken on the Sturgeon River basin. Three years ago when the Water Resources branch was talking to a group of people in the Town of St. Albert, they referred to the clean-up of the Sturgeon Basin, a recreation area in the Big Lake area, and a park area, and to do this job would be in the neighbourhood of \$150 million to \$200 million. This is where the mistake arose in the first place.

I would just like to say I still support a small park which will serve two purposes. It will service, first of all, as a buffer zone between the City of Edmonton and the Town of St. Albert, and I will do my utmost to see that St. Albert retains its own identity. It will serve as a nice recreational park in the neighbourhood of Edmonton and St. Albert.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member now close the debate?

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, Motion No. 145 refers to the principle under which a provincial park in Edmonton or near Edmonton would be established. The talks opposing the motion have been off the target. We have made no reference to specific parcels of land. We have made no reference to negotiations with land owners or for land assembly. We are only asking the basis on which the establishment of an Edmonton provincial park will take place.

Has the government an agreement with the City of Edmonton on the principle on which the park will be established? Who pays the development costs? Who pays the maintenance costs? Who pays the operating costs? What kind of facilities will be offered in this park? Has there been any negotiation at all with the municipal government?

The city has a long-term park policy. Has, or is, the government taking into consideration or will the city have an expensive park dumped on them with no opportunity for input? Does the proposed provincial park fit the Edmonton Parks and Recreation master plan?

Mr. Speaker, we are concerned and trying to determine if local autonomy is going to be recognized in the establishment of this park. Has local autonomy

been recognized to date? Does the government's great hesitancy to disclose any information mean that they really don't have any information to disclose? It appears the government is trying to hide their lack of local consultation. Does the adamant opposition to the motion mean that there has been no dialogue at all with Edmonton or the Regional Planning Commission regarding this proposed park? Mr. Speaker, the government's negative reaction to this motion makes one wonder if they are only paying lip service to local autonomy.

Mr. Speaker, did the province have any input to the Edmonton Parks and Recreation master plan? Has the government completed, or would they be willing to finance a detailed study of the North Saskatchewan River system in the Edmonton area? In proposing this park, has the province reviewed Chapter 8 of the Edmonton General Plan, which deals with parks and recreation? Has the province reviewed the regional park study of the Edmonton region?

Mr. Speaker, the turmoil created by an independently located provincial park can be considerable to the City of Edmonton, both in general planning frustrations and in financing. Such things as the accessibility by car, public transit, bicycle or pedestrian trails affect the overall municipal planning and budgeting.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised at the lack of constructive interest displayed here, at least, on the part of Edmonton members of the Legislature. Let the records show that the Socreds tried to establish that a provincial park for Edmonton would be approached on a constructive basis, including local municipal consultation.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would all those in favour of Motion No. 145 please say aye. Those opposed please say no.

[The motion was lost.]

[Inaudible comments from the floor.]

MR. HENDERSON:

It's the first thing you have had all year to laugh at, so go ahead.

MR. LUDWIG:

Open government in action.

MR. HENDERSON:

Too busy working for the Government House Leader today.

[A number of members rose, calling for a division. The division bell was rung.]

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

For the amendment:

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

Against the amendment:

Adair	Doan	Jamison	Purdy
Appleby	Dowling	Koziak	Russell
Ashton	Farran	Lee	Schmid
Backus	Foster	Leitch	Stromberg
Batiuk	Getty	Lougheed	Topolnisky
Chambers	Ghitter	McCrimmon	Trynchy
Chichak	Hansen	Miller, J.	Warrack
Copithorne	Hohol	Miniely	Young
Crawford	Horne	Moore	Yurko
Diachuk	Hunley	Paproski	Zander
Dickie	Hyndman	Peacock	

Totals: Ayes - 23 Noes - 43]

[The motion was lost.]

146. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. R. Speaker:

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

A list indicating the name and the amounts of each grant which has been made available to community minded organizations, such as citizens' groups, volunteer groups and charity organizations, covering the period from March 31, 1972 to the present.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that motion is agreed to.

[The motion was carried.]

147. Mr. Dixon proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Wyse.

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

Copies of all correspondence and minutes of all meetings held between the Government of Alberta, its Ministers or Agencies, and the C.N.R. since September 10, 1971, regarding the Alberta Resources Railway.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would agree to the tabling of the copies of all the correspondence on this particular motion if the mover would delete the minutes of all these meetings held. I am sure that he is aware and knowledgeable of the sensitivity of negotiations, and it is certainly not in the best public interest to make these public. And if not, it would be necessary for me to amend.

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps to regularize the matter we might record a motion to amend by the hon. Minister for Industry seconded by the hon. Minister of Highways. Strike out the words "and minutes of all meetings held".

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the minister a question? Were there any minutes tabled in the Returns that had been thus far produced in the House last year on this particular issue?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would have to inform myself of that. I am not sure, I don't think there were.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, we might hold it on the Order Paper just to clarify that point.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree that this motion may retain its position on the Order Paper? Perhaps we could completely disregard the suggestion I made as to an amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

148. Mr. Barton proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Cooper.

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

All correspondence between Government of Alberta, its ministers, department, agencies or boards and the Government of Canada with regards to the site of the 1975 Canada Winter Games.

MR. BARTON:

I would like to also say a few words to this motion. First of all, there are in the north -- and Grande Prairie's submission was done very well, an excellent job -- reports coming out that there is a little bit of political hanky-panky. I feel that all this information should be available, Mr. Speaker.

DR. HORNER:

[Inaudible]

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I'll accept the motion subject to concurrence by the federal government. At the same time, I would like to assure the hon. member that the province had no input whatsoever into the decision regarding the Canada Winter Games.

[The motion was carried.]

149. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Ludwig.

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

Detailed breakdown of the reasons for the Special Warrant amounting to \$1,020,000 for the Department of Advanced Education for allocation to the Faculty of Medicine, University of Calgary and the Banff School of Fine Arts.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I think that Motion No. 149 should more properly be worded as a question rather than as a Motion for Return. I would be quite happy to deal with it either as a question for a Motion for Return.

MR. CLARK:

It is here.

MR. FOSTER:

I am just pointing out, Mr. Speaker, that in my view, the approach is wrong. It should more properly be a question. If the member wishes to pursue it as a Motion for Return, I am more than happy to comply.

MR. CLARK:

This may be the first time we agree this session.

MR. HENDERSON:

We accept the Speaker's direction in the first place, so argue with him.

[The motion was carried.]

150. Mr. R. Speaker proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. D. Miller.

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

(1) How many applicants were requesting space in Alberta Senior Citizens Homes as of December 31, 1972.

(2) The number of applicants for accommodation in the Senior Citizens Homes in each city and town in Alberta as of December 31, 1972.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

I understand the minister has up-to-date information as of a date in October. I would move that amendment to the motion and it would be acceptable to me on that basis.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is the case. It happens that the department has a survey of senior citizens' homes operated by foundations. There may be private ones of which they have no record in various places, but the ones operated by foundations as of October 18 would therefore become the date referred to in the hon. member's amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the House will unanimously agree to an informal amendment may we take the motions as having October 18 substituted for December 31, 1972?

[The motion was carried.]

151. 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:

All correspondence since September 10, 1971, between the Government of Alberta or any of its agencies, departments or boards, and oil companies, the federal government, or the Automotive Retailers' Association regarding the McKenzie Report on Gasline Marketing.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we agree subject to the usual concurrence.

[The motion was carried.]

152. 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:

What is the Alberta Government's position regarding the ownership and disposition of Canada's offshore mineral rights?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the government has no objections to this Motion for a Return subject to the usual -- although on this one I don't think we need the federal government's approval.

One thing I would point out, Mr. Speaker, I do find myself in the same position as the Minister of Municipal Affairs the other day. I am now in a position to answer my own Motion for a Return but just at a different time. I find it interesting, Mr. Speaker, that I guess copying is the supreme kind of flattery -- isn't that the --

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, dealing with the question of copying being the supreme kind of flattery, I recall about three years ago when it was pointed out to, I believe, the hon. member who just spoke that they, in fact, had copied an NDP motion that had been placed on the Order Paper in the House of Commons in Ottawa.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion I wonder if the hon. minister could tell us where The Alberta Bill of Rights came from.

MR. STROM:

May I close the debate?

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member close the debate?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't intend to make a long speech. I just want to make a point that I have always made, and that is that I'm really not interested in knowing what happened in the past, nor what decisions made were related to information in the past, but I am very interested in finding out what the decisions were related to the current times.

[The motion was carried.]

153. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Clark.

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

All correspondence since September 10th, 1971, between the Government of Alberta, its ministers, departments, agencies or boards, with the Government of Canada with regard to any crude oil shortages in Canada, as well as minutes of all meetings held between these parties on this subject.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, we agree to the motion where it requires the correspondence. However, I would have to reject the suggestion for a request for the minutes. So I would accordingly move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, that the words following crude oil shortages in Canada, "as well as minutes of all meetings held between these parties on this subject" be deleted.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment, I would like to suggest that I do so not knowing if there are minutes here, I do so on a matter of principle that the minutes be tabled in the Legislature. I would look at the question of minutes being tabled as somewhat similar to correspondence between ministers, interdepartmental correspondence.

Also the difficulty that always troubles me is the question of minutes and how you define minutes. Sometimes there are notes that are made after a particular meeting. Having drafted a number of minutes for various organizations that do require minutes, I can appreciate that sometimes these minutes are not actually reflecting what might have really gone on. I think that would be a danger, if minutes of this nature were requested, or being

tabled on the floor of the Legislature. They could, in fact, really convey a different picture than perhaps what the intentions of the parties were.

I think I say that because in most cases the minutes are reflecting one side. On occasion, minutes are signed by all of the parties, and that might be a little different position. However, where there is a question of what constitutes a minute, and what constitutes a note, I think we would have to suggest that it would be quite improper to have those filed and tabled on the floor of the Legislature.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, just a word on closing the debate --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member -- what is before the House is an amendment, not the original motion.

MR. HENDERSON:

I was going to speak to just about the same, Mr. Speaker. I accept the words of the minister so far as the desirability of tabling the minutes, and I have no quarrel with the proposed amendment, but I would like to speak to the motion as amended.

[The amendment was carried.]

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it that the hon. Leader of the Opposition wishes to debate the motion as amended?

MR. DICKIE:

One observation further that I would like to add; the motion would be subject to the usual concurrence of parties to any correspondence.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. Opposition Leader close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, just a very brief comment on the desirability of making as much information on this subject possible. I find on examining the report the government tabled in the House the other day, which is a copy of the federal government's policy paper in this matter, leading in turn to the decision to place restrictions on export nominations of Alberta crude into the American market for the month of March -- that it is not readily possible to discern any basic difference between the data of the Alberta Energy Board and the National Energy Board.

I think that any differences are really within the realm of error and statistical judgment. But obviously there is a wide divergence of opinion between the provincial government and the federal government as to the conclusions they have arrived at -- the two parties -- out of the statistics.

It is obviously of considerable significance to the people of the Province of Alberta. I quite frankly suggest, Mr. Speaker, not only to the minister of the provincial government, that it is in the best interests of the federal government, that the difference in viewpoint be publicly examined just to ascertain how on earth two different governments, accepting recommendations and advice from two energy boards, have arrived at two divergent viewpoints on the interpretation of data which is essentially the same.

I would hope that the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals would bring the importance of this matter to the people of Alberta when he contacts his counterpart in Ottawa with the request for their permission to table any relevant information.

[The motion was carried.]

154. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to this Assembly, seconded by Dr. Buck.

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

All correspondence and minutes of meetings held between the Government of Alberta, its Ministers, Departments, Agencies or Boards and the City of Edmonton or Agencies thereof, including the Commonwealth Games Committee, with regard to the subject of the Government of Alberta's financial contribution toward the Commonwealth Games to be staged in Edmonton in 1978.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to amend the motion, seconded by the hon. Minister without Portfolio Responsible for Northern Development, that any minutes of meetings held be deleted, of course, also subject to the usual concurrence by the correspondents.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the House will agree to the informal amendment, will all those in favour of the motion as amended please say aye. Those opposed please say no.

[The motion was carried.]

155. Mr. R. Speaker proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Ho Lem.

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

- (1) How much new construction in the hospital field was approved in 1972?
- (2) What were each of the projects, where were they located, and the total cost involved in each case?
- (3) What projects are proceeding in the hospital construction field in 1973?

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I second motion No. 155 because it deals with the question of the amount of hospital construction in 1972, as well as asking for information policy regarding the projection for 1973. In seconding the motion I do so with a view of securing pertinent information, not only on a province-wide basis, but in particular as it applies to the Calgary situation in that I am a member from that city.

For some time now there has been a constant demand for increasing services in the way of medical services and hospital facilities. In fact, in many instances we find that as one institution is being completed, new plans are on the drawing board for an additional one; and, of course, we find that many plans are being proposed for extensions of the existing institutions.

Mr. Speaker, in the Calgary situation there is really no difference. Presently we have six acute hospitals -- the General Hospital, the Holy Cross, Foothills...[Inaudible]...for a total capacity of over 7,500 acute hospital beds.

DR. HORNER:

A point of order. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that the hon. member is completely irrelevant with regard to the motion that he is seconding.

MR. HO LEM:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I bring the situation and also the concerns of the people of Calgary to establish my reasons for asking for this information.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, even though the hon. member is referring to the situation relative to the City of Calgary, I think his observations apply in general and are general concerns throughout the province. And his remarks are relevant to the motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

As the Chair understands it, the hon. member is pointing out certain concerns with regard to the information which might be taken as reasons for giving the information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Dr. Horner rose to protest.]

MR. HENDERSON:

Easy now.

MR. HO LEM:

As I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, in the Calgary area we have acute hospital beds, which, compared to our population -- it figures out to a ratio of between six and seven acute hospital beds per thousand. The minister indicated previously that it is --

MR. FARRAN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that the hon. Member for Calgary McCall already knows the answer to the question, so why is he asking it?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I rise once again on a point of order. The member is using a reference to the city of Calgary to illustrate the point, and he is asking for a Return relevant to the provincial situation. So the suggestion that the member's comments are answering his own Return is absolute nonsense and does not demonstrate any statesmanship on the part of the mover of the point of order.

[Laughter]

DR. HORNER:

[Inaudible]...contribution by the Leader of the Opposition either.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, in bringing this ratio to the attention of the House I also want to comment on what the Minister of Health and Social Development had said regarding reducing this ratio to 4.5 per thousand. That is something we are striving for.

Now, in order to bring this ratio down it doesn't mean that we are going to close a wing in certain hospitals. But it has been suggested that there be a moratorium on the construction of new hospital beds in the city of Calgary, and that, as the population of the city grows, the ratio will eventually adjust itself. It was suggested that perhaps by 1980 we might reach the criteria 4.5. This cannot, of course, be achieved --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The Chair must concede that at this stage the hon. member is really going far afield and is giving a general speech concerning the surrounding situation. If the hon. member wishes to come back to the importance of giving the information requested, then his remarks will be in order.

MR. HO LEM:

With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the House the auxiliary hospital board's concern because if we are going to go ahead with this procedure there will be additional demands on the auxiliary hospital, and because there are additional demands on the auxiliary hospital --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. HO LEM:

-- in 1973 --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please, the concern of the House is not whether a certain procedure will be proceeded with. It's whether or not this information should be given.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have a very relevant and --

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask you two or three questions.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Ho Lem is not finished.

MR. CRAWFORD:

I thought the mover and seconder had both spoken already. I'm sorry.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no requirement that a seconder of the motion has to speak right after the mover. That applies only to an amendment.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes, the thing can be said in less time than it has taken for me to listen to the hon. gentleman say why I shouldn't say it now. That was that the contribution I have to make to all this is that we are in agreement with providing the information.

MR. HO LEM:

The reason I am bringing it before the House is that I called the hon. minister two days ago, hoping that I might be able to transmit this information to him in writing, but I haven't had a reply. So having said that, may I continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HO LEM:

The situation is that if this were to be proceeded with, this policy, certainly there would be added demands on the auxiliary hospitals --

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The only reason I said "Order" is that I can't hear what the hon. member is saying.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Carry on.

MR. HO LEM:

-- the increase in demands on other levels of services. When you hold the status quo on the top level, which is the acute hospitals, then naturally, with a growing demand and the growing population, there would be added demands on the secondary level. And this is in the area of auxiliary hospitals, day hospitals and hospital extensions. Now the Calgary Auxiliary Hospital and Nursing Board

District No. 7 have been responsible for the development and the co-ordination of these services in the city of Calgary.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. I must find that the hon. member is again digressing a long way from the purport of the motion. Is there any further debate on the motion?

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I just have a word or two to say because of the motion that is before the House which is apparently being agreed to by the government. I would just like to bring to the attention of the government that Alberta had had the highest ratio of hospital beds per capita for many, many years --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. May I point out, with the utmost respect for the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, that this kind of motion is in many ways similar to a question. Hence it would be expected in debate that the remarks would relate to the obtaining of information rather than giving information, although certainly it is in order to give information to indicate the importance or necessity of getting the information. I think that we are getting into a custom of using these motions for general debate on the subject, which is indicated in the Motion for a Return.

MR. DIXON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I shall abide by your ruling. I am only interested in the fact that there is concern with hospital construction. But I am wondering before we branch off into hospital construction, if the hon. minister would enlarge on plans that have been sent to him by the different hospital boards. I am referring in particular to the Calgary Auxiliary Hospital Board regarding their new multi-service facility request, which will have a bearing on future hospital construction in Alberta.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to appear unwilling to respond to that, but it is certainly not the sort of thing that can come up at this time in the House proceedings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question, question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The motion was carried.]

156. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Miller.

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

Two copies of all studies and the resultant plans for the development of the hydro potential on the Peace River.

[The motion was carried.]

157. Mr. Barton proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Dr. Buck.

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

A copy of the study referred to by the Minister Without Portfolio Responsible for Tourism in February 16, 1973 Hansard which includes information of new major airports for Alberta.

158. Mr. Ludwig proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Wilson.

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

(1) Rate increases that have been made for use of the Southern Alberta Jubilee Auditorium and the Northern Alberta Jubilee Auditorium since September 10, 1971. Please itemize all categories of increases. Please table all correspondence received by the minister concerning this issue since September 10, 1971, and his replies to said correspondence.

(2) Dates of meetings held with high school students of Alberta and the minister or his representatives prior to the decision to increase charges for use of the Southern Alberta Jubilee Auditorium and the Northern Alberta Jubilee Auditorium for graduation ceremonies by high school students. Please table correspondence received by the minister dealing with regard to increased rates to high school students for use of the auditoriums for graduation ceremonies, and his replies to the said correspondence.

(3) Revenue increases expected to be received by the government from the increased rates levied against use of the auditoriums for high school graduation ceremonies annually.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, may Motion No. 158 please stand?

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member the unanimous consent of the House to allow Motion No. 158 to retain its place on the Order Paper?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

159. Mr. Gruenwald proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Clark.

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

(1) The enrolment for each of the past three years for full-time students and/or full-time equivalents in each of the following institutions:

- (a) University of Alberta;
- (b) University of Calgary;
- (c) University of Lethbridge;
- (d) Northern Alberta Institute of Technology;
- (e) Southern Alberta Institute of Technology;
- (f) Community College -- Red Deer;
- (g) Community College -- Lethbridge;
- (h) Community College -- Grande Prairie;
- (i) Community College -- Medicine Hat;
- (j) Mount Royal College -- Calgary
- (k) Agricultural and Vocational College -- Olds;
- (l) Agricultural and Vocational College -- Vermilion; and
- (m) Agricultural and Vocational College -- Fairview.

(2) The Department of Advanced Education forecast for enrolment and per pupil operating costs for the next five years.

MR. GRUENWALD:

It being a very reasonable request, I'm sure there will be no problem about Motion No. 159.

MR. FOSTER:

Ha! Mr. Speaker, this is another one of these motions that seems to have its author on this side of the House rather than the other. It looks substantially the same as a motion put by the Premier in 1968. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, one of the problems with copying somebody else's initiative is that sometimes you are not careful enough to make sure you have all of the facts in there that you'd like. In looking over the question I was interested to note that the author of this Motion for a Return was, in fact, careful enough to include Mount Royal College in Calgary, which is a public college now, but was

not careful enough to include, for example, Grant MacEwan College, which is a college in Edmonton, and which obviously was not on the Return in 1968 when it was originally put --

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I'm sure you know, Mr. Speaker, that I don't get up on too many points of order, but I just ruled out myself, on the irrelevancy of what was in the debate. There is nothing in this motion that the hon. member is talking about, and he is imputing motives. So he's out of order and he should stick to the point.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, may I just respond to this nonsense he is giving here?

MR. SPEAKER:

Might the hon. member --

MR. GRUENWALD:

It's a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Well, if it's a response, might the hon. member save it until he closes the debate?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the point of order, I merely wish to point out that I was trying to do the homework for my friends and colleagues in the opposition, and suggest to them that there may be more institutions in this province they would like listed, because I am more than happy to provide the information. So if you'd like to add, Mr. Speaker, the Grant MacEwan College from Edmonton, I'd be happy to see it added. I think it would be a great service to the members of the opposition. If you'd like to add, for example, the Alberta Vocational Centres, which are institutions we operate; if you'd like to add the Petroleum Drilling School, which is also a part of Advanced Education, I'd be delighted to add them. I'm merely saying, Mr. Speaker, that when members of the opposition are seeking information, and it's good information, they should be careful to include all of those institutions for which Advanced Education has some responsibility. I think it's important they get all the facts, not just some of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion, the only concern I have is that the hon. minister is so anxious to answer questions that he is not asked, but is so weak in answering questions that he is asked.

MR. GRUENWALD:

May I close the debate?

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. FOSTER:

Perhaps when the hon. member does close the debate he might answer whether or not he would like to add more information --

MR. HENDERSON:

The hon. minister has already spoken.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate, I'd like to point out to the Minister of Advanced Education that if I wanted to know something about Grant MacEwan College, I'd jolly well ask it. And I would like to point out that if I need your help in printing questions, I will also ask for it. And I will point out, Mr. Minister of Advanced Education, I didn't get this from any other journal, because I wasn't around here when those questions were being asked, and I don't know if you were or not. I'd suggest that you are not making any suggestions --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please address his remarks to the Chair.

MR. GRUENWALD:

I'm sorry.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. Order, please.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I apologize for that, but I got a bit carried away. Nevertheless, the point is that I would humbly suggest that the Minister of Advanced Education, if he has the background information and if it is available, if he is able to dig it up, would he please answer these questions and not the ones that he is asking.

[The motion was carried.]

160. Mr. Gruenwald proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Clark.

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

(1) The enrolment in all public and separate schools in the Province of Alberta for each of the past three years, indicating

- (a) Grades 1 to 6 inclusive;
- (b) Grades 7 to 9 inclusive; and
- (c) Grades 10 to 12 inclusive.

(2) The Department of Education forecast of enrolment and per pupil operating costs for the next five years.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Minister, it's my question.

[The motion was carried.]

162. Mr. Ruste proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Mandeville.

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

A copy of all the submissions made by the Government of Alberta, its Ministers, Department Agencies or Boards, to the Federal Committee on Food.

[The motion was carried.]

163. Mr. Notley asked the Government the following question:

What oil drilling activities are presently in progress within the Willmore Wilderness Park and what companies are involved?

[The motion was carried.]

DR. WARRACK:

The answer is none; I table the answer.

MR. HYNDMAN:

There's one minute to go!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Government House Leader's prediction having come true, it is now 4:30 o'clock.

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

Bill No. 200 An Act to Amend The Companies Act

MR. ASHTON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move, seconded by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, second reading of Bill 200. The principle of this bill, of course, is related to the general topic of foreign investment. The bill, if passed, would require that all Alberta companies have as a majority of their boards of directors, Canadian citizens who are ordinarily resident in Canada.

Now supplementary to this, to give the bill even more teeth, is that the majority of these directors' meetings would have to be held in Canada; all of those directors' meetings that are for the purposes of transacting business would have to have a quorum; and of that quorum, the majority would have to be the Canadian directors.

Now I must say I introduced this bill with some fears, Mr. Speaker, in view of the events of the last few weeks; I rather suspect that one of the hon. members opposite might somehow find that this bill infringes the intent and spirit of The Alberta Bill of Rights. They seem to find it lurking everywhere.

But I must say, Mr. Speaker, there is no other economic issue facing this province which exceeds in magnitude and importance the mixed blessing and problem of foreign investment. The hon. Member for Edmonton Calder, who isn't here at the moment, pointed out to us very clearly the value of foreign investment to the economy.

However, without disputing the validity of Mr. Chambers' points, I would suggest that Albertans have to grow to economic maturity, they have to have an ever increasing influence over their own economic destiny. The growing and higher degree of foreign investment in Canada, particularly the U.S. control, has led to industrial and resource development which actually reflects priorities other than our own. And this is the problem. For example, some of the people in Grande Cache may be asking if the decision to close down one of their mines was made in Alberta, or in some other country. Many of these resource companies have invested in Canada for the purpose of taking our raw materials to their countries. These investment decisions were influenced by their own priorities, not by priorities determined by Canadians or Albertans.

Now as a result, we in Canada, and particularly in Alberta, are having less and less influence on what is happening to our economy. Refer to the Foreign Direct Investment in Canada Report, and I am sure many of the hon. members have had a look at it, it is a so-called 'Gray' report.

This report will point out to us that the degree of foreign ownership and control of economic activity in Canada is already substantially higher than in any other industrialized country of the world. It is continuing to increase. Nearly 60 per cent of the manufacturing in Canada is foreign controlled. In some manufacturing industries, such as petroleum and rubber products, foreign control exceeds 90 per cent. 65 per cent of Canadian mining and smelting is controlled from abroad. Approximately 80 per cent of foreign control of Canadian manufacturing and natural resource industries rests in the United States.

Now, if we look at the total national wealth, the proportion controlled by non-residents is only in the order of 10 per cent, but one-third of the total business activity in Canada is operated by foreign controlled companies.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is not going to solve all these problems. It wasn't intended to. However, it does provide an important step toward Albertans gaining more control over the decision-making process of foreign companies operating in Alberta.

I want to make absolutely clear at this point that I am not joining the state control advocates who are attempting to pervert the foreign investment issue into a reason for having state control. But I introduced this bill as a beginning step in this area. It may be that additional legislation can be and should be added at a later date. One of the reasons, of course, that I am not attempting to tackle the complete problem is that the Select Committee on Foreign Investment, under the competent chairmanship of the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona, has the matter currently under consideration. With reference to that Select Committee, I would like to congratulate the government for having taken the initiative so early, soon after the election, at the first sitting.

I don't wish to imply that I have any lack of gratitude for the value of foreign investment in Canada to date, but it would appear that the policy of the former government was an economic sell-out of Canada. A classic example of this, of course, were the 16.75 per cent restrictions on the maximum royalties imposed by the previous government. However, Albertans are fortunate in that they elected a government a little over a year ago with enough foresight and imagination to solve the problems that the other government left to them.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose of bringing this bill before the House, is so Albertans and Canadians should have more influence over the decision-making process of these Alberta subsidiaries of foreign countries.

One thing you will find, if we had Canadian directors on these subsidiaries, of course, they would be expressing a Canadian viewpoint. They would be relating their decision-making more closely to the feeling of Albertans and Canadians. I don't suggest that the bill is going to give final control over the decision-making process. There is a possibility, if Canadian directors cause too much trouble for their parent companies, that the parent companies would in fact fire them and find different Canadian directors, some of whom would be prepared to dance more easily to the tune of the foreign parent.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there will be great public pressure on the foreign companies to take no steps to discourage their Canadian directors to speak out on issues important to Canada. It would be very poor public relations on their part if the situation arose where in fact they took such a disciplinary step against Canadian directors for attempting to bring the Canadian viewpoint to the forefront.

I might say that there is nothing new about the bill before us. A year ago we in Alberta learned that, probably for the first time in 36 years, some positive steps were taken to give Albertans a larger say in the economic decisions of foreign companies. Of course, the one I am referring to is the historic announcement made by the government a year ago on the Syncrude application. The hon. members will recall that the terms for approving that application included a couple of items which related to the topic we are discussing today. The first one, of course, was that the applicants -- namely Syncrude -- would grant to Canadian citizens, or Alberta residents, an opportunity to purchase equity in the Syncrude project. The nature, allocation and distribution of the equity was subject to approval by the Alberta Government.

Secondly, the application would only be approved if there were a director from Alberta, and his appointment could only be made with the prior approval of the Government of Alberta. These very significant steps have already been taken.

I would ask all hon. members to support this bill. I think merely speaking for the bill would indicate our support in the Legislature for the position that has already been taken by the provincial cabinet with regard to the Syncrude application.

Now, I understand -- or at least I hope -- that some of the terms that may not have been outlined in complete detail a year ago will be settled by the provincial government; I hope that we, in this Legislature, will indicate our support for what they are doing.

I might also point out that the steps the government took with the Syncrude application go even further than the bill in front of us. Of course, the director they are talking about must be approved by the provincial government. I am not suggesting we go that far with this general bill at this time. I would be pleased to hear comments from the hon. members sometime today.

Mr. Speaker, some members might suggest that this bill would be even more effective if it were instituted, for example, by every province or even by the

Canadian Parliament. Now one can't dispute that: however, I would suggest that the hon. members not be detracted by the logic of that argument to oppose this bill. Voting for this bill would be a clear indication of how this Legislature stands on the issue. It may have substantial influence on the decision-making processes in the other provinces, and by the federal parliament. This Legislature has already shown itself in the last 18 months to have been a leader in bringing progressive legislation in Canada, particularly a leader in western Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Tell us more.

MR. ASHTON:

Just keep listening, it's coming. Actually, Mr. Speaker, I had a chance to add another 45 minutes to my talk when my bill wasn't called last week.

Mr. Speaker, if we had Canadian directors, surely the hon. members would agree that these Canadian directors would better understand our economic and political situation in Canada, and the whole social environment. It would help to integrate these foreign communities into the Canadian fabric. I'm sure these companies would contribute more effectively to the Alberta economy.

Canadian directors would be more sympathetic to the Alberta scene. For example, I'm sure if we had Canadian directors in these foreign companies they would have a sympathy for and would strive for things like using more Canadian engineering services, purchasing more of the products that they would buy in Canada and so on, and I'm sure using more Canadian labour.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned a little earlier, I don't expect this bill to solve the complete foreign investment problem; I will wait for Mr. Koziak and his committee to deal with some of the other issues. But there is a possibility, of course, that some companies could frustrate the intent of that bill, by appointing directors who are merely figureheads or dummy directors, who in effect would not have the best interests of Canada or Albertans at heart. There is no question at all that in the majority of the cases the mere fact of having Canadian directors would be a positive step, and of course if it would appear over a period of time that this legislation is not being effective or is being intentionally frustrated, then perhaps a further step could be taken, maybe even an amendment and committee of this bill which could be to the effect that these Canadian directors would require the approval of the provincial government.

I am not suggesting that this step be taken at this time. I think the principle of the bill is clear, that Albertans want a greater say in their economy. The nuts and bolts of the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker, are that we don't want to discourage foreign investment. This bill will not discourage foreign investment. However, it will be positive in that we will be giving an expression of attitude to foreign investors: "We want your money, but we want more say as to how it is spent in our province."

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask all members to support this bill. I think the principle is very very important. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, followed by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure of seconding this bill, and I congratulate the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell for his good sense in bringing in such a bill. The bill is really quite a moderate proposal, what I would call a minimum position, and it deserves support.

I think one has to distinguish, Mr. Speaker, between reasonable nationalism and chauvinism or xenophobia -- in other words, between being probably pro-Canadian and not anti-foreigner. We all know that narrow nationalism can cause many evils. But I think that if you don't acknowledge the driving force of national pride with bills such as this, then you encourage the growth of the more vicious aspect of nationalism. So nationalism must be positive.

Developing countries like Canada, which are far short of their ultimate fulfilment, must find a proper balance between maintaining control in their own

house, and encouraging capital investment from abroad because they cannot expect to develop enough capital resources themselves. We must never forget, in the words of Robbie Burns, that "We are brothers all the world o'er" and it's arrogant, narrow and parochial to feel that we are innately better than some other race or nation. But that is not to say that we shouldn't be proud of our accomplishments and we shouldn't love our land.

Some people sneer at patriotism -- the 'my country right or wrong' approach -- but often those very intellectuals who sneer at that patriotism are in the vanguard of those who preach hatred for foreigners, especially if they are big and successful foreigners. Hopefully our ethnic mosaic, our insistence on preserving diverse cultures as opposed to the melting pot idea, will protect us from much of this narrow, parochial nationalism.

I put in the context, perhaps, of the ancient rivalry between Calgary and Edmonton. There is much to be desired in the healthy competition, say, between the Edmonton Eskimos and the Calgary Stampeders, but if the standard jokes between those two cities took on a more serious note it might turn into a bad form of rivalry. Of course, a Calgarian will quickly acknowledge that amongst our enemies Edmontonians are our best friends. Of course we are sorry for Edmontonians and there is good cause for it.

Now, I don't believe there is any nationality to abut. There are exchanges and exchange rates, but nobody should try to attach a national tag or a flag to capital. And an expanding economy like ours requires vast sums of capital. I believe it would be utterly impossible for Canada, for instance, to find enough home-grown capital to finance the Mackenzie River Pipeline. I don't think we could ever have developed in the '40s and the '50s as much private capital as has been invested by the oil and petroleum industry in Alberta.

So OK, it doesn't matter if you accept and, in fact, welcome and even seek out foreign investors, if you keep political control and the certain minimum positions for independence. I think it is true to say that Canadian independence is a fragile thing. One well-known politician at the federal level said the other day that it was like being in bed with an elephant to live next door to our giant neighbours south of the border. But I don't think there is anything to fear so long as we do maintain these minimum positions.

And the debate goes on with the difference between the direct colonial control of the past, of the empires of the British and the French and the Dutch, who at least assumed direct responsibility for these countries where they were exploiting natural resources. In the end they were putting out more investment in social services for those countries for which they were responsible than they were receiving back in goods, or benefits from those countries being a market for their goods. People have said that dollar imperialism, the other type where you don't accept any responsibility for the social services in the country you are exploiting, is a much more dangerous thing. But if South American countries, in the interest of a narrow nationalism, drove away, for instance, American capital, I believe the prospects for raising the standards of living of their people would be even worse than it is now. I think when they rashly go in and nationalize the much hated multi-national corporations, they perhaps do their people harm. I wouldn't like to see Canada go the way of Chile, for instance.

I don't think we should ever forget what American dollars, and before them British dollars, have already done for Canada and what benefits came from those foreign investments. I don't think we should ever forget the biggest, most magnanimous gesture in history of the United States, the Marshall Plan, the rejuvenation with direct American loans and grants of the ruined industries of West Germany and Japan, the very countries that are now strong enough to challenge the strength of the dollar. And they would not have been able to do it if it had not been for the generous American Marshall Plan in 1946.

I believe the Mexican position of insisting on 50 per cent Mexican ownership of all industry is unsound. I don't think I would want to exchange our standard of living, regardless of how many of our businesses are foreign controlled, for the standard of living of the Mexicans. I believe you've got to keep the principles of free enterprise in mind. The fear of the multi-national corporations, international corporations, leads to a danger of a simplistic solution which may also be unsound. Those people who think that the redistribution of wealth is the answer to the problems of the poor sometimes do the poor more harm than good.

The Robin Hood approach of pulling down the rich to benefit the poor makes terribly little difference to the poor in the redistribution of funds immediately, but in the long-term, one gets the prospect of everyone being

poorer, because the incentives are removed, the urge to risk -- which is the basis of all economic growth -- is removed, and all they can then think of is dividing up existing wealth and not creating new wealth. The right way to help the poor is to raise the entire plateau of an economy. I think we should always remember when we talk about the poor in Canada -- and we have our disadvantaged people like other countries -- the poor in Canada are wealthy as compared with the poor in many other parts of the world. For instance, they are wealthy compared to the poor Egyptian dying of hookworm in the Nile to whom an old tin can is an object of wealth.

The levelling process, which is sometimes promoted by narrow nationalists, soon leads to diminishing returns. I believe that there are some very bad features in the new federal income tax plan, for instance. It is amazing that in a country which requires so much investment and enterprise to produce jobs, in a country where they are always accusing its people of not being brave enough to risk in industry, one of the first measures introduced at the time of crisis in this regard should be a penalty on dividends, where an investor who gets a dividend now has to add 30 per cent to the actual money he received in his tax return, and then he gets a big deal of 20 per cent federal rebate. So, in effect, he is paying taxes on 13 per cent more money than he actually received, which is a complete negation of the old tax principle of only paying taxes on money you actually get. Every shareholder in Canada this year will be paying more tax on his dividends than any other Canadian. He will be paying taxes on money he has not actually received. This is the sort of thing that makes capital formation in Canada so difficult.

The ultra-nationalists would probably like to take over all companies on a government level, where they have no worry over prices because they can fix them; no worry in raising capital in a certain sense because they raise it by taxes; no worry about profits or losses, but they always end up because of the overheating of the economy and the galloping inflation that results in rigid control over wages and prices. That is the inevitable penalty that any country pays for mismanaging its economy.

I don't, when I say this, plead any excuses for corporations, whether they be Canadian or foreign-owned, that have as a firm axiom of their policy that they don't pay dividends, or very seldom pay dividends to shareholders and resent paying taxes. We have some of those. And it is for that very reason that we must have Canadian boards.

Not so very long ago in Calgary, we had a controversy over the attempt to appoint an American as a chief of our police. There was a public outcry and those who protested were accused of being bigots, or narrow nationalists. I don't believe this was a true assessment of their position. What they were saying was, we know that our independence is fragile. A minimum position for us is that at least the people in our parliaments, the people in our courts, the people who administer our law must be Canadians. We don't see that that is narrow at all. Well, I think the same point of view should be taken over this Bill No. 200. I am not suggesting that we go down the road, say, of Uganda where they have been crazy enough to kick out all the foreigners and seize their assets. They didn't come in with a simple measure saying that if you want to do business in Uganda as a company then you must have a majority of Ugandans on your board. What they did was to rob these Asiatics and give them a kick in the pants and send them to Britain, a few to Canada.

I think what is proposed here is probably agreed to by any enlightened company. I don't think that you would find any protest from any company that was really up to date with their thinking of how a foreign corporation operates in a host country.

We have the example of the Hudson's Bay Company not so very long ago repatriating its board to Winnipeg. It always used to have its directors meeting in London. But now it's an enlightened company and it sees that this is wrong. It does its business in Canada; it should have Canadians on the board, and its directors meetings should be here. I would like to see the same though for companies like international utilities which have a huge stake in Alberta. One of the main parts of their business is supplying utilities to Albertans. I believe their board meetings should be here, too.

I just conclude now by commending this bill to your support. It comes from a colleague, for whom I have great respect, who has given a lot of thought to this subject of nationalism.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I believe I'm going to support this particular bill, being Bill No. 200, not for the reasons that have been outlined by the hon. members, but really because it is a non-bill. It means nothing -- a weak effort waving in the wind, Mr. Speaker. You know I think when the history of The Seventeenth Legislature of the Province of Alberta is written, it will be characterized by the ability of the government members to throw up vast clouds of dust and periodically coast along on very thin ice. They have the ability to evade the fundamental issues, Mr. Speaker, that we have in front of us, not to give recognition to the fundamental essentials of economics when they evaluate and bring up this particular extra-ordinary bill. However, for the purpose of flag waving, and for no other reason, I intend to support it as I have already mentioned.

There are several presumptions that I think are wrong. One is that the directors of a company, in effect, run or operate the company. The directors of the company set policy in the same manner as the hon. members of the Legislature when they are not going through the process of establishing dust clouds to confuse everyone. The directors of the company establish policy. The operations of the company are conducted by management. So I question very much whether adding "directors who are Canadians" would, in effect, do what they desire -- and I appreciate the desire of the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell; I appreciate the fact that he is thinking about this particular subject -- it would not be effective.

Mention has been made of Mexico, and the basis, of course, is 49/51 per cent, but I think the fundamental basis of the problem that we are facing in this country in relation to foreign ownership boils down to one essential, and that is economic strength. Economic strength is basically the ability, Mr. Speaker, to produce more and sell more and keep your economy viable. I don't get totally turned on about this foreign ownership pitch, period. In my brief experience in the stock market, I have seen several things happen. I have seen the control of Hudson's Bay Company be repatriated to Canada. And how was this done, Mr. Speaker? Not by bills like this, but by Canadian people who finally said, "Well, we're going to buy shares in Hudson's Bay Company and we're going to bring this back to Canada." I can mention another company -- Laura Secord Candies. Nothing could be more Canadian than a name like Laura Secord. This was sold down the river in bondage to the United States and rescued by a Canadian brewery company. It is now again a Canadian company.

So, Mr. Speaker, in order to overcome this horrendous giant, foreign ownership, Canadians must be aware and must build the strength of their country. Now, I recall that I had a few shares in Canadian Pacific railroad, and that was a long time ago. At that time 68 per cent of Canadian Pacific was controlled by foreign ownership, American capital. Now in 1973, we have a complete reversal where the majority of the control of Canadian Pacific is in the hands of Canadians where it should be, and nowhere, Mr. Speaker, in doing this did the government stick its finger in other peoples' business and say this had to be. I think probably there should be more realization of these fundamental economic facts. I can talk about Labatts, and I can talk about some of the American companies who came to this country, to their misfortune and left fat wads of money before going away very sadly.

Corporations, regardless of the ownership or the management or the directorship, must be run for profit. This is the basis of our economic system. Now, if we in this Legislature really had the power to say to the multi-national companies, to the federally incorporated companies, and to the inter-provincial companies that this bill allows us the right to determine who the directors are, I could see some particular advantage in this.

Another thing that has not been touched on by the hon. members in their discourse is the competence that is essential in the management of a business. I could well understand it if a new and innovative business that had not had any expertise developed in Canada or in the province of Alberta had to seek out directors in other areas, wherever they come from. I don't care whether they come from Pakistan, or London, England or Timbaktu, but they should be people who would have at least an elementary understanding of what this business was intended to do and how it should function.

Alberta is basically an immature economy. If I thought that this bill was going to accomplish any serious things I would probably oppose it, but as I say, it's a duster, it's a duster that throws dust in the eyes of the public of Alberta and leads them to believe that their good old Legislature of the Province of Alberta is worried about foreign ownership.

You know, we heard about how we couldn't get anyplace without vast sums of foreign investment, and I'll mention one particular country. But before I do that I'll refer to a book that the hon. Minister of the Environment kindly sent to me. This book, called *The Limits of Growth*, was a study by the Club of Rome, and in it there is a projection of the income bases of the Americans, the Russians and the Japanese. The Canadians weren't a big enough entity to be analyzed, and certainly Alberta didn't rate at all in this particular book. I don't know why. What this book showed whereas the per capita income of the United States in 1985 or 1990, I'm not too sure and I'm not too sure of the figures, but the differences are very significant. Some are in the ratio of 4,500 for the Russians, 6,000 for the Americans, and 18,000 for the Japanese. Now all this was achieved without any injection of foreign capital. So when we say we have to have vast sums of capital poured down in any particular area of Canada just for the sake of developing it, we may have the odd idea that this money was ploughed in here for the good of the Canadian people. We are supposed to say: "Thank you. You dear people have invested your money in this province or other parts of Canada." These aren't the objectives of these people, kindly as they are, as has been mentioned by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill. The objective of these people is to put their money in here, make a fast buck, and get the hell out. And this is basically what it amounts to, Mr. Speaker.

[Interjections]

I think the answer is, let the Canadian people pull up their socks. After all we are descendants of pioneers. We can make Canada by putting our shoulder to the wheel, getting the misconceptions we have in this bill straightened out in our minds, thinking clearly, and working for the future progress of this fine country, Canada. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to blow away the dust that the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest sprinkled on the bill, and bring it back to its true value.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MRS. CHICHAK:

I would like to say at the outset that I welcome Bill No. 200, except that I feel it hasn't gone far enough in some areas. I think that, in reflecting on the investments by foreign companies in this country, the companies did not come here because they were concerned over our capability for development, but for the harvests they could reap. And because this was allowed in the beginning to happen and to carry on, by and large Canadians feel they have lost a great deal of control over their own destiny. And so bills of this nature are necessary, I believe.

I would just like to refer to the amendments in this bill. Section 76, subsection 5, only requires that the majority of directors on the board of directors of every company shall be resident Canadians. I don't believe this goes far enough. I feel in addition, there should have been included in the amendment, a requirement that a majority of the shareholders' interests in the companies be Canadian, and that the majority of interests be Canadian interests.

I feel that this tool cannot be just politically controlled, and therefore must be controlled by way of legislation. As well, I would suggest that perhaps the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell consider an addition to the amendments, that some proportion of the board members be Canadian citizens who are not employees of the parent, subsidiary, or any related foreign firm. I believe in his remarks he alluded to this thought, but I would think it would be worthwhile to consider bringing it in as an amendment. I believe that Canadian employees appointed as directors would no doubt have some difficulty in serving the best interests of Canada or of Alberta if their loyalty must be true to the company by whom they are employed. Of course, out of necessity they must give some degree of loyalty to their employer.

I would like to refer to Section 76, subsection 6 of the amendment. It proposes that a majority of meetings of directors be held at a place in Canada. I think if we review the percentage of foreign investment in the province of Alberta as it is in comparison to other provinces in Canada, we will find that by far the highest percentage is in the Province of Alberta. I feel the amendment is not satisfactory when it requires that a majority of the meetings be held in Canada. I feel there should be some proportion, that if there are interests of these companies in the Province of Alberta and they are benefiting from our resources, there should be a requirement that some proportion of these meetings be held in Alberta as well. I think this would have some bearing on encouraging establishment of head offices in this province, and not only production plants. This, I think, would have the effect, as well, of increased employment, apart from any other benefits.

There was something else I would have liked to have seen included in the amendment to this Bill No. 200. That is in relation to Section 76, subsection 3 of the act which sets out that after the qualification period has expired, any unqualified person acting as a director of the company is guilty of an offence. But it says nothing more, so really there is no encouragement to stop such offences. I feel that the amendments should have been included to impose some penalty.

I think that by and large, although there are many more changes that could have been proposed, but recognizing the work of the Legislative Committee on Foreign Investments, no doubt we will have some very effective and meaningful proposals at a later time.

In the interim, keeping in mind the intent of Bill No. 200 and perhaps considering additions of those items I have suggested, I might add another suggestion, that perhaps the government might consider bringing this bill under its wing as a government bill. These are some of the views I wish to make known with respect to this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the Chair had previously recognized, if I'm not mistaken, the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight as the next speaker, followed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, before I begin I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder on their concern for what we all know is a very crucial issue in Alberta and in Canada, and that is the control of our economic resources by those people who do live in Canada and Alberta.

At the same time, however, I would like to react to some of the statements made by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest when he says that this particular motion will not achieve any worthwhile benefit. I think it will, it's a beginning in some of the areas that we must deal with here. I think, as well, that it is a beginning in some of the areas that we must deal with here.

One area that he spoke about, and that I would like to elaborate on just a little bit, is this idea of the development of Alberta expertise to deal with the whole area of economic concerns. I would like to center my remarks around a principle, an economic principle, and this is that capital follows management. If we as Albertans can develop the managerial talent in Alberta, then we can attract capital on our own terms. By this I mean that if we can develop the knowledge related to business and economic development, then we can increase, in Alberta and in Canada, the influence that we wish to exert on business decision-making and business development.

On the other hand, the less that we know about a particular business arena, the less we can expect to attract capital on our terms. I would think that a lender would be very reluctant to make capital available to a businessman who doesn't really know what he is going to do with his loan.

Thus, if we are not competent managers in Alberta and Canada, then the capital that we do attract will in fact be equity capital -- equity capital, where we are forced to sell our resources rather than use resources from outside. It will not be the kind of debt capital that we would like to use to facilitate economic growth. So, the real issue in this kind of economic development is control. This bill, Bill No. 200, does go some distance, I feel, in developing the capability. It's a positive alternative to the deceptive approach of state ownership, and some of the disadvantages described so well by my colleague from Calgary North Hill.

I am saying that by requiring Canadian directors, as illustrated in Section 76, subsection 5, there is a greater possibility that more Canadians and Albertans will acquire the required managerial ability, the ability which will ultimately result in Canada being able to attract capital on its own terms. Now I might note that this isn't the first time that this thought has been expressed. There are other jurisdictions in Canada and other provinces that are looking to this same type of control. I understand that in Ontario there is this type of amendment before the House. I might also refer to a January 24 news release by the Hon. Alastair Gillespie, the Minister of Canadian Industry, Trade and Commerce, where he stated in a speech outside of the Commons that the government of Canada expects, or intends, at an early date, to bring an amendment to the Canadian Corporations Act to provide that the majority of directors of all federally incorporated companies must be Canadian. There is a concern, and it is not limited just to Alberta. Other jurisdictions are looking into this area.

Just a couple of brief remarks about subsection 6, under Section 76, and this was described somewhat by Mrs. Chichak. If the requirement is that a certain number of these meetings will be held in Canada, this doesn't mean that they are going to be up for public scrutiny. They are not going to be public meetings. But once again -- just similar to the requirement for having directors -- the fact that these business decisions are made within Canada, and within Alberta, does ensure to a greater extent that those people who can develop this ability, who can influence these decisions, will be able to attend and do so.

When it comes right down to it though -- and this was mentioned by my colleague from Pincher Creek, and I think he is right on this -- the real issue, the real overriding issue, when we are talking about Canadian economic development is the willingness of the Canadians themselves, Canadians and Albertans, to participate to a significant extent in the development of their economy. But perhaps as government -- governments in Alberta and Canada -- we should assure that this opportunity is available through policies, through procedures in legislation by which those people who are prepared to participate can be given the vehicle to participate, instead of being pushed out by outside interests.

So I feel that this bill is a step in the right direction, and I look forward to the report of the committee on foreign investment to further incentives in this area. Thank you.

MR. HENDERSON:

Well, Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes available I would like to offer one or two comments. As the member from Crowsnest Pass has said, we can go along with a little flag waving on the issue -- that is certainly not too unexpected. I can't get too concerned about using the bill as an exercise in self-adulation on the part of the member of the Progressive Conservative party. I'm always amused, of course, at the remarks that would try to lead people to believe that nothing existed or happened in Alberta prior to August 30, 1971 -- I guess we can go along with that gag too, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I agree.

MR. HENDERSON:

We'll go along with that gag too, as long as it doesn't get to the point where they start burning books printed prior to August 30, 1971. But, Mr. Speaker, although a bill like this, in the interest of patting themselves on the back about what tremendous fellows they are, may have some merits in it, obviously they seem to crave this type of praise. But, Mr. Speaker, when I hear the mover of the bill suggesting that what this does is in keeping with what the government has done on the proposed Syncrude Project where there is provision to appoint one director by the government as I understand, and contrast that to a proposition that there is to be 51 per cent Canadian directorship on it -- maybe I don't remember the terms of reference the Premier gave on their Position Paper, but I don't recall hearing anything in that particular Position Paper about a 51 per cent Canadian directorship in the Syncrude Project. I do remember saying that the provincial government should have the prerogative of appointing one.

Really, if I have any concern about this bill, it's with regard to the negotiations, which I presume are still underway between the government and Syncrude relative to the possibility of another development in the tar sands. I

feel quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it would be most undesirable to pass this bill at this time and tie the government's hands to some type of formula which may prove to be a serious impediment when it comes to the future development of the tar sands. I think the government -- and I'm surprised that the motion should come from a government back bencher -- because of that, surely should have a little more discretion in the matter than this particular bill will allow.

We understand the levity that relates to the comments of the mover of the bill. I suspect the levity may be somewhat misplaced so far as the implications of tying the government down to where they would be bound to this type of process on dealing in this very important issue. I say this, Mr. Speaker, knowing full well that there is increasing concern amongst Canadians over that.

I'm sure all the members receive International Review. There's a very interesting article in it for the month of February that deals with a nation-wide survey over the past four years on this issue, showing there has been a growing trend toward concern on the part of Canadians with this particular matter. Though I won't bother going into it, there is one thing that comes out of the survey, just one table, which concerns the question of maintenance of Canadian independence while maintaining the present level of U.S. ownership in Canada. And the question was -- I've got the wrong table I think, Mr. Speaker. But there is one particular clause in here that really deals with the question of unemployment and the reduction of the standard of living. How many Canadians are prepared to accept a reduced employment opportunity and reduced standard of living to achieve this goal? And close to 50 per cent favour more stringent control. This also comes out in another question, that there is something like 40 per cent aren't prepared to accept a lower standard of living to achieve that goal.

I think any red-blooded Canadian would like in principle the idea that the bill has presented, but I think that the mover of the bill -- I really don't take too much quarrel with the remarks of the seconder -- would be well advised to consider whether he really wants to tie the hands of the gentlemen seated in the front row on a rather critical issue at this time in the Province of Alberta. A motion such as this could very well do just that. I apparently have a little more confidence in some of the members of the Executive Council than the mover does, Mr. Speaker. And with that, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. Leader of the Opposition adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before adjourning the House, may I just explain that there has been another breakdown in the photocopying equipment and this had some delay in getting the members' copies of Hansard prepared for correction, that is, the rough proof copies for correction.

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

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