

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, the Standing Committee on Private Bills, Standing Orders and Printing has had under consideration the following bills and begs to report the same with the recommendation that they be proceeded with.

Now with the House's indulgence, I'll take the liberty of abbreviating the names of the bills and reading the numbers.

The first is Private Bill No. 4, The Royal Arch Masons of Alberta Incorporation Act; No. 6, The Canadian Union College Act Amendment; No. 7, The Order of the Eastern Star Incorporation Act; No. 11, The Alberta Wheat Pool Amendment.

The Standing Committee has had under consideration the further following bills and recommends that they also be proceeded with, but with certain amendments:

No. 5, The Calgary Community Foundation Amendment Act; No. 8, The Knights of Columbus Act; No. 9, The St. Vincent's Hospital Incorporation; and No. 10, The Westbank Golf & Country Club Incorporation Act; No. 13, The Mennonite Brethren Incorporation Act.

The Standing Committee has had under consideration the following further bills and begs to report the same with the recommendation that it not be proceeded with: Private Bill No. 12, The Fort Assiniboine Agricultural Association Incorporation Act.

The Standing Committee also begs to recommend that with respect to the following bills that the fees, less the cost of printing be refunded:

No. 4, The Incorporation of the Royal Arch Masons; No. 5, The Calgary Community Foundation Amendment; No. 6, The Canadian Union College Amendment; No. 7, The Incorporation of the Order of the Eastern Star; No. 8, The Knights of Columbus Amendment; No. 9, The St. Vincent's Hospital Incorporation; No. 12, The Fort Assiniboine Agricultural Association Incorporation; and No. 13, The Mennonite Brethren in Christ Church Amendment Act.

[See the last page of this Hansard for the full titles of these bills.]

NOTICE OF MOTION

DR. PAPROSKI:

I wish to give notice to introduce a bill, being Bill No. 219, The Community Health and Social Service Centres Act on Thursday, May 10, 1973.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to give notice of the introduction of two bills, The Coal Conservation Act and The Arbitration Amendment Act, 1973 which are intended to be introduced tomorrow.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to give notice that tomorrow, Thursday, May 10, 1973, I shall introduce to the House a bill entitled The Alberta Uniform Building Standards Act.

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give notice that tomorrow I intend to introduce a bill, The Occupiers Liability Act.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give notice that tomorrow I shall introduce a bill, The Wage Assignments Act.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

##### Bill No. 57--The Disaster Services Act

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 57, The Disaster Services Act for first reading. This bill essentially outlines a new proposal for a disaster services agency in Alberta to replace the present Emergency Measures Organization.

Besides outlining the structure of such an organization, it essentially brings into being, for the first time in Alberta, two emergency funds. One emergency fund is under government funding and government direction. In addition to that a fund will be set up as a provincial disaster relief fund to which contributions could be made by interested philanthropists throughout the province. This fund would be directed by non-government people in relation to its spending.

It's the intention of the government, Mr. Speaker, to allow this bill to remain at first reading and to receive submissions from interested people throughout the province with regard to its content through the summer months.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 57 was introduced and read a first time.]

#### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of introducing to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, some 25 good-looking, intelligent young ladies from the Communications Section of NAIT located in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher, instructress Correen McPherson. I'd like to congratulate them for taking time off to observe the democratic process in legislative action. I sincerely hope that their training in communication -- communication being one of the most important ingredients in the human endeavour -- will truly assist them and society. I ask them now to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Legislature students from the Caroline School, which is in my constituency. With them are two teachers and their bus driver. They are seated in the members gallery and I would ask them to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me today to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly 85 Grade 9 students from the J. R. Robson School in Vermilion. They are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Stangeland, Mrs. Montalbetti, Mr. Sweet and Mr. Bachmann. I hope that what they see and hear in this Assembly will help them to understand the democratic process. The group is seated in the public gallery and I would ask them to stand and be recognized.

## FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to table two reports. One is the Annual Report of the Eastern Rockies Forest Conservation Board for the fiscal year 1971-72. The second report is the Annual Report of the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Corporation for the fiscal year 1971-72.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the 55th Annual Report of the Workmen's Compensation Board of the Province of Alberta for the year ending December 31, 1972. In addition, I wish to file returns to Motions for a Return No. 193, 238 and 188.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file a return to Motion No. 166.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, before we leave the matter of filing return -- with the 4 returns just presented to the House it brings us to the point where there are 32 outstanding returns and questions on the Order Paper. I'd like to ask the government for some indication of their intentions. There are 15 outstanding since the month of February, some 10 dating back from the month of March and the remainder were presented during April or May. I was wondering if there was any hope of any significant number of these returns coming into the House before the end of the week?

DR. HORNER:

We will review the situation, Mr. Speaker, with the various ministers who are responsible and see if we can't file as many as possible tomorrow. Now there are some returns, of course, delayed because of the necessity of securing concurrence of the people involved in correspondence and so on.

But I know there are a couple of other major returns outstanding from February nearly ready for tabling.

MR. HENDERSON:

I thank the Deputy Premier, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if we could possibly have a report of the general status of each one that remains outstanding?

DR. HORNER:

We would be willing to do that, Mr. Speaker.

## CRAI QUESTION PERIOD

Janvier Water Well Program

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question, I presume it would go to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, as to whether he could advise the House as to the status of the water well drilling program carried out some time ago at Janvier in the northern part of the province?

MR. RUSSELL:

No, I am unable to answer that question, Mr. Speaker. I haven't been directly involved. It's been more the responsibility of the Minister of the Environment. But I will check with him and report back to the House at the earliest possible date.

MR. HENDERSON:

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister Without Portfolio Responsible for Northern Affairs has any information on that.

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure exactly what it is you're looking for. The Janvier water well program saw ten wells drilled at the Janvier site. These were finished, I believe, in October. I'm not sure of the date.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister, what provisions were made with the wells so they would be operational during the winter?

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, the department was in the Janvier area a couple of times to ensure they were in operational shape. A number of them were not. A number froze and of course we had to replace the pumps. We had some problems getting other pumps, but I think the majority of them were kept in operating shape. I can't verify that. I would have to check with the Department of the Environment as to the last report we have.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did the Minister of Northern Development ask the Metis Association of Alberta to divert some of their funds toward putting shelters over the wells so they could be operational last winter?

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, no, not in that particular matter of diverting their funds. They were asking for shelters to be placed on them. We suggested that possibly they could use some of their funds in that area. We had provided the well and the pump and the drain but we didn't have that particular building we could place over them.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, would you check and see if it is true that only three or four of the wells were operational all winter?

MR. ADAIR:

I'll certainly check, Mr. Speaker.

DR. PAPROSKI:

One supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. minister would be so kind as to tell us how long this situation existed before we took office. Do you have any idea?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. The hon. member is obviously inviting a regular debate.

Appointment of Councillors for Fort McMurray

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have the indulgence of the House to ask one further question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs on another matter. I was wondering if the minister could advise the House as to the reasons the government has chosen to revert to the appointment of a number of councillors in McMurray as opposed to following the election procedure with all the councillors?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, this is something that has taken a fair amount of consideration of late. Under The New Towns Act under which Fort McMurray operates, I believe there are five options by which councillors can be placed on the town board. Essentially some of them are merely versions of one main option and that is appointment. So you really have two means, by election or by appointment.

If you look at the history of new towns throughout Alberta there has been any sort of combination or permutation of those mixes from appointed boards to

purely elected boards or some mix in between. The provincial government, as you are probably aware, has undertaken a program involving extremely heavy investment commitment by the province in the immediate development of the new town.

Within the last four months or so there have been four resignations from the board. By-elections are being held to replace three of those members and we would like to replace the fourth member by putting a senior provincial civil servant on the board as the government's representative.

MR. HENDERSON:

Supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Is it the government's intention to increase the council accordingly so the number of elected councillors remains, does the total number remain the same, or is the number elected to be reduced?

MR. RUSSELL:

No, the total number remains the same. I should say, Mr. Speaker, I received a telegram today from the chairman of the present board indicating their agreement to the appointment of one member.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen followed by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray.

Family Aid Training Course

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question; I don't know whether it should be directed to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education, as it involves AVC, or possibly the hon. Minister without Portfolio Responsible for the Women's Bureau. It deals with the family aid training course. My question, Mr. Speaker, will a domestic aid training course be ongoing?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, that is a course with which the hon. Miss Hunley has had a good deal of contact and concern. Perhaps she could answer the question.

MISS HUNLEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Whether or not the course will be an ongoing one remains to be seen. We are having trouble recruiting students so there is a great demand for employees to fill vacancies and of course be employed in the domestic field. The program could be ongoing if we had sufficient people to take the course.

MRS. CHICHAK:

I wonder if the hon. minister could --

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood could ask her supplementary, followed by the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen with another supplementary.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Could the hon. minister advise whether any consideration has been given by the Health and Social Development Department to support the program by giving strong encouragement to individuals on social assistance who appear to have problems in domestic management, or even to go so far as to require them to take the course for upgrading? This would fill the requirement of students.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I don't feel really as though I have the complete answer to that. Perhaps the Minister of Health and Social Development might like to supplement it. I do know that there is close contact kept with that department because many of our recruits come from there and also of course, the trained personnel would certainly help fill some great needs I am sure that department encounters.

MR. FRENCH:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is there a demand for such employees and how do you recruit people for this program?

MISS HUNLEY:

Well, there certainly is a demand. There is a great demand for them; the unfortunate thing is that we can't recruit enough people. We don't really know why. Perhaps it hasn't been advertised widely enough.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this program has been offered in northern Alberta and started as a pilot project. I have kept in quite close contact with it because I am extremely interested. We have just finished the third one. Unless there are more recruits, it is doubtful, even though there is money in the budget, whether it will continue.

MR. FRENCH:

My last supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is there something that we can do as members of the Legislature to give this very important program the lift it will take to keep it ongoing?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, could I give a commercial? Yes, certainly there is a great deal that can be done. I feel that it needs to be more widely talked about because I am sure in every constituency there are people who could benefit by the training. There are certainly people who could benefit by being able to secure trained personnel. If all of us directed our minds to it, perhaps it would not be necessary to phase out the program.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lac la Piche-McMurray, followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

#### Municipal Assistance Grants

DR. BOUVIER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I would like to ask the minister -- in view of the announcement yesterday by the Mayor of Edmonton that the population figures for the years 1970-71 were actually inflated, and in view of the fact that municipal assistance grants are based on a per capita basis, I wonder whether the Minister of Municipal Affairs will advise the House whether these inflated figures were in actual fact the figures used to compute the municipal assistance grants for the years 1971-72 to the City of Edmonton?

MR. RUSSELL:

The news story in yesterday's press could perhaps pose some kind of problem with respect to those grants, Mr. Speaker. We tried to get hold of Professor McVey this morning to see which figures he was in fact using for which year.

But what the hon. member has suggested is quite possible. If the figures for the Edmonton population had been reported too high for the years 1971 and 1972 then, in fact, Edmonton did receive too high a municipal assistance grant at the expense of other Alberta municipalities.

DR. BOUVIER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. This is probably hypothetical, but if it is too high is the government planning on claiming a refund from the City of Edmonton for that portion they were overpaid?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has successfully objected to his own question.

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, let me rephrase the question. Would it be a matter of government policy to reclaim portions of municipal grants that were actually overpaid to municipalities?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, it has been my understanding that this has never happened in the past. Of course, in areas that have declining populations it's to your advantage to use an old population figure, such as the last federal census figure, in order to obtain your grant. If you are a rapidly growing centre it's to your advantage to do your own census annually to get those figures up to their latest level. I understand that declining areas in the province have traditionally used the last federal census and therefore at least until the next census is done have the benefit of old figures, if I can put it that way. There has been no attempt in the past to try to get a refund from that kind of situation. This is a little bit different in that annual census figures have been collected by the cities each year.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Edsburry, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder.

Optical Trade Monopoly

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. I would like to ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, if he has received any representation, either written or oral, complaining about the alleged monopoly situation in the optical business in Alberta?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would be surprised if that subject hadn't from time to time been brought to the attention of members on both sides of the House. I wouldn't say representations, I would say that people have commented upon an alleged monopoly to me from time to time. It has not seemed to me there are any particular steps that are urgent to be taken in that respect.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Has the Ophthalmic Dispensers Guild amended the code of ethics so that, in fact, they are prohibited from advertising the competitive prices?

MR. CRAWFORD:

There have been some recent changes in regulations, Mr. Speaker, which have been approved by one of the bodies involved in the ophthalmic field. I don't think it was the ophthalmic dispensers. I think it was the opticians. However, I have found that these occupational groups, with the greater attention they are giving to ethical practice, have been concerned about things such as the hon. member raises and have been moving slowly in the direction of doing away with practices that appear to be unprofessional.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Mr. Minister would you check on the Ophthalmic Dispensers Guild and see, in fact, if there were an amendment to their code of ethics as I outlined?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member, I believe, is asking for information which is accessible to the public.

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

Firenza Automobiles

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. In view of the fact that there are many owners of the imported automobile called

the Firenza in Alberta and since the machine appears to be something of a mechanical disaster, because of the bad publicity owners find that in many cases they cannot sell these cars at any price. I wonder if the hon. minister would consider some type of action to assist these unfortunate car owners?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have this under continuing study in the Consumer Affairs Branch. I should say that of the 12,000 Firenza cars of 1971-72 vintage that were imported, 600 of them are known to be owned by Albertans. The complaints we have received to date in the Consumer Branch have been by phone only and I have received one letter in my office. I suggested to this complainant that she direct her inquiry further to Box 99, Ottawa, because the consumers' department in Ottawa is undergoing some negotiations with General Motors Corporation regarding the problem which seems to be running across the country.

The last word I had was that the present owners of Firenzas who wish to dispose of their ownership may trade their Firenza for another General Motors product and receive a \$250 credit. We have been and are maintaining our vigilance on this particular problem and will report to the hon. member further if anything comes up.

MR. CHAMBERS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could visualize any preventive action or procedure which his department might be able to take to prevent the future mass sale of defective products?

MR. DOWLING:

Well, Mr. Speaker, as you know, we are doing a massive study of the department; asking for proposed legislative change and proposed reorganization of the entire structure of the Consumer Affairs Branch and other branches of government that will come under the jurisdiction of the department. I am sure this particular item will be under consideration during the summer months and perhaps by fall we might have something to offer.

DR. PAPROSKI:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister clarify the one point he just mentioned? He meant a \$250 credit over and above the trade-in value of the Firenza?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is correct -- \$250 in addition to the amount allowed on a trade-in.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

#### Feed Grains

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Does the hon. minister contemplate having talks with other eastern agricultural ministers concerning feed grains?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary to the minister. Will the minister be presenting a feed grain policy paper to the federal Minister of Agriculture?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we already have. Last November we presented our views in regard to a feed grain policy to the meeting in Ottawa. These views were presented I think in November. We intend to have meetings with the other



provinces in western Canada in relation to feed grain questions, and also with Ontario and the Maritime provinces.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Student Temporary Employment Program

MR. LEE:

I have a question for the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. In the 1973 initiation of the Student Temporary Employment Program in Alberta, has an office been established in Calgary to deal with applications to the program and to assist in its implementation?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, there has been an office established. Because the hon. member is from Calgary he is bound to be asked questions about this during the summer. I should like to give this information: the office is located at 734 - 8th Avenue S.W., and the telephone number there is 263-5876. The person manning the office out of the operation placement office is a Miss Carole Plishka. Her work is to give information to students as well as to the provincial government project supervisors, and also any municipality asking for information with respect to the STEP program.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

William Roper Hull Home

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the minister advise the reason for the current staff cut of 25 social workers at William Roper Hull Home in Calgary?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have no information on changes in staffing at the William Roper Hull Home. The hon. member indicated to me just before the question period that this was something which had just occurred, and I would be glad to look into the matter.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister also check why almost half the staff cuts are planned for the cottage that treats especially disturbed juveniles whom the government previously indicated should receive priority attention?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I might say that changing staff patterns, of course, must occur from time to time in various institutions. That is another one which I believe is quasi-independent in that it is operated by an appointed board. But I'll certainly look into the matter and bring information to the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member --

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, one supplementary for clarification. Is it not true that these staff cuts were public assistance workers versus social workers, or not really social workers? Maybe some of them are.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose I haven't read the same parts of the newspaper that other hon. members had before coming to the question period today, so this

information is new to me. I will become better acquainted with the facts as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Forest Fires

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Lands and Forests. I wonder if the minister could tell us what the situation of forest fires is in this province as of today, and are there any fires out of control?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, yes I can. I do receive a daily forest fire situation report so I'm able to give a cumulative report up to now, as well as the present situation.

We have two fires burning at the present time, both under control, a small fire in the Whitecourt forest and a larger 168 acre fire on the Jean D'Or Prairie Indian reserve, northeast of Fort Vermilion.

That is the situation at this time. So far this year we have had 62 fires and the total acres burned are 800.

MR. TRYNCHY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister tell us, is this better protection this year? Are there fewer fires this year than last year? How do they compare with last year's fires?

DR. WARRACK:

Slightly better this year so far, Mr. Speaker, largely related to the circumstances of weather. We had our largest fire problem in late May last year when it was necessary to make an all-out effort to save the town of Swan Hills. It depends entirely, particularly at this time of year, on the weather, and during the summer largely on the extent of lightning, particularly dry lightning fires that we might have ignited.

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary to the minister. Has the department added any new firefighting equipment for 1973?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, although not in the hon. member's constituency.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Great Plains Project

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister in charge of Northern Affairs. Mr. Speaker, has the minister's department participated or been asked to participate in the deliberations of the Great Plains project?

MR. ADAIR:

Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

Janvier Water Wells Program (Cont.)

And I wonder if I could, while I'm on my feet, provide some additional information on the question asked earlier about the Janvier well situation.

We did, as I said, provide 10 wells. Four of them froze up during the winter. We are, I think I should add, looking at alternatives toward providing the shelters and maintenance on a better basis than that provided this particular winter, because we drilled the wells and provided them to the Metis people and they were to look after them and there have been some problems.

MR. COOPER:

A supplementary to the --

Great Plains Project (Cont.)

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House. Our department had a representative at the recent meeting covering the Great Plains project.

MR. COOPER:

I had a supplementary for the hon. minister. Has the hon. Minister in charge of Northern Affairs or the Minister of Industry and Commerce had the opportunity to study the reports and findings of the Great Plains project?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, yes, we have it under study and we'll have a report for the House at a later date.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Highwood, followed by the hon. Member for Taber-Warner.

Fingerprinting of Civil Servants

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Does the government have a policy with regard to fingerprinting civil servants in any of the departments?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, not to the best of my knowledge. But you know -- who knows? I would be tempted to say that the people who have been here for 36 years might know better than those who have been here for 20 months. I simply don't know, but the question is certainly intriguing and important and I'll find the information.

Continental Trucking

While I'm on my feet, if I could answer a question asked several times on the floor of the House before and most recently by the hon. Member for Highwood. It has to do with Continental Trucking.

In examining the question with respect to the severance pay and other benefits to the employees of this company, it had been my information at that time that they had no access for assistance to the Board of Industrial Relations in Alberta. But I said I would check it out. That information is accurate.

This employer is within the jurisdiction of the laws of the federal government, since its enterprise spans several provinces. The definition of what operation falls within provincial law and that of the federal government is defined in terms of an employer working exclusively in one province, even though auxiliary services may extend to other provinces or a bona fide several-branch kind of service that goes across several provinces. That is the case with this company.

While the federal Labour Standards Branch people in Edmonton have assessed the company for severance pay, to the best of my knowledge this pay has not been forthcoming from the receiver who was appointed to conclude the operation of this company.

At the same time, other entitlements which include wages and vacation pay have been paid. So I just want to make sure that this information is brought to the House before the session concludes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Tater-Warner, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Greenhouse Construction

MR. D. MILLER:

My question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Has there been any significant increase in greenhouse construction in the province since the fall of 1972?

DR. HORNER:

I'd have to inquire, Mr. Speaker, and get that information for the hon. member.

MR. D. MILLER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the hon. minister, if there has been an increase, I would also like the answer to, are the greenhouses successfully producing out-of-season fresh vegetables?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think certainly that's a matter of business management, but it would seem to me that there are a great number of successful greenhouse producers in Alberta, particularly in the Medicine Hat area, but not just confined to that area.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Pelinda Manybears

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. It is further to the Belinda Manybears case. I was wondering if during your investigations of the last two days, other cases had been brought to your attention of the same thing happening, Mr. Minister?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Not specifically, Mr. Speaker. It has been made to appear by remarks made by others that there have been other such cases. However, when they occurred, they were not, so far as I know, brought to the attention of the department.

I might take this opportunity to add that one of the undercurrents of the statement, that other cases have occurred, has left the impression in some quarters that only Native children had been involved in other such cases. There is an undercurrent therefore of a racial factor in some of the statements that have been made. I just wanted to add that my understanding of it is that is not the case. Although dead bodies are not always moved from place to place in a casket, but may be moved from one place to another in another type of container, this is something that is not limited to Native children. I think the members should know that, because I have noticed from seeing some of the recent reports that appeared that some people believe it was something that happened only in respect to Natives.

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. During yesterday's question period I posed this question. I wonder if the hon. minister has had an opportunity to determine how the bodies of children who are aborted are handled.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have no precise knowledge of it. I think all hon. members are in the same position of having received representations from organizations describing how that is done. But I have not yet made the inquiry I indicated yesterday I would make.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican with a supplementary, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the hon. minister is, does the provincial coroner make any attempt to contact the parents to get permission before an autopsy is performed? I realize the Act allows him to do it without the parents' permission, but do they make any attempt to contact the parents for permission first?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the jurisdiction with respect to the coroner's office is that of the Attorney General and he is not in the House this afternoon. But I have discussed it with him, and his statement is that normally it is the doctor involved in, perhaps, the terminal treatment of the patient who would be in touch with the parents.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the minister would be; has the minister given any consideration to a plan whereby perhaps an agreement could be arranged between the department, the embalmers' association and the hospitals, that where bodies are to be shipped directly to parents, guardians or family members rather than to funeral homes automatically, there be an arrangement that the bodies be embalmed and in proper caskets? To cover such costs -- where the department might recover such costs -- a claim could then be placed against the estate, so that in no circumstance would a body be shipped to any relative without it being properly prepared and in a casket.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we haven't gone into that aspect of the matter at this point. It's the sort of thing we might expect could be commented upon by the Hospital Services Commission in view of the fact that I've asked them to comment upon the propriety with which these matters are handled at the present time in Alberta.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary question to the minister. If the four other names were supplied to the minister, would your department look into these as thoroughly as they are looking into the first case?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the question is hypothetical. But I think that would have to depend on the time the other occurrences took place. I have the feeling that the inquiries being made at the present time would show very much the sort of guidance we need to have and multiplying that type of inquiry might not serve any additional purpose.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the department of the hon. minister have some positive proof that one or more of the bodies was not that of a Native?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has said, "positive proof". I would say, not in the technical sense. But I would mention that my staff has told me they have received calls from people who have given such information.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

#### Commission on Occupational Health and Safety

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, during the Throne Speech there was the information that the government would, at a future date, make an important announcement with respect to a commission for the purpose of studying the field of industrial health and

safety. I should like to make that announcement on behalf of government this afternoon.

Several programs of safety are presently administered by a number of departments, boards and agencies, including the Workmen's Compensation Board, Energy Resources Conservation Board, Health and Social Development, Manpower and Labour, and Environment.

The government, Mr. Speaker, will establish a commission on industrial safety or in the wider context, occupational health and safety. The commission will conduct a broad comprehensive study and survey of all existing policies and programs and recommend, within six months, alternative plans which will provide a totally coordinated program of occupational health and safety and thus ensure the highest possible level of industrial safety for the province.

The commission will consist of a full time chairman, expert in the field, and two or four members selected from the general public representing labour organizations, employer organizations, safety associations and medical or public health associations.

The commission will undertake a complete study, review and assessment, including such necessary research and public inquiries as may be required, so as to present for government consideration the establishment of a totally coordinated program of occupational health and safety functions.

The commission is to complete its work, including final reporting, not later than six months from the date of its appointment. We are presently, Mr. Speaker, drawing up a panel of candidates from which to make a final selection of commission members.

#### Commission on Educational Planning

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now table parts two and three of the five-part response of the Department of Advanced Education to the Commission on Educational Planning. Part two deals generally with the subject of governance and part three with the subject of finance.

In so doing I would like to highlight a few conclusions of each part very briefly.

Under the subject of governance, while it is not our jurisdiction, we endorse two statements in the document. One is that:

The prime function of the board of governors ought to be planning the long range future of the institution by establishing goals and priorities.

And two that:

....this body [which is the board of governors] must strive to link the institution with other institutions, the community, government and other public agencies in such a way that it will advance the interests of students and faculty.

Under the heading of that which we endorse in principle, one item certainly is that "lay persons must continue to constitute the majority of the membership [of the board of governors]."

Under the heading of that which we might reject in principle, one item is a rejection of the conclusion that "University senates might very well be disbanded."

Under the heading of that which we have implemented or are implementing, in whole or in part, is the recommendation of the report that the two commissions, the universities commission and the colleges commission, be dissolved and their responsibilities taken over by the government.

Under part three, finance, Mr. Speaker, under the heading of that which we endorse in principle, a couple of items among many others, but a couple in particular. That:

the federal share of the cost of research ought to be increased -- for research is more a national and international commodity than a provincial one.

There are convincing arguments ... in favour of relating expenditures more directly to the objectives that programs purport to achieve.

Differentiation in function [among institutions of higher education] implies differentiation in resource allocation.

Also by way of endorsement in principle that:

No direct capital expenditures for further education are anticipated for our schools, colleges, institutes and universities beyond those provided for full-time students.

Under the heading of that which we reject in principle, one item in particular; the rejection of the proposal in the report that:

An increase in student fees [in higher education] to around the 25 per cent level of program costs is warranted in the interests of equity and efficiency.

That we reject.

Under the heading of that which we have implemented or are implementing, in whole or in part, one in particular and that is that "Three year operating and five year capital budgeting, subject to annual review, should ... be adopted." I have indicated to the House that we are working on that with universities and will be dealing so shortly with respect to colleges.

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS  
(Second Reading)

Bill No. 52  
The Public Utilities Board Amendment Act, 1973

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister for Municipal Affairs, second reading of Bill No. 52, The Public Utilities Board Amendment Act, 1973. This is a very simple act, Mr. Speaker. The purpose is to double the size of the Public Utilities Board and to enable it to hold simultaneous hearings in two parts of the province.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 52 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 21  
The Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1973

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Edmonton Kingsway, second reading of Bill No. 21, The Child Welfare Amendment Act.

In the introduction of this bill on first reading I stated the main issues of the bill. I would like to make just a few brief comments about amendments to one section of the act, and that deals with Section 41 and the amendments relating to child neglect and child abuse. Briefly, there are three main changes reflected in these amendments.

The first amendment would require that all reports of child neglect and child abuse would be made to the Director of Child Welfare. This is done in the hope that there would be a centralization of the reporting agency within the province in which reports are made. It is hoped that through this procedure there would be a clarification of the manner and the procedure in which reports are made, and that through this there would also be a correlation of repeated cases of neglect and abuse. At the present time reports are made through a number of agencies such as social workers, the police, the Director of Child Welfare or a hospital. It is also the intention of the department, in coordination with this particular item, to provide a Zenith telephone number to facilitate this reporting procedure.

The second amendment to Section 41 provides a penalty of \$500 for failure to report suspected cases of child abuse and neglect. The present legislation has been criticized in that it is mandatory that citizens, individuals, do report cases of child abuse; however without the penalty clause it was felt this

was not an adequate procedure. This particular case has been commented on by members of the Alberta Medical Association and it is hoped talks will continue with them with the idea of facilitating reports.

Finally, the third amendment requires that the Director of Child Welfare establish a registry of all child neglect reports throughout the province. It has been felt in a number of jurisdictions that a central registry is required once again for the purpose of ensuring that repeated cases of abuse and neglect do not occur and that the investigation and the dealing with reports will be done in a consistent manner. It is also the intention of the department in conjunction with this particular central registry, to establish an advisory committee on child abuse consisting of members of the medical association, a member of the Attorney General's office, and a representative of the department of the Director of Child Welfare.

Now, through my investigation the implications of these amendments show the legislative framework we have now established in cases of child neglect and abuse provide probably some of the more progressive legislation in the area of child abuse and legislation in North America.

Some of the immediate results of this legislation are as follows: first of all, the legislation of these three amendments will assist in dealing with and facilitating the reports of child abuse and neglect. Add to this a Zenith phone number and a consistency in dealing with these procedures, the development of a common form, for instance, and there should be a more extensive reporting in the near future of child abuse and neglect from those citizens and individuals who do not know where to go at present to report.

A second immediate result should be more extensive information collection and the development of statistics relating to abuse and neglect. I mentioned previously that repeated cases of neglect and abuse will be picked up through this centralization and the central agency. It is also hoped that other provinces and other jurisdictions would develop a similar kind of legislation, and perhaps in the near future we might have a national network, a national registry to identify those cases of abuse in which parents move from one jurisdiction to another, from province to province.

A third immediate result would be a consistency in the investigative procedure and the disposition of reports of child abuse and neglect. At present, once again, when a report is made it may be made to the police. It may be made to a social worker. It may be made to a hospital, and it will probably be dealt with by the agency in the manner in which they operate. By adding to this the report to the central agency it can be dealt with in a further way.

In a future sense, though, it's not just enough to have progressive legislation in the area of child neglect and abuse. It's not enough to set the framework for a good system. This was pointed out, and I refer to a news item in yesterday's Edmonton Journal, by Dr. Jean Nelson who is a member of the Alberta Medical Association child health committee. She commented that there is a great need at the moment for a system in which people who report battery can have faith in the manner in which these reports will be disposed of. There is at present no adequate system of preventive and supportive help for parents or children. She stated that it is not enough to require people to report, that we have to develop a rehabilitative, a treatment and an educative system in which these will be dealt with. I concur wholeheartedly with the statements she has made on behalf of the Alberta Medical Association.

Consequently, we have to develop a system within Alberta through the Director of Child Welfare that will attack the whole problem of child neglect and child abuse in its entirety, so that we have a balance of the punitive, the protective, the educative and the rehabilitative aspects in dealing with child neglect. This does imply a much more extensive involvement by the department of child welfare than is now the case.

Immediately I can think of three areas in which the department must become more extensively involved. The first of these is that the Child Welfare Branch must become involved in community involvement and report procedures. As stated by Dr. Nelson, the Child Welfare Branch must develop confidence regarding the disposition of reports before the reporting of abuse will result. It must also become more extensively involved in preventive social service aspects dealing with lifeline kinds of services in the community, such as emergency homemaker services and parental assistance for children in the case of reporting.

There must also be a more extensive involvement, I believe, of the foster parents and the Foster Parents Association in the whole coordination of child neglect cases. It's my personal feeling that the foster parents and their



association are very often used as a service but are not initiated into other procedures, the planning of a total child neglect program. I would hope the branch would look into this at an early time.

There must also be more extensive coordination and a liaison with those groups that will report. There must be an extensive coordination with the police, with medical practitioners, social workers, teachers and with the citizenry at large.

A second aspect into which I feel the department of child welfare must extend itself is the area of rehabilitation and treatment for abused children and the parents of neglected children. There must be developed a referral system by which parents can become involved in therapy. Now the present legislation does not provide for treatment or rehabilitation within the Act itself and it may involve a change in the Act in order for this to occur.

One thing I might mention is that research has been undertaken as to whether therapy which is undertaken to assist in cases, if it is made compulsory, can be adequate. I feel this can occur, that compulsory rehabilitation, if built into the Act, could occur. I had the opportunity to become involved with a traffic clinic counselling kind of course. In this case individuals were referred in a compulsory manner for rehabilitation. The counselling procedure did help in many of these cases.

A final area in which the department of child welfare may become more extensively involved is in the education and information services associated with child neglect and abuse. There must be, I feel, a more extensive public information program developed in this area, involving such things as television programming, films, pamphlets and personal appearances by practitioners in the field. There must also probably be more extensive family life education types of programs dealing with child neglect, raising of children and so on.

Finally, the department could also assist in, I believe, training institutions and the development of curriculum relating to child neglect and abuse. Some that come to mind are the medical faculties, law, police education, and teacher training which could certainly benefit from the identification in dealing with child neglect cases.

Now in the past I think we have relied on our jurisdictional preventive social services department to provide these kinds of activities. I feel it is not quite enough and the department of child welfare and the director must become more involved in initiating programs, perhaps preparing packages for preventative social services jurisdictions.

As a government we will probably have to become much more extensively involved in funding. If we want to get this type of program off the ground funding for the aspects which I have just mentioned -- at present we do have specific practitioners and social workers dealing with child neglect but perhaps we may have to go more extensively into child protection units within departments of social development.

There may be required also further amendments to the Act. One of them I have mentioned is that we may need amendments relating to treatment where treatment and rehabilitation for parents and children is built right into the Act.

Another area where we may require changes is in the area of the rights of the child. For instance, New York City has now developed a child advocate system where each child who is brought to family court for child abuse cases has the legal right to representation by counsel. There is a certain mythology that has grown up over the last centuries regarding parenthood, that the child is just a possession of the parent. I think there is more and more emphasis on the rights of the child within courts and so on. And if all of you have received information from the Voice of the Unborn, this type of emphasis I think will spread to younger children.

In closing I would just like to say child abuse does occur in Alberta. Last year there were 199 reported cases of child abuse in which children were taken under temporary care of the Department of Social Development. This has contrasted with 133 reports in the past year. I would like to point out these are only reports in which the children were taken into custody. The fact of the matter is that there is child abuse and it is probably much more extensive than the statistics which I have just given illustrate. There was very extensive research carried on in the United States recently by Kempe and Helfer. They studied the whole area of child abuse. Their feeling was that if a child is returned to the home where the abuse occurred, there is a 25 to 50 per cent risk

that this child will suffer permanent injury or death -- a 25 to 50 per cent chance if there is no intervention.

This is where these programs become so important. It has been said that abused children may become abusive parents and research has supported this. If we really feel tomorrow's society is based on the children of today, then I think we have to take a very good look at more extensive legal and social responsibility in the area of rights for children.

In this Legislature we have placed a great deal of emphasis on human rights, and perhaps we have to look at this in a more specific sense with children and the whole area of child abuse.

MR. WILSON:

In rising to speak on second reading of Bill No. 21, The Child Welfare Amendment Act, I would like to congratulate the government for moving in the direction they take in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, my research has shown that there is a segment of society that believes children are possessions similar to property, something that they own rather than individual human beings. They believe that no injustice can be done to one's own property and they treat their children in that manner. They abuse and terrorize children, and they believe children should give them comfort rather than the other way around.

Mr. Speaker, there are cases in North America where people in desperation have reported child battering cases to the SPCA when no other agency would respond. It seems to me that this bill is very timely and is urgently needed.

There are estimates of 250 to 300 children out of every one million in urban areas in North America are injured in a non-accidental manner, with two to three per cent killed each year. Now there is good reason to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the actual statistics would be much higher. We have a lack of accurate data due to no mandatory reporting in most areas of North America. The accuracy of the data is further questioned because of believable stories presented by battering parents. It is further aggravated by the fact that the children in most instances are too young or too frightened to speak up. Also, there is the physicians' fear of legal implications and just the plain fact physicians and others have a disbelief parents would destroy their own children.

As has been mentioned there is ample evidence to indicate that in most instances a battered child becomes a battering parent. It occurs in all walks of life, and all combinations of socio-economic and religious backgrounds. An adult with childhood experiences of emotional and physical brutalization has a very high chance of becoming a battering parent. In fact, studies in North America have indicated five generations of battering parents.

Usually one severe incident of a battered child indicates there will be more. Children in these cases need protection from further beatings, abuse, injury or death. Case histories indicate children are punished by being punched, kicked, pinched, bitten, scratched and flung against hard objects -- beaten with whips, cooking utensils, electric cords, garden tools, building materials and anything handy. They have been stabbed, burned, locked up for days in closets, pushed outside in night clothes in zero weather, chained to beds, placed in scalding water, given boiling enemas and force-fed boiling milk, their own feces and vomit, placed on hot stoves and burned by cigarettes. All this was done as a result of the belief in a need for absolute obedience, all done by parents who regard them as possessions rather than individual human beings. Surely people acting in this manner are sick. If the cycle is not interrupted with psychiatric treatment there is little hope of eliminating the problem.

Public awareness and general education is needed. Public cooperation is needed. Government leadership is needed to advise the public what to do with the information they have. And this bill will help.

There is an organization called Parents Anonymous that started up, Mr. Speaker, one in Calgary and one in Edmonton, which is very conscious of the problems and the background, and who are encouraging parents with this tendency to join their group. Through contact with Parents Anonymous they try to encourage them to seek psychiatric help.

Mr. Speaker, because of the related bill on the Order Paper, I have received approximately 50 letters from individuals and organizations throughout the province. I suppose the organizations that have sent in letters would

represent literally hundreds of people who are concerned. I was amazed at the number of organizations that are sincerely concerned about this problem, wanting to see action, to see something done.

Mr. Speaker, the penalty section of this bill is probably repulsive to many. But it seems to me that it will help to speed up public awareness of the problem and hopefully through education, the penalty section will not eventually be needed. However, it seems to me that by the penalty section we are certainly stimulating discussion and debate throughout the province and stimulating thought about the problem, which is to the benefit of the general situation.

Mr. Speaker, I would refer members to the Canadian Medical Association Journal out of Winnipeg of April 7, 1973, which has a very interesting article on child abuse. It shows the increasing incidence of child abuse in that area. As has been related, the Alberta statistics show an increasing reportage of incidents.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is most timely that this bill is brought forward. I wholeheartedly support it and recommend it to other hon. members.

DR. PAPROSKI:

As the seconder of this particular act, The Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1973, I rise to spend just a few moments on this particular act, although I, as I am sure many of the members of the Assembly could spend hours and hours. Much has been reported, recorded and documented. I don't think it needs repetition.

I agree with the comments made by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight and the hon. member opposite. I think this will suffice to reinforce some of these areas. I want to add to this by way of reinforcement because I have had very strong representation from my constituents regarding this matter, and I feel a special obligation because of that, but even a general obligation regarding that unspoken voice, the child.

To improve the lot of the child, members of the Assembly, I suggest indeed is to improve the lot of society. When we speak of neglect, we certainly have to identify two clear areas of neglect. One is parental neglect, where the parents either are not aware, or are aware of the neglect and are probably or possibly not motivated to do something for themselves or for the children.

The other one is the community neglect. This occurs, of course, when the community either has poor housing or doesn't have the vitality or the services, the health and social services or education or various child welfare laws. This includes, of course, poverty, and I bring to the attention of the members of the Assembly that in Alberta at this time we have some 100,000 children who are below the poverty line.

Having said this -- I indicated initially I am going to be brief -- I think the important issue here is community coordination and team approach, utilizing those entities that the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight has mentioned, in other words, across the board citizen participation. Therefore adding to the amendments that have been made regarding the reporting aspect for child abuse, I'd like to emphasize again a number of other things, or just emphasize those things that have been mentioned.

I suggest a standard reporting form be available in every emergency ward of every hospital and other areas where it is readily available for the public; Zenith number for rapid communication of this child abuse; gentle and firm public relations with the media regarding this problem; ongoing education of all concerned -- for example, family planning and so forth -- a necessity to have a mechanism at the community level for action programs for the children who are being abused so that something could be done at the community level where people understand. The team approach is not necessarily just a team in the sense of a professional team of a medical doctor, social worker, legal help or law enforcement agency, but it must be a team that is actually working and is prepared to get up in the middle of the night and go out and investigate the entity when necessary, in other words, a follow-through to educate the family to ensure action.

We must dispel all fear of reporting regarding child abuse. I think this is a very sensitive area where neighbours refuse to report this problem despite the fact that it is obviously in front of their eyes.

So ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, physical, mental and social abuse of children will now, I feel, be acted upon and prevented by these amendments if the citizens of our province indeed play a role, and I have confidence they

will. I think the passage of this bill is the first step, and make no mistake about that, members of the Assembly, the prevention of child abuse is an important area and I feel that every member of this Assembly has a responsibility to go back to his constituency to ensure he knows clearly what the steps are and to encourage and educate his constituents regarding the problem. Thank you.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the principle on Bill No. 21, the only principle I wish to touch on is the one regarding juveniles placed in detention. The hon. members who have preceded me in speaking on Bill No. 21 have covered the other two major points.

But I must bring to the attention of the House a problem I feel exists in the juvenile offenders branch, and in particular the detention of our young people. It was only two or three weeks ago when a case was widely read about and broadcast in Calgary where a young man had been held for a considerable length of time before a suitable place for treatment could be found for him. I feel this is something we should have uppermost in our minds because if we are going to detain these children, then I think the number one criterion is a place of treatment to place them in.

I believe also that we have to take a serious look to guarantee that our youngsters who run afoul of the law or are very hard to handle as far as their family is concerned be given every protection of the law just like an adult. I believe that when a child is mentally disturbed he can be placed in an institution without representation by counsel. I think we have to look at the type of institution we are putting him in. Are we putting him in an institution just to incarcerate him or are we putting him there for treatment?

When I look at some of the regulations carried out as far as trying to visit one of these youngsters, it makes you wonder just what we are trying to do. Where the parents are only allowed 20 minutes to talk to the young fellow, where only a selected group of people can come in and visit him or her, whichever the case may be. I believe what these people need more than anything else is some love and understanding, and in particular interest from somebody on the outside.

I believe if you are going to have any success at all in rehabilitation, the number one criterion would be that someone is interested in them. And if we make it difficult for people to become interested in them, I think we are defeating the very purpose of rehabilitation.

Getting to the legal matters, I think the juvenile court should be concerned only with the evidence on the particular charge in determining guilt or innocence. A child charged with a criminal act should be assured every right and procedural safeguard guaranteed to adults. I think it is more important these people get this guarantee, even before adults.

So I would like to urge the House and the government in particular, to do whatever it can. I congratulate them in this step they have made where there is going to be some guarantee that the court can review cases that have been placed in detention, and a weekly review, that is a good step forward.

But I think there are so many other things in this field that we could have looked into. I think also that the provincial government is going to have to work hard and cooperatively with the federal government to bring in a new offenders bill, where instead of every juvenile just being caught up in the fact that he has been charged under the, what I would say, bulk charge of being a juvenile delinquent, the charges that are being laid against him should be spelled out, whatever they are -- the more businesslike approach as far as guaranteeing that child his right to counsel; his right to have visitors at a longer period of time, if those visitors are not going to retard his opportunities to be rehabilitated.

I believe it is up to the provincial government, which by and large and in the final analysis is responsible for all wards that are in detention in Alberta, because they are automatically made wards when they are charged and found guilty, to ensure that everything is done for these children.

I think it must be pointed out to the federal government that if they are going to do anything about this, the first step is to get a realistic child young offenders bill passed in the House of Commons so that every juvenile charged in Canada will be treated on an equal basis.

But the thing I am most concerned about is that justice for our young people is available to them just the same as it is for an adult person who is in a much better position to protect himself than any of the youngsters we have confined in our present institutions. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make three quick comments on the bill. The first one, following what the hon. Member for Calgary Millican has just said, I may say that a few years ago I visited Boys' Town in Omaha and I was amazed of the results in some of the lives of some of those boys simply because people took an interest in them.

One boy in particular who was slated for the gallows became a very outstanding citizen. In speaking to him he said the point where he started to change his attitude was when Father Flannagan met him at the gate and said, "We're sure glad that you've come to our institution. Welcome." He said it was the first time in his whole life he had ever had anybody glad that he was around. So the points raised by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, I think, are well taken and very excellent.

The two points I wanted to make in connection with foster care are, number one, the Judge Catonio Commission carried out a very excellent study on foster care. I liked the way the judge and the committee went into the smaller communities of the province and had heart-to-heart fireside talks with people who were concerned. The report reflects that very thing. I am wondering how many of those recommendations are now in effect or will be put into effect, not just the ones for increased pay, but many others that were equally important if not even more important.

The last point in connection with foster care is that many times we take Native youngsters and put them into homes of white citizens and I have seen this work out very excellently. They become a part of that family. I am thinking of two or three homes in the Drumheller valley where this has happened. You can go into the home; there is no difference, no excitement at all over the fact that one or two are Native children. I think this is a very excellent thing as far as our country is concerned.

I am wondering though if we put forth enough effort to have some of the Native children put into homes on the reserves. Some of the mothers and fathers there have indicated that they would like to take a child and even though the house might not be so wonderful, I think that should be secondary. If the father and mother can provide that child with love and care, it makes up for a shack in which they have to live or a house that is not quite as modern as others in our major cities. I would like to see the department put forth an extra effort in connection with Native youngsters in having them to a greater degree put into homes on reserves even though the houses may not be as wonderful as they should be or as wonderful as we would like to have them. I think this might pay dividends both in responsibility of the people there and in providing the child with a background in the culture of which he is a part.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I would just to make a few comments in regard to one principle that is in Bill No. 21 and that is one that is dealt with in Section 41.

First of all let me preface my remarks by saying that it is hard to imagine that some of the things that have been related in the House by the members in regard to children can actually happen in our so-called "enlightened civilization." Yet I am the first to admit that it does happen and it is happening all too frequently.

I am very pleased that the bill has been brought forward and attention has been focused on this very serious problem. I hope that in some measure it will help toward eliminating this very serious problem facing society today.

I am very interested in the setting up of the central registry so that adequate information is maintained, and I think thereby will ensure the authorities will be better able to determine the cases that are genuine and the ones that need attention.

I am a little concerned in regard to the penalty that is suggested in the section because it seems to me that it is very difficult to force people to give information by having a penalty section. I would like to suggest that it can place some people in a very difficult position. For example when you have a penalty of a fixed amount it immediately, in my mind, suggests that it will not

be equitable. Certainly I would be the first to recognize it would have to go before a court and it would be the responsibility of the judge to determine the exact amount of the fine. But even so, I think that it does lead to the possibility of inequities as far as meting out punishment for not giving information.

For example, I don't think it would be unfair to suggest that we could have a situation where a doctor and a nurse would be involved and that both would be just as likely to have knowledge of the case as to whether or not it was a case of child beating. It has been my understanding that a doctor in that case should be the one who would be the most responsible. But certainly, it places the problem in a very difficult light. Would the penalty then be the same for the nurse not reporting as for the doctor? If it were, then I would suggest that it certainly would not be equitable. On the other hand, should the nurse be reporting it where she and a doctor were involved? I think it would be the responsibility of the doctor.

But really I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, I think this is beside the point. In my view the objective we have is the improvement of the situation for the children. I do not think it would come about by suggesting that there is going to be a penalty for not giving information. It is my view that instead we ought to suggest that anyone who is prepared to provide information will be protected and will not be dealt with harshly in any way, even if their reporting may have been a little bit misguided. I'm sure there are cases where people may think there has been child abuse and actually it has not happened. On the other hand, it is going to be just as likely that there may have been child abuse and certain individuals will feel it wasn't actually child abuse.

I come again to this fact of a fine. I have to say this was reinforced by one of the people who attended the mental health breakfast that many of the members attended at the hotel some month and a half ago. An individual who has been involved in many of these cases expressed great concern to me with the fact that there was a penalty section in the proposed bill the hon. Member for Calgary Bow had introduced just shortly before that meeting.

So I think we ought to look very carefully at the suggestion of a fine, but rather do everything that we can to encourage anyone who might have some knowledge on a case to give it to the proper authorities. I would certainly hope the general intent of the bill will provide some improvement in what I would consider a very serious situation that is facing society today.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 21 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 25 The Cemeteries Amendment Act, 1973

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Ponoka, second reading of Bill No. 25.

Mr. Speaker, if I may make just a few comments to reinforce the items I mentioned before. The intention is to enable a cemetery which is not being maintained to be liquidated and sold or taken over by a city or municipality. This would be done without the necessity of moving the bodies to a proper or another burial ground.

To bring some history into this particular bill: in 1964 amendments were provided that cemeteries could not be liquidated without having the bodies moved to a proper burial ground. In recent time in one area of the province some 200 bodies needed to be moved with resultant distress and grief of relatives and friends. It was very costly. Now I understand there are two other cemeteries with a similar problem.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker and hon. members, that this will alleviate the problem with the amendments that are brought forward in this particular bill.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 25 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 30  
The Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1973

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell, second reading of Bill No. 30.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker,...[Inaudible]... the results of this Bill No. 30, The Municipal Government Amendment Act, 1973, and will therefore absent myself from the House during all debate and voting on the bill.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that because of the nature of the bill it is difficult to establish whether or not a person is for or opposed to the principle of the bill. So I would simply announce to the House my intention at this time of supporting the bill in principle, but of making two amendments to it in committee stage, that is to delete Sections 6 and 11 with which I disagree in principle though not with the rest of the bill.

Very briefly I would also draw the attention of the members to Section 14 of the proposed amendment act which, in my view at least, may be one of the most remarkable pieces of legislation of this government, at this session or any other session, in that it provides for the first time the first steps by which the citizens of a municipality may direct their legislators, in a very direct way, as to the kind of legislation they want. That section, as members are aware, provides that citizens of a municipality can, by petition, create the passage of a specifically worded by-law they favour. I think that insofar as it is the first legislation of that kind in Alberta and, indeed to my knowledge, in any province in Canada, that it is a remarkable piece of legislation for inclusion in The Municipal Government Act.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I want to just voice my views in connection with one principle in the bill and that was referred to by the hon. member who just spoke, namely Section 6. Section 30 prohibits members of a municipal council from voting on certain matters in which they have a personal interest or involvement. We have here a very small move to permit members of council to handle money that may have been voted to an organization by the city council. It certainly is one step removed.

I would like to say at this stage that in Committee of the Whole I think we should give this very careful thought because there is a danger once you start permitting certain things to be done with regard to personal involvement in public affairs it may then lead to something far more serious. I don't look upon this one as particularly serious except that it is a first step permitting someone who is elected to deal with public money when he may have some personal involvement in that. Consequently I am suggesting that while I am supporting the bill we should take a very careful look at that section during committee study.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether I want to address myself at this time to the bill or not, but I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs which will have a bearing on remarks as to whether this particular bill has sections in it dealing with the question of off-site development charges. There is another bill before the House which has off-site development charges or implications to it. I wonder if the minister could answer me first.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. Opposition House Leader put the question and the minister answer it?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes, it does, Mr. Speaker. Section 24 of the act amending Section 242 of the original Act.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a very brief remark on the subject at this time, mostly with a view to giving the minister notice of some concern about the matter with a view that it might make consideration more productive in the committee stage.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the amendments in the bill while I support the principle of them so far as off-site development charges. My concern, in introducing the amendments, is that the amendments are essentially formalizing practices which have existed in a number of communities in previous years in the province. Almost immediately when one introduces amendments to formalize procedures which have been followed in other communities or some communities in the province in years gone by, it brings up the question in somebody's mind of whether it's a matter of formalizing the past practices or a question of legalizing past practices in this area.

I suggest inevitably it is going to be interpreted in some areas as meaning legalizing practices which have been going on in a number of communities in the province where off-site development charges have been levied in years past. One can envision the legal challenges to those practices, or the possibility of legal challenges to those practices because the practice presumably would only have become legal with the introduction of this particular bill.

I would like to ask the minister if he would seriously take under consideration the possibility of bringing the clauses in under the umbrella of a 'grandfather' clause so that the amendments to the bill would, in effect, ratify practices of this type which have already been carried out in the province in previous years.

I realize in principle this is generally not looked on too favourably by legislators, regardless of which side of the House they sit on -- making legislation, that in fact is retroactive. But the principle of say 'grandfather' clauses is used on occasion. I would bring to the attention of the members of the House in this regard, a case relating to Calgary I believe, some years back, wherein there had been a practice established relative to public fund-sharing for the separate school system, I believe it was private schools. While it had not been specifically sanctioned in law, it had been a custom that had been established and ongoing for some period of time.

When the bill came into the House at that particular time to, in effect, formalize what had been an established custom and accepted practice, the bill and the terms relating to the bill were made retroactive to make it plain there was not any question of the legality of those practices prior to the introduction of the bill.

I don't necessarily want the minister to respond on the matter at this time, unless he so wishes, but rather ask him if he would take the matter under advisement with a view of being able to deal more explicitly with the appropriate sections in some detail when we get into committee stage and seriously consider the desirability of making these particular clauses retroactive so there is no question of legality of the practice of off-site development charges which have been levied in a number of communities in the province in the years gone by.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 30 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 32, The Public Health Amendment Act, 1973

DR. MCCRIMMON:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Lloydminster second reading of Bill No. 32, The Public Health Amendment Act, 1973.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 32 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 39, The Companies Amendment Act, 1973

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Stettler, second reading of Bill No. 39, The Companies Amendment Act, 1973.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 39 was read a second time.]



Bill No. 41 The Public Service Pension Amendment Act, 1973

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 41, The Public Service Pension Amendment Act, 1973.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 41 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 40 The Dental Association Amendment Act, 1973

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Advanced Education, second reading of Bill No. 40.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 40 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 42

The Senior Citizens Housing Statutes Amendment Act, 1973

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Advanced Education, second reading of Bill No. 42.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 42 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 43

The Teachers' Retirement Fund Amendment Act, 1973

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Rocky Mountain House, second reading of Bill No. 43.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 43 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 44

The Department of Education Amendment Act, 1973

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Deputy Premier, second reading of Bill No. 44, The Department of Education Amendment Act, 1973.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 44 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 46 The Farm Implement Amendment Act, 1973

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Lloydminster, second reading of Bill No. 46, The Farm Implement Amendment Act, 1973.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on this bill. In asking for guarantees on farm machinery this is a proper way to go, but the type of guarantee -- the more these guarantees have to be paid for -- I think in making these things too tight we are charging an added expense to the farmers.

We talked about warranties. In the question period today a little General Motors car, I believe -- it could be a Ford or a Firenza -- was mentioned. In a way we are asking for higher warranties on farm machinery and really have stiffer competition there than we have, say, in the line of automobiles.

There is another part I might add in comparing this to the one in Manitoba which is much tougher than ours. I'll read a little part here from The Lethbridge Herald which said:

Massey-Ferguson Industries Ltd. announced today a 1.54-per-cent increase in list prices of new tractors and combines sold in Manitoba.

The company also announced that list prices of farm machinery repair parts have been increased two per cent, effective today.

R. E. Drennan, vice-president of sales and distribution, said the increases are necessary to cover added costs resulting from the new Manitoba Farm Machinery and Equipment Act which became law March 31.

The act requires a three-year warranty for tractors and combines, a one-year warranty on all other farm machinery and a one-year warranty on all farm machinery repair costs.

It was also stated by the John Deere Company in Manitoba that they would raise the price of their machinery 4.5 per cent. This throws quite an added cost onto the farmers. When we look at 1971 in the Province of Alberta, practically \$140 million was spent on machinery and repair parts. So the two per cent, say, on repairs on this would cost maybe \$2.8 million. If you add this onto the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba and, say, at 1.5 per cent on tractors and combines, a \$10,000 tractor now would cost \$150 more.

I would suggest that the Minister of Agriculture try to push this with the other three western provinces where we would have an independent testing station where these machines must measure up.

Most of us have read Popular Mechanics. There they have an independent board that tests cars and gives their strong points and their bad points. The car manufacturers, I'm sure, are quite cognizant of the fact that if they don't measure up, their products won't sell. I think if there were an independent testing station in the western provinces where they took these tractors or farm machinery, tested them under various types of conditions and gave an honest independent survey of just how these machines measured up, you would find that your major machine companies would try to give better value for their money.

The other thing I'd like to speak on is dealers. I think some of the dealers are quite upset that they now have to have, say, a \$10,000 bond. If they can get a \$5,000 bond I suppose this part reflects on their integrity. The other thing I am concerned about is that all the dealers, according to this act, are now being rated. A questionnaire, I understand, was sent out from the Department of Agriculture in which the dealer has to list the various points of his dealership and the parts he carries. If he doesn't measure up to a standard of 60, he is considered outdated and he could lose his licence or he could be required to update himself.

In my own town the Massey dealer, the John Deere dealer, in fact we have a John Deere dealer in Cardston, if they are out of parts they have to come from the city of Edmonton. It is very difficult for dealers, when you are coming out with a new tractor or combine every second or third year, to carry a complete line of repair parts on all these various models. But what I'm concerned about is that the little dealers are now becoming few and far between. There are many centres now, say with a population of 2,500, that used to have four or five dealers and now only have two major companies. They have come into more regional offices for different dealerships.

I'm concerned with the little dealer. He has a small line of parts. He doesn't pretend to sell the full line, but he does serve a useful purpose. If we are going to close these small dealers out -- quite a lot of these dealers go along with the village garage -- any hope that these little fellows had of carrying on the selling of parts is pretty well out of luck. This again destroys the economy of the smaller centres.

There is another part, too, about the dealers that I have often felt sorry about, and this was the outdated parts. If a dealer sells out completely he probably might have \$10,000 or \$15,000, if he is unlucky enough, of parts the company won't take back. They are outdated and they won't take back that many any more. There are some parts of the country where you have binder repairs nobody wanted any more. These were all left on the dealer's shelf and somebody has to pay for them. I don't suggest that this act is too tough. What I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is let's not get too tough because ultimately the farmer is going to pay the full shot.

MR. DRAIN:

Just one question rises in my mind here in relation to new tractors sold and the horsepower thereof. I am just wondering what the hon. member would have in mind to assess this power. To illustrate my point, a tractor, is sold and then operated around Edmonton. If you take the same tractor to the Pincher Creek area it would develop probably 80 horsepower because of the difference in altitude. This is a particular thing. So would the man buying the tractor in Pincher Creek then have to have a conversion table? Probably this would be the way you could go about this.

I would say, in looking at this particular bill, that you can get all the guarantees the farm people are prepared to pay for. You can get a gold-plated tractor guaranteed to last for the next 25 years with a parts service similar to a Rolls Royce. Now I remember reading an article on Rolls Royce cars. This man was touring India and the axle broke on his car. He wired the Rolls Royce plant and they flew in a mechanic by special aircraft to install the axle. When he inquired about the billing they said there is no billing because Rolls Royces do not break axles.

So when we talk about guarantees, whether there is an area of exploitation in faulty workmanship or in poor parts availability is something that hon. members in the business of agriculture specifically are better able to assess than I. Interestingly enough, you can get better parts service on a tractor in High Level than in Pincher Creek, just because of the difference in abilities of transportation. I was quite amazed at that while working in the north; I would simply radio in in the evening and the parts would be there the following morning. Repeating the process down in the Medicine Hat or Lethbridge area, you would find that you would be looking at two or three days because of the difference in transportation problems and so on.

Generally I think it can be accepted now that the numbers of parts and the complexities of the machines are such that you have to rely on centralized depots. I would say that to request a small town farm implement agent to stock unique and versatile types of parts with a high obsolescence factor in other than a centralized depot would be asking for far more than possibly could be realized.

Additionally, with the sophistication of machines -- now you take a turbo charged tractor and you're talking about \$10,000 involved in parts, or something like that. Yet this is just peanuts, a one block assembly. You're looking at machines that are now \$30,000, \$35,000 or \$40,000. I frankly question the value of this bill. Although I admire the intent, I believe frankly this will create as many problems as it solves, and I must get back to my original theme which basically says that you will get as much guarantee as you pay for. Don't think the manufacturer is going to give farming people anything, so if you want to go the way of better guarantees you're looking at added costs and added costs are paid by no one except the customer. For the person you actually start out to help -- you will find the end result to be more self-defeating than effective.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in support of this bill. Over the years I have had a number of cases where a lemon has been sold to a farmer and there has been tremendous difficulty in that farmer getting satisfaction from the company -- one man several months. After you pay \$20,000 or \$30,000 for a farm implement you certainly expect that implement to perform and to give satisfaction. I believe the authority in this act given to the Minister of Agriculture is essential to deal with the exceptional cases possibly, but the few cases where there are lemons given to farmer. Because it is a catastrophe to a farmer who buys a \$20,000 or \$30,000 implement and then finds it just won't do the job for which it was purchased. So I do support this act and I am very happy to see it come in.

MR. HINMAN:

This Section 7.1 covers it. One of the real complaints farmers have is that the depots, particularly now they are centralized, observe some pretty short and strict hours even in harvest season. I hope that if Section 7.1 doesn't permit the government to regulate, that everybody selling equipment or servicing it must provide emergency numbers which can be reached, particularly on Saturdays, but longer than from 9:00 o'clock until 5:00 o'clock. This is one of the very great problems. In my area you might have to drive 70 miles to get a part for a tractor because there are no regional dealers. If you have a breakdown at 4:00 o'clock, even if you phone, if you can't get there by 5:00 you had better wait until tomorrow. If this happens to you on Friday night, you may have to wait until Monday. This is one of the very real complaints we have.

Another is, I think, that in the matter of belts and gears and pulleys, the companies ought to be required to supply specifications or numbers. This is particularly true with bearings. You go to get a bearing for a Massey-Harris tractor and the dealer hasn't got it. If you go to enough trouble you will find you can go to some other dealer and get exactly the same bearing. I have had the experience of not being able to get rear-end bearings for a truck. I went to a tractor dealer and got the same bearing for half price, exactly the same number.

Now what I am concerned with is that perhaps they ought to be required in the matter of belts and bearings and pulleys and things of that nature to give specifications and cross reference numbers, because so many times you ought to be able to use a part made by somebody else when these are exactly the same. I think most of you are aware that in bearings there are only two companies making most of them. It is a little disconcerting to find on the Massey-Harris bearing only the Massey-Harris number and there is no way you can discover what bearing this is. I will say that some of the bearing companies now have catalogues and if you can measure the bearing inside and out they can supply you. As I say, if Section 7.1 does not make it possible to make such regulations, perhaps we ought to be thinking of an amendment to make this possible.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments on closing the debate with respect to points brought out by members opposite.

I appreciate the hon. Member for MacLeod's concern regarding increases in farm machinery prices in Manitoba apparently as a direct result of their farm machinery legislation there. I want to assure you that in developing amendments to the existing Farm Implement Act in Alberta we will very definitely take into consideration the fact that additional warranties, additional duties on both manufacturers and dealers could in fact result in additional cost to farmers. There is not however, in my view, anything in the amendments that we propose in this bill which would impose a hardship on manufacturers, or vendors as we call them in the Act, or dealers. Many of the dealers and manufacturers in the province are now operating in a manner whereby they will not have to adjust their business practices very much to fall in line with the amendments proposed here.

On the other hand there are possibly a number of dealers and vendors or manufacturers not operating in the best interests of the farming public across the province when it comes to warranties and the supply of parts. We intend by these amendments to put those people in line with the good manufacturers and the good dealers.

With respect to bonding, the previous Act did have provisions that each dealer should be bonded. The only changes that occur here are that we allow security in another form acceptable to the minister to be used other than bonding.

With regard, Mr. Speaker, to the comments which the hon. member made about the rating of dealers which has occurred through the Department of Agriculture, I would just like to say it is essential in my view that we know what kind of performance the farm machinery dealers across Alberta are giving in regard to supplying parts and machinery. It is essential to know what kind of business operations they run, what kind of profits they might be making and so on. After having determined what the state of the farm machinery dealer industry is in Canada there are a number of ways, through the Agriculture Development Corporation, through the Alberta Opportunity Fund and so on, where we might be of assistance to those dealers in upgrading their facilities to help them provide better service to the farmers they are serving. So the rating is not being carried out with any intention whatsoever of closing out dealers but only of trying to provide the department with some information which might, in fact, enable us to help them upgrade their operations.

The Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest made some references to horsepower and the determination of what an individual tractor might be delivering in the line of horsepower after it's sold. I appreciate that there are some concerns with respect to different elevations and so on, but I'm sure that can all be worked out. We would expect that many tractors would be graded after having been sold, on dynamometers, and the allowances for elevation and so on consideration without too many problems.

One of the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, commented with respect to the establishment of a farm machinery testing centre and a standardization of parts. I might say that it's my information that we do have within the Department of Agriculture in Alberta a committee working with their counterparts in the

provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan in trying to develop a centre to test machinery used on western Canadian farms.

We are also looking quite actively at the standardization of parts. Our own Farm Machinery Appeal Board here in Alberta has had under consideration that question of standardization of parts, particularly with regard to bearings and parts which can be obtained from other manufacturers.

I don't believe at this stage that we have had much encouragement from the federal government with respect to the operation and establishment of a farm machinery testing centre as was outlined in the Barber Report of a few years ago. We are hopeful that the situation will change in the near future and we can get on with that job.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the concern expressed by the hon. Member for Cardston in regard to the supplying of telephone numbers and that type of thing so farmers can adequately obtain parts at all times of the week, section 7.1 allows for the Lieutenant Governor in Council to make regulations imposing some duties and obligations upon vendors and other persons in respect to the supply of parts.

I think you will appreciate that when we get into the area of such things as saying we require a list of telephone numbers for parts in an emergency situation we almost have to do that type of thing by regulation because of changing factors that may occur from time to time.

I would just like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by emphasizing once again that it is not the intention of this bill in any way, shape or form to put smaller dealers in the Province of Alberta out of business. It is the intention of this bill to make vendors, manufacturers and dealers upgrade their service to farmers in various areas so we might have a farm machinery dealer organization and vendor organization in Alberta second to none in service for the farmers of this province.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 46 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 49  
The Health Unit Amendment Act, 1973

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for St. Albert, that Bill No. 49, The Health Unit Amendment Act, 1973 be read a second time.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 49 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 50  
The School Amendment Act, 1973

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, that Bill No. 50, The School Amendment Act, 1973 be read a second time.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 50 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 54 The Alberta Heritage Act, 1973

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona, second reading of Bill No. 54, The Alberta Heritage Act, 1973.

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments as I am quite interested in this bill. It is very difficult indeed to find words in our English vocabulary to describe the vandals who take to the fields armed with hammer and chisel in order to chip away historic Indian paintings from rock faces here in our province. In my estimation, this ranks close to being number one among the more despicable of the many kinds of despoilation being practised today. We have white people who would walk off with the rainbow if that were possible.

Speaking of rainbows, it may be of interest to the hon. Member for Rocky Mountain House to know of an incident which happened there many years ago. The great geographer, David Thompson, was in the area with a contingent of Indians when a great rainfall occurred. The mountain streams became raging torrents and the rivers were overflowing. During the height of the storm the Indians addressed themselves to the Manitou of the waters, asking them to cause the deluge to subside. Suddenly a great shout went up from the Indians. "The mark of life. The mark of life. We shall yet live." David Thompson writes that looking eastward there was the most splendid rainbow he had ever seen.

I believe this Assembly is aware of the efforts of a number of people to retrieve the Manitou stone for Alberta where it belongs. Today it is in the museum awaiting the minister's decision to call a date for the unveiling. The meteorite was taken some 100 years ago to Ontario. There it was kept and now it is back where it belongs.

I am reminded of a beautiful oxen yoke in my hometown which hangs in a garage there. One day a tourist pulled up and noticed this yoke. He went to the owner of it and said, I would like to purchase that and take it back to the United States on this occasion. The man said, No, it's not for sale. Well the tourist pulled out his cheque book and said, I'll give you so much money for it. And it was a vast amount. But the owner stuck to his guns and said no. The tourist became quite indignant and offended the garageman but still he would not sell. I wish we had more people who will keep these historic treasures in Alberta.

I want to congratulate the museum for two recent purchases. They have purchased the Delph rock collection that was at Lloydminster and a beautiful collection of Indian artifacts from Mr. and Mrs. Ben Webber, who are neighbours of mine.

One treasure I would like to see retrieved for Alberta is a grizzly bear which was taken north and east of Edmonton. It is the largest grizzly ever taken and it is mounted and now on display in a sister province. So I certainly support Bill No. 54.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, as the member for Rocky Mountain House I would like to advise the House that I found the story of the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation very interesting. I would also like to have it recorded that it occurred before my time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 54 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 60  
The Alberta Resources  
Railway Corporation Amendment Act, 1973 (No. 2)

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Highways and Transportation second reading of Bill No. 60, The Alberta Resources Railway Corporation Amendment Act, 1973 (No. 2).

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 60 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 61 The Department of Consumer Affairs Act

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Northern Development, second reading of Bill No. 61, The Department of Consumer Affairs Act.

MR. CLARK:

Just a few comments with regard to Bill No. 61 which was just introduced in the House yesterday, or the day before yesterday, and we're now getting involved in second reading.

It's the bill dealing with the Consumer Affairs Department and I might say I had hoped the legislation would be somewhat more specific than it is. I

appreciate the government made the decision to move on a Consumer Affairs Department after this session had started and perhaps that accounts for some of the generalities in the bill.

I would though, Mr. Speaker, be somewhat remiss if I didn't say that I'm disappointed there is no provision for some sort of consumer's advocate in this particular bill. It seems to me frankly that this bill doesn't have the ability to come to grips with some of the problems many people consider real problems in the consumer affairs area today.

One of the things I very sincerely hoped I'd see in the legislation was what I call a consumer's advocate or an independent council made up of Albertans from a number of walks of life, and that this consumer's council or consumer's advocate would have the powers set out in legislation so they could investigate complaints and as far as products are concerned, make known to the public the results which they conclude after they've done their investigation.

I might also say that I'd hoped there would be some indication in the act there would be some members of the legal profession, shall I say, 'housed' in the Department of Consumer Affairs so they could give rather full priority to the question of consumer complaints.

I recognize it is a touchy area as to how far can a government agency or government department go in giving legal advice to consumers. But it seems to me the department has not dealt with this question in the legislation before us. On a number of cases, I'm sure consumers are going to find that they'll be sending things to the department, asking for advice, and I see nothing in this bill that will prevent the government from saying, well, I'm sorry we can't give you legal advice or choose not to give you legal advice in this matter. You'd better get a lawyer.

Now if the thing is going to go to trial or if charges are going to be laid, I agree with that approach directly. But it seems to me that if this Department of Consumer Affairs is going to be meaningful then it had better have some people, and I suspect they had best be lawyers on staff in the department who can give some good advice to people.

I cite the problem of people with prefabricated homes. The matter has been raised in the Assembly several times. It seems to me that people should be able to go to the department and get some fairly responsible legal advice as to what their options are and where they can go from there. I don't think it is good enough to say, well we think we have a problem here. We suggest you go get a lawyer. If the people are going to lay charges or charges are contemplated, then very definitely that is the responsibility of the person's lawyer and they are going to have to get legal advice.

But we are going to have to go much further than this department has been going to date in this area of legal services. So if it is a question of legal services, legal advice, there is also the question of the consumer's advocate and I sincerely hope that the minister is going to be persuasive enough with his colleagues in cabinet that this consumer's advocate, consumer's council, would be able to be involved in investigations and publish their findings. Because if that isn't the case, and if that kind of information isn't made available to the consumer, then the department isn't going to be very meaningful.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, just briefly in response to the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. DOWLING:

I would like to correct a misconception he seems to have, that the decision to establish a Department of Consumer Affairs was made during this session.

I know the decision to establish a Department of Consumer Affairs was made in the late 1960s by the people responsible for the development of the policies of the present Conservative party. In saying that, I am saying the people of Alberta established a need for it and made it part of their PC party policy.

MR. CLARK:

Why didn't you include it in the Speech from the Throne?

MR. DOWLING:

If the hon. member wishes to speak again, he might speak on another bill, Mr. Speaker.

The other thing I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that we have now the facility in the present legislation and the present acts to establish a consumer's advocate.

I also know, Mr. Speaker, that it would be a very simple matter for me to build myself a very large empire, being the first Minister of Consumer Affairs. But I am not interested in empire building. I am interested in effectively handling a much needed new department in the government of Alberta. And I am going to take my time doing it so it's done right. Thank you.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 61 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 45

The Alberta Educational Communications Corporation Act

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Public Works, second reading of Bill No. 45, The Alberta Educational Communications Corporation Act.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to ask the minister for a short explanation on a couple of sections in the bill, not that I want to get into the details we would in committee, but just to forewarn him of the areas of my concern.

Mr. Speaker, it's the area that deals with committees. They talk about advisory committees. They talk about an authority and about a corporation. I wonder if the minister could give the House an indication of the function he sees each of these particular areas performing.

I am a little concerned about a bill like it. While I support it in principle, I'm concerned about the input into the educational content, the type of curriculum, the type of programming that will go out over this province by this corporation when it is formed. When we consider they could be all powerful, could be indoctrinating our total society, I am concerned about the input into the programming. I don't think we want to let this grow into something where we are going to have another CBC in the province of Alberta that can't be touched by anybody or anything. I am concerned about that, Mr. Speaker.

Also, in the corporation, I am wondering if the minister would consider, in committee, legislating into the corporation representation by some numbers of people from the Alberta School Trustees Association and the Alberta Teachers Association.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the second reading of Bill No. 45, would all those in favour please say aye.

Those opposed please say no. The motion is carried.

MR. HYNDMAN:

[Inaudible]... there is no need to go back to second reading. I was about to make a few comments, but I'll handle them in committee -- the questions posed by the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER:

I apologize.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 45 was read a second time.]



MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for consideration of bills on the Order Paper.

[The motion was carried]

\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair.]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of the Whole Assembly will now come to order.

Bill No. 5 The Public Highways Development Amendment Act, 1973

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

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 5 be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 13

The Health and Social Development Statutes Amendment Act, 1973

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

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 13 be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 16 The Students Loan Guarantee Amendment Act, 1973

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

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 16 be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 19 The Hail and Crop Insurance Amendment Act, 1973

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

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 19 be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 20 The County Amendment Act, 1973

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

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 20 be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 24 The Alberta Gas Trunk Line Company Amendment Act, 1973

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

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 24 be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 31 The Alberta Housing Amendment Act, 1973

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

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 31 be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 33 The Municipal Taxation Amendment Act, 1973

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, on second reading of Bill No. 33 I raised a number of points and the member sponsoring the bill assured me he would deal with them in committee. Before he deals with them in committee, I'd like to ask another question. In reading Section 2, it says: "The leasehold interest of the person in those lands shall be assessed as if the lands were grazing lands owned by him." This prompts me to ask the question, are we going to go back and reassess all these lands? As we know, under the Order-in-Council which was passed -- I don't have my notes with me, I didn't know it was coming up today -- I think four or five years ago, grazing lands were assessed according to the carrying capacity. The top grazing lands were assessed at \$12.50 an acre in the province as compared to \$40 for the top arable land. I've always had some question in my mind whether this business of taxing Crown lands would stand up in a court of law. I have always been under the impression you have to own something before you can assess it. To the best of my knowledge this has never been challenged in the courts, but I was always thinking that maybe the time would come. So now if we are going to assess these lands on the leasehold interests of these persons, we're in a brand new ball game, and I want to ask the minister, or the member who is sponsoring this bill, if we are now going to go out and assess these lands on their value? Are we going to assess them on their market value. Are we going to assess them on their carrying capacity, or what are we going to do?

We have a very unequitable ratio between arable land and grazing land today. I have been talking in this House now for some time and I don't know what I can do to get this thing straightened out. It's certainly not good, and I would like to have some assurance from somebody that we are going to show some leadership in this whole field and get some action in this whole area.

MR. HENDERSON:

Might I suggest that in this particular bill, which is a brief one, we go through it section by section, because I think there are some other areas we would wish to discuss.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well.

[Sections 1 through 9 were agreed to without debate.]

Section 10

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I have some concerns about this particular amendment. It may well be, following an explanation by the minister or the Member for Ponoka, that the interpretation of the bill does not do what it appears to do.

It specifically concerns one of the communities in my constituency wherein Calgary Power operates the water system. The source of water lies outside the corporate limits of the municipality and the source works and the pipeline are located in an adjoining municipality.

Under the bill it would mean that the utility facilities, the waterworks that lie in the adjoining county, would now become taxable because the system, to my knowledge, is not used in the municipality in which the source works and the pipeline are located. Now if that were the case it simply would mean that indirectly the tax is naturally going to be paid out in the form of higher utility rates on the part of the city in question. To be more specific, it is the City of Wetaskiwin and their water source is Cold Lake in the county.

I see there are two qualifications below that may alleviate the concerns, but on the face of the proposed amendment very clearly it is going to place the handful of communities with this problem -- I think Camrose is another one, and I think I have listed five communities in the province where some of the water system lies beyond the corporate boundaries of the municipality.

One can envision that if this proceeds as established herein, in the interests of avoiding the taxation involved the municipalities in question in the final analysis will probably be required to take over and operate the system themselves, even though it may be in the interests of the community in spite of their original agreements. Because of the fact that water services were provided by an independent company they will certainly be pressured, I believe, to take over and operate the systems directly. And in so doing, of course, they are simply going to be making demands upon the municipal finance corporation to buy out the system and convert it into a publicly owned utility. The amount of taxation involved is bound to be, province-wide, minimal.

I would like to hear the minister's comments more specifically on the interpretation of the clause because the way I interpret it it will only be a matter of time until the municipalities in question -- at least some of them -- are going to be paying taxation indirectly to an adjoining municipality. The instances involved are so minimal I am somewhat at a loss to understand why, at this point in time, these agreements should now be affected by the changes in legislation.

DR. MCCRIMMON:

Mr. Chairman, this particular point didn't come to my attention until yesterday afternoon. Now this amendment was passed in the 1971 session, retroactive until October, 1970, and the present amendment just takes out "in the municipalities".

Now, I realize that Wetaskiwin -- I didn't know whether the reservoir was outside the particular municipality or the sources were outside the municipality but under this change the franchise or agreement when the contract terminates or expires is not taxable. So I don't know how many years, in the particular case of Wetaskiwin, the contract or the agreement with Calgary Power has to go. But at the termination of the contract it is not taxable again.

Now, water system zones are listed under the exemptions. In some cases a franchise agreement exists or an agreement approved by the minister as to the payment in lieu of taxes is in effect. If the franchise agreement expires or the agreement approved by the minister terminates, then the system is exempt from assessment and taxation.

Now Calgary Power evidently made representation on the basis that some municipalities own their water works and therefore pay no taxes. The amendment was introduced to put Calgary Power on the same footing when franchise or payments expire, or agreements expire. I think the city of Wetaskiwin comes under this particular situation. I don't know if that clears up your point or not.

MR. HENDERSON:

Well no, Mr. Chairman, it gives me some cause for concern because it is the interpretation of the city council that very definitely if the amendment proceeds just changing the two words, providing a water supply service to

consumers of that municipality -- their source works is at Cold Lake, it is in the County of Wetaskiwin. I can't specifically tell you when the agreement will expire but very clearly when it does expire then the system will become taxable the way I read it --

DR. MCCRIMMON:

Not taxable.

MR. HENDERSON:

-- upon the expiration of the agreement. They are not taxable now is my understanding of the matter. An agreement exists in the matter. This is the point would like to have clarified specifically, because the correspondence from the City of Wetaskiwin doesn't coincide with the interpretation being placed on it by the sponsor of the bill. And I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if I could simply ask that the clause be held until we receive a check and find out specifically what the exact picture is on the matter?

I would ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs if he has responded to the City of Wetaskiwin on the matter relative to their letter of May 2?

MR. RUSSELL:

I haven't responded to the letter yet because the concerns in the letter are correct. We face one of these situations whereby if we don't proceed with the amendment the county is mad at us, and if we do proceed with the amendment the city is mad at us.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Politics, eh?

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes. The county in this case was probably a bit politically more astute, if I can put it that way, by taking their concerns to the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties and getting a resolution passed supporting them in this. So when the association came in with this resolution and requested the government to introduce the legislation, we indicated that this situation would arise, there was a matter of taxation dollars here, and unless the two parties involved could, between themselves, reach some fair and equitable tax-sharing agreement there wasn't much else we could suggest. On that basis we have proceeded. We realize it is contentious but it is one of those situations where somebody is going to be mad no matter what happens.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, might I ask the minister -- the way I read the bill, its not now taxable. It is now exempt because the act as it now reads says "...of providing water supply service to the consumers of a municipality..." and so the works are now exempt so far as taxation is concerned on the part of the county. Now by moving the amendment it makes them taxable on the part of the county and so the works are not taxable at the moment, and I think the question is whether private ownership should be the determining factor in it.

Is it a matter of principle that facilities and services owned by one municipality and extend beyond into another, if the system is publicly owned that the -- Let's assume the water line, the service supply system were owned by the city itself. As I understand it under the agreement the County of Wetaskiwin would not be taxing the City of Wetaskiwin.

The issue is really that simply because it's privately owned it becomes taxable on the part of the county and becomes a tax that the city of Wetaskiwin residents indirectly have to pay. Circumstances where the facility was publicly owned, even though it's owned by a different municipality and doesn't serve that municipality, it is not taxable. I'm suggesting that it should not be taxable in this case.

All that is going to happen if the government proceeds is simply the communities in question (in order to avoid the taxation) are simply going to come to the province with a request for funds to buy out and take over the system. The absolute end would be the simple fact that it would put them on the same basis as other publicly owned systems where the tax is not applicable. That's the basic question I'm concerned about. It's only in something like five communities in Alberta as I understand that the problem exists.

Am I right, Mr. Minister, in my conclusion or assumption that publicly owned utility works lying outside the corporate boundaries of one municipality and within another not used by that municipality are not taxable now, or are they taxable?

MR. RUSSELL:

I think because of the way the franchise agreements expire that, in fact, this is the only one left in the province. I don't think there are five --

MR. HENDERSON:

There are five being served by Calgary Power.

MR. RUSSELL:

This was just verbal, not written advice given to me by the department and so it could be corrected on that basis.

But the problem is the last amendment, in 1970 or 1971, took away from the county tax revenues they had up until then. The thing was taxed up until that particular time. The amendment then removed the right of taxation. So the county objected because they were losing that revenue. This amendment puts it back. Up until that time the taxes, of course, had been paid by the users, presumably, of the utility system. What this amendment does is really restore the situation to what it was to try to make up for the lost tax revenue to the county. The last amendment gave a saving to the city and naturally they would not object.

But as I said earlier it is really one of those situations where somebody is going to be mad no matter what happens. The city or the county in one case or the other stands to lose the tax revenue.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, the minister didn't answer my question. I agree it's a hypothetical one. The question is: portions of the water system involved now serving the City of Wetaskiwin lie beyond their corporate boundaries in the county. If they owned the facilities would they be paying taxes to the county, if it were publicly owned? That's the question. This simply relates to a privately owned facility. The question I'm getting at is that it is my impression that the facilities owned by the City of Wetaskiwin, if they owned them as opposed to Calgary Power, outside their own boundary they wouldn't be paying taxes to the County of Wetaskiwin. That's the question I pose.

The reason the amendment went in was to put the private utility serving these particular consumers on the same basis as publicly owned ones, so that the private utility is not paying a tax not paid by the publicly owned one. It's my understanding, subject to correction by the minister, that if it were publicly owned it would not be taxable. By changing it back it is simply discriminating against the privately owned utility operator with whom the municipality in question is quite happy. As I say, conceivably the ultimate consequence would be to force -- in order to avoid the taxation becoming significant, to avoid the taxation on the part of the county against the City of Wetaskiwin -- for the city to come and request public money through the Municipal Financing Corporation to take over and operate the thing themselves in order to get them on the same basis as the other publicly owned utilities in the province. That is the basic question. I realize what it is doing, but I am questioning whether one should be discriminating against the private utility providing the service in this case. I would like to know the answer to the question, if it were publicly owned would it be taxable? -- because that is the crux of the case. If it were taxable, even publicly owned, then I would accept on principle that the city doesn't have an argument. But if it were not taxable and city owned, I suggest that it is simply a discriminatory piece of legislation to eventually force the utilities in question onto the public ground at the borrowing expense of the Municipal Finance Corporation.

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe what the hon. member says is correct. I would like the section held for me to be able to absolutely check in legal terms the sort of hypothetical solution he has advanced for the problem. The other part of the clause is simply an effort to try to restore the tax revenue the county formerly had prior to the last amendment.

MR. HENDERSON:

I realize that, Mr. Chairman, but only one, two or three municipalities are involved. I would ask, Mr. Chairman, that we simply hold the section and ask the minister to check it further because as it stands now it is discriminatory.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is it agreed that Section 10 be held?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Sections 11 and 12 of the bill were agreed to without debate.]

[Section 13 as amended was agreed to without debate.]

[Section 14 was agreed to without debate.]

[Section 15 as amended was agreed to without debate.]

[Sections 16 through 19 were agreed to without debate.]

[Section 20 as amended was agreed to without debate.]

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, am I going to get a reply to my question from the hon. member sponsoring this bill?

DR. MCCRIMMON:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. Now I believe you were speaking, Mr. French, on Section 3(2), lands of an arable nature which could be cultivated economically but are restricted to grazing use. They must be assessed at grazing values. The variables and quality of grazing lands or carrying capacity of the lands determines the assessment value within the limits set by the grazing value schedule.

Now you mentioned that the ratio 3.2 to 1, of arable land to grazing land, which implies a value of \$40 an acre for the top arable land as compared with \$12.50 per acre for 16 acres per head pasture, illustrated by taking 320 acres of pasture and comparing it to 100 acres of top arable land. The illustration used a 40 acre per head rating against the 320 acres to show that eight animal units were produced in comparison to the returns from 100 acres of top arable land. The actual illustration should have been used for a 16 acre pasture taking a value of \$12.50 per acre which would then produce 20 animal units. I think perhaps if you would like to check over your figures you may find the difference.

The actual grazing schedule then is 2.5 times more generous than you illustrated in your debate. Pasture classifying at 40 acres per head will take an assessment of \$5.00 per acre giving a ratio of 8 to 1. This is my finding on checking out your debate, Mr. French.

MR. FRENCH:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm very sorry the hon. member misunderstood my reference.

I notice it is getting close to adjournment time and I think in all fairness to the hon. member I should give you some other concerns. If I have time I'll go back and maybe correct that information you have.

Now coming back to Section 2, this is the one that really disturbs me. It says here "the leasehold interest of the person in those lands shall be assessed as if the lands were grazing lands owned by him." Now, Mr. Chairman, this simply says that henceforth the grazing lands held by lessees are going to be assessed at the same rate as the grazing lands owned by a person.

Now I don't know if this is the answer to what I have been saying for a few years with respect to ratio assessment and I'll come to that when we get time for it.

What we're saying is simply this, that we're recognizing that the tenure of land is not important. In a grazing lease held by a person we all know that it's a grazing lease for a 20 year period or whatever the term of a lease is. At the end of that time we don't know what the tenure is. As far as deeded land is concerned, that is deeded land until the time the land is transferred. This section says there is no difference between tenure land and deeded land and grazing land. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is completely ridiculous.

Now let's have a look at the next thing. I have made just two or three points.

We're also saying the use of the land is not important. We know in a grazing lease, when you have a grazing lease through the Department of Lands and Forests, that grazing lease tells you what you can use that land for. It says it can be used for cattle or whatever use it is. If you use it for any other reason it's a violation of the lease. The lease is subject to cancellation.

Now what we're saying is that the person with a grazing lease has the same value as a person with deeded land and I say in all respect, Mr. Chairman, that anybody who has any knowledge of grazing land at all knows this is completely ridiculous. I certainly oppose this amendment.

I should also say, Mr. Chairman, that we all know that a grazing lease is subject to cancellation for a number of reasons. It is subject to cancellation. There isn't a thing you can do about it. The minister just simply says the lease is cancelled and that's it. But here we are saying that a grazing lease has the same value as deeded land.

We also know too that when you have a grazing lease you have to graze your own cattle on it. You are unable to buy cattle or take somebody else's cattle on a cost-share basis or any consideration and raise it. Deeded land you can put anybody's cattle on at any time; you're your own boss. Here we are -- with this amendment, we're saying that grazing land has the same value as deeded land.

Now I must say in all respect, there certainly is a difference. Let's have a look at what happens in lease land when the lease expires or when it is assigned.

A person with a grazing lease, when it's assigned, must pay -- there is a consideration paid to the department. For instance when a lease is signed, half of the value of the consideration has to be paid to the department. These things don't happen in deeded land. When you sell deeded land from A to B, it's a transfer from A to B and that's it. We're saying that lease land has the same value as deeded land. I submit there are many, many differences. I'm only giving two or three very small illustrations.

Now one of the factors in determining deeded land is the location to a market centre. This also has a bearing with respect to market value if it's closer to a market centre. This is one of the factors assessed in deeded land.

As far as a grazing lease is concerned it should be based on the carrying capacity of the value of the forage. It should be based on what that land is worth to graze cattle. As far as a cow is concerned, a cow doesn't care whether that land is 20 miles from market or 5 miles from market. The cow is only interested in the grass. Now as far as deeded land we do get into a completely different area.

Now coming back to your other point. Just briefly, Mr. Chairman, I want to try and clear up some of the impressions we have in this House. The top grazing land in this province is assessed at \$12.50. The top arable land is assessed at \$40 an acre. The ratio is 1 to 3.2, whichever way you want to look at it.

What we are saying is that you can take 100 acres of the very best arable land and produce the equivalent on that -- you can take it either way, maybe I should take it with the grazing ratio because that's the way it is under the present formula -- you can make as much money off 320 acres of grazing land as you can on 100 acres of arable land.

Anybody in the cattle business knows that is completely wrong. You take a carrying capacity of 40. That's four head to the quarter section or eight head for the 320 acres, and I say in all sincerity you can't make as much money on eight head of cattle on a 40 acre carrying capacity as you can on 100 acres of the --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Would the hon. member possibly conclude or continue next day?

MR. FRENCH:

I beg leave to adjourn debate because I am really not into it yet.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Attaboy! You keep it up.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report progress.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Chairman left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration the following bills: Bills No. 5, 13, 16, 19, 20, 24 and 31, begs to report same and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe there were some bills that were amended. Were the bills that were amended reported?

Mr. Speaker, then before moving adjournment, I would like to give oral notice that tomorrow following completion of Orders of the Day, Written Questions and Motions for a Return, I will move, seconded by the hon. Deputy Premier that we move as an Assembly to government business for the balance of the afternoon of tomorrow, Thursday. This matter has been explored and I believe will meet with favour by members of the Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 5:32 o'clock.]



PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES (CONT.)

Bill No. Pr. 4	An Act to Incorporate The Grand Chapter of Royal Arch Masons of Alberta
Bill No. Pr. 5	An Act to Amend The Calgary Community Foundation Act
Bill No. Pr. 6	An Act to Amend the Canadian Union College Act
Bill No. Pr. 7	An Act to Incorporate The Grand Chapter of Alberta, Order of The Eastern Star
Bill No. Pr. 8	An Act to Amend The Knights of Columbus Club Act
Bill No. Pr. 9	An Act to Incorporate St. Vincent's Hospital
Bill No. Pr. 10	An Act to Incorporate Westbank Golf and Country Club
Bill No. Pr. 11	An Act to Amend the Alberta Wheat Pool Act, 1970
Bill No. Pr. 12	An Act to Incorporate the Fort Assiniboine Agricultural Association
Bill No. Pr. 13	An Act to Amend an Act to Incorporate The Mennonite Brethren in Christ Church